

**Question on your staff report for Colgan dated October 8, 2025**

---

**Brent Andreychuk** <bandreychuk@adjtos.ca>

Wed, Dec 10, 2025 at  
5:15 PM

To: Floyd P <floydpinto84@gmail.com>

Good evening Mr. Pinto,

Thank you for your questions Mr.Pinto. Please see my responses below in red.

Best regards,

**Brent Andreychuk, B.Comm, CPA, CGA**

Director of Finance/Treasurer

7855 30<sup>th</sup> Sideroad Alliston, ON L9R 1V1

T:[705-434-5055](tel:705-434-5055), ext. 227

E: [bandreychuk@adjtos.ca](mailto:bandreychuk@adjtos.ca)

W: [www.adjtos.ca](http://www.adjtos.ca)

**From:** Floyd P <floydpinto84@gmail.com>

**Sent:** December 7, 2025 8:18 PM

**To:** Brent Andreychuk <bandreychuk@adjtos.ca>

**Subject:** Question on your staff report for Colgan dated October 8, 2025

Good Morning Mr. Andreychuk,

Hope you had a nice weekend. As you are aware that the high cost of water and wastewater along with the ever increasing debt being taken from general taxation or working funds to subsidize the residents on municipal water and wastewater has become unaffordable to residents on municipal water and wastewater and residents on residents on private wells and septic systems, I have some questions and your answers could give more clarity on the issue. My questions pertain to the

report you presented on October 8, 2025 and would appreciate it if you could get back to me. I have also attached along with this email your staff report, the Watson report dated March 29, 2021 two pages, the Exp report from Tribute's consultant dated 201 and a page from the IBI report dated 2019 from Tribute.

## DC charges questions

1. As per your staff report the township collected based on the DC By-Law 2016-35 (original 525 units) Singles 478 units x \$6,742.00 DC charge each unit = \$3,222,676.00 and Towns 47 units x \$5,621.00 DC charge each unit = \$264,187.00 the township also collected interest of \$286,187.00 for a total amount of  $(\$3,222,676 + \$264,187 + \$286,187) = \$3,773,050.00$ . **This \$3,773,050.00 is based on the 2016 DC bylaw.**

Had the township not signed the subdivision agreement on November 9, 2021 and waited until December 1, 2021 the township would have got the new DC bylaw rates which would be (original 525 units) Singles 478 units x \$11,399.00 DC charge each = \$5,448,722.00 and Towns 47 units x \$8,681.00 each = \$408,007.00 the township would still collect interest which would be much higher but we can go with the interest of \$286,187.00. This would bring for a total amount of  $(\$5,448,722 + 408,007 + \$286,187) = \$6,142,916.00$ . **This \$6,142,916.00 is based on the 2021 DC bylaw.**

I have not included DC charges paid in 2023 and 2024 as those were as per the 2021 rates.

Question : Based on the above calculations if you minus the above 2021 DC rate total of \$6,142,916.00 from the 2016 DC total of \$3,773,050.00 the Township lost \$2,369,866 in DC charges. Have I accurately calculated the loss of DC charges based on the 2016 and 2021 rate difference? If not, could you please provide me with the accurate loss based on the 2016 and 2021 rates?

The 2021 DC bylaw (general/townwide) rate in force in 2021 was \$9,012 for singles and \$7,008 for towns. Based on the 2021 rates the township would have collected, 478 single units x \$9,012 DC single = \$4,307,736 and 47 Towns x \$7,008 DC town = \$329,376. Using the same interest the total amount  $(\$4,307,736 + \$329,376 + \$286,187) = \$4,923,299$ . The 2021 DC rate total is \$4,923,299 and the 2016 DC rate total is \$3,773,050 for a difference of \$1,150,249.

## Water and wastewater

2. You stated in your report Identified in Schedule T Tribute Communities (owner) would receive a credit towards the wastewater connection fees and the water connection fees in an amount not to exceed the capital costs of the wastewater treatment plant and capital costs of the standpipe and associated infrastructure.

I fully agree with you that the township had to give a credit to the developer for the additional wastewater capacity being built to accommodate the 87 pre-existing homes in Colgan not part of the development as this was stated in the Ontario Land Tribunal Decision.

There is no mention in the Ontario Land Tribunal decision that the township had to give a credit to the developer for any water capital costs for the stand pipe and associated infrastructure

## Water questions

1. Do you know why the township gave the developer a credit for the capital costs for the stand pipe and associated infrastructure when it was not part of the Ontario Land Tribunal decision? **No credit was given to the Developer.** Could you kindly direct me to the section of the Ontario Land Tribunal decision that required the township to issue these credits for water just in case I missed the section in the Tribunal decision? **Please see previous answer above**

2. You stated in your report the Water connection rates 644 units @ 6326.47 = \$ 4,073,944. How much of the \$4,073,944 collected was credited to the developer as a credit for the stand pipe and associated infrastructure? **See answers in red above.**

3. How much credit did the developer give the township for using the existing township infrastructure that includes the wells in Colgan that the developer is using for their development? **None**

4. How much credit did the developer give the township for using the existing pipe infrastructure that was put in by the township from the wells to the pre-existing homes in Colgan as the developer hooked up to the existing pipe and did not have to put a new pipe from the wells to their development? **None. The developer was responsible for constructing and paying for all the water pipes in the new subdivision as well as the construction of a standpipe and water booster station and the cost to connect to the wells in Colgan.**

5. As the cost of construction was \$3,500,000 and the connection fees collected was \$4,073,944 could you let me know where has the difference of \$4,073,944 - \$3,500,000 = **\$573,944** been accounted for? **See answer below in red.**

7. Just as the developer was credited only for the cost of the wastewater infrastructure for the pre-existing 87 homes. The developer, if needed, although not mentioned in the Ontario land tribunal decision should have been credited only for the cost of the water stand pipe and associated costs for the 87 pre-existing homes in Colgan. This amount would be the water connection fees of  $\$6326.47 \times 87 = \$550,402.89$  this again raises the question how much was the developer credited for water and why? **Connection charges are only levied when a new or existing homes connect to existing municipal infrastructure. There was no township wastewater system in Colgan and Tribute was responsible constructing and paying for entire wastewater treatment plant and system infrastructure at their cost. Tribute was also responsible for the constructing and paying for the standpipe and water booster station and related infrastructure. Hypothetically, the total connection charges of \$15,260,868 wastewater + \$4,073,944 water = \$19,334,812 in place at the time would not have exceeded the total cost of the water and wastewater infrastructure (\$35,000,000 wastewater + \$3,500,000 water) = \$38,500,000 paid for by the developer. Therefore township did not collect any connection charges.**

### Wastewater questions

3. You stated that the construction of the sewage treatment plant was \$35,000,000 and the township collected Sewer connection rates 644 units @ 23697.00 = \$15,260,868 which would leave the township with a shortfall of \$19,165,188 as per your report.

The land tribunal decision stated that the township had to credit the developer for the pre-existing 87 homes in Colgan not part of the development so they could hook up if they wanted in future.

Using the 644 developer allotted homes plus the 87 pre-existing homes = total 731 homes. If you divide the cost of the sewer plant \$35,000,000 by 731 total homes = \$47,879 per home. Hence, the actual connection fees for each home in Colgan should have been \$47,879 and not \$23,697 that the township charged the developer. **The Watson report attached stated connection charges would be calculated using actual costs or updated estimated costs.**

The difference in the connection fees of \$23,697 and \$47,879 was because the \$23,697 was calculated using the old costing for construction of the wastewater treatment plant and not the actual costs. However, as the actual costs of the plant was \$35,000,000 and that is the amount that the township staff and council should have taken when fixing the connection fees as per the Watson report approved by council attached along with this email.

## Questions

1. You stated that the township would have a shortfall of \$19,165,188 but this shortfall was caused because the township used connection fees that were based on an old costing report plus inflation and the township did not use the actual costs of construction of the plant. Had the township used the actual costs \$35,000,000 divided it by the number of homes there would be no shortfall except for the 87 homes that the township was required to credit the developer, which would be  $\$47,879 \times 87 = \$4,165,473$  and the balance would have been covered by the connection fees from the 644 homes. Is my calculation right, if not could you kindly provide the correct calculations? **As noted above, connection fees were not collected, as the Developer built and paid for all infrastructure.**
2. As per the Watson report dated March 29, 2021 approved by council attached along with this email the township share was to be paid to the developer in 20 years with interest. This payment plan was put in place by council to avoid increasing the money taken from general taxation (including residents on private wells and Private septic systems) to subsidize the municipal wastewater users. Has this 20 year payment plan been put in place or has the entire credit been returned to the developer? If the 20 year plan was put in place was it part of the subdivision agreement and could you direct me to that section of the subdivision agreement? When does the 20 year payment plan start and at what interest rate? **There was no payment to the Developer for the infrastructure constructed by the Developer.**

3. As per the Watson report attached along with this email there were two scenarios. The first was costing without development and the second costing with development commencing in 2025 as the Colgan development was anticipated to start in 2025 by which time all reports etc would be completed. The last paragraph of the Watson report states "Charges would be indexed annually based on capital cost indices and updated periodically as updated capital costs estimates or actual costs are known." Were the connection fees of \$23,697 arrived at using the updated capital costs estimates or actual costs? If the actual cost of \$35,000,000 was used how did the connection fees come to only \$23,697 when connection charges or DC charges are supposed to pay for the complete infrastructure costs as per the IBI report 2019 from Tribute marked in red? **As explained above, there were no connection fees, nor are there water or wastewater infrastructure costs in the DC Background Study**

4. The EXP report dated 2019 from Tribute attached along with this email that was presented to council showed the exact breakup of the costing of the Colgan wastewater plant. Could you kindly provide me with any report that came to council with the detailed costing of the sewer plant after 2019 that was used to calculate the connection fees of \$23,697? **Please note that any Council reports from February 2019 date on are publicly available on our website.**

5. What total construction cost was used to come to the connection fee of \$23,697 as if you multiply \$23,697 x 731 homes the total cost of the sewer plant would only be \$17,322,507 and not \$35,000,000. **The connection fees were determined and approved by Council before the sewer plant was constructed**

I do not think you were the treasurer when the Colgan subdivision agreement was approved and the financials negotiated by whomever. However, residents have been given to understand that the negotiations and trade offs for water and wastewater are well documented by past staff. If needed, you could refer to those well documented negotiations and trade offs which could help you answer some of the questions as there are no records of any detailed financials for water and wastewater costing coming to council for approval. As council did not have a delegation bylaw at the time of signing of the Colgan subdivision agreement on November 9, 2021 all financial and other approvals should have come to council.

I thank you in advance for your time and look forward to receiving your reply.

Floyd Pinto

I sent the below follow up email to the township treasurer. I have put my comments in purple below for residents to understand. The portion in orange is my new questions that I am awaiting answers on.

## Follow up question on water and wastewater

---

Floyd P <floydpinto84@gmail.com>

Thu, Dec 11, 2025 at 5:31 PM

To: Brent Andreychuk <bandreychuk@adjtos.ca>

Good Afternoon Mr. Andreychuk,

I would like to thank you and I acknowledge your answers to my past questions. However, I would like to get more clarifications on the water and wastewater as Mayor Scott Anderson's email to me seems to contradict some of your answers. In Scott Anderson's email to me he specifically states that credits were given and tradeoffs took place. Below are my corresponding answers and questions following up your answers on my last email.

1. Thankyou for clarifying that the difference of \$1,150,249 between the 2016 and 2021 DC rates is a loss to the township revenue.

While I agreed to go with his amount of \$1,150,249 loss in revenue from DC charges the amount will be much higher as the amounts he used were from the 2021 bylaw of \$9012 for singles and \$7008 for townhomes. But as per the staff report attached below page 2 circled in red the first building permits were issued in November 2022 so based on cost indexing the price would be much higher had the permits been issued in November 2022 rather in 2021 when the subdivision was signed and payment was made for the 525 homes. In my initial calculation I used an average indexing to come to an amount for November 2022 when the building permits were issued and should have been paid. That made my estimated cost using the November 2022 date at around \$2.3 million

### 2. water questions.

1. Thank you for confirming that No credit was given to the developer for the standpipe and associated infrastructure. As you are unable to direct me to any section of the Land tribunal decision I would be safe to state that no such section exists that requires the township to reimburse the developer for any water upgrades or new construction.

The treasurer and I agree that the developer was given no credit (no payment ) for the standpipe (water tower) and associated infrastructure. As he cannot direct me to any section in the land tribunal agreement that required the township to credit the developer, the township is not responsible for any costs. But did Scott Anderson not state in his email to me dated January 2024 that credits were given for water infrastructure.

2. Thank you for confirming that No amount of the \$4,073,944 in water fees was given to the developer as a credit.

Here I confirm with the treasurer that the entire amount of \$4,073,944 (water hookup fees of \$6,326.47 x 644 homes) was not given to the developer. As this fee was not given to the developer this entire amount of \$4,073,944 was to be collected from the developer. So, where is this \$4,073,944 that could have been used to pay up a major portion of the water debt of 5 million that would then reduce the water rates and make the rates more affordable?

3. Thank you for confirming that the developer did not give the township any credit for the use of the township pre-existing well and main water pipe from the well to the colgan development. Based on your answer the residents paid around \$2.5 million for the well and main pipe from the well to the pre-existing homes and the developer got all this for free. This money was supposed to have been recovered from the developer to reduce the water debt and also reduce the water rates. The debt once paid up was supposed to be returned to the residents not on Municipal water and wastewater.

The way this development was initially done was the township drilled the wells that could sustain the development of 300 homes, The engineers then decided to put two pipes in the same aquifer and said they now found additional water for 615 homes. As the development would be using the township well, the developer was required to repay the debt the township took to drill the wells plus all interest and piping costs from the wells to the Colgan pre-existing homes as the developer hooked into the main pipe paid for by the township. The hookup fees of \$4,073,944 were to cover that debt and make the water rates more affordable. So now we are back to the same question if the treasurer has stated no amount of the \$4,073,944 was given to the developer as a credit then where is the \$4,073,944 and why is it not being used to reduce the water debt and thereby reduce the water rates for all residents on municipal water?

4. Thank you for again confirming that the developer gave the township no credit. I completely agree that the developer was responsible for constructing

the standpipe and water booster station and the cost to connect to the well as there is no section in the land tribunal agreement that required the township to pay the developer or give the developer any credit for infrastructure that benefitted the developer.

I agreed with the treasure that the township was not responsible to the developer for any payment of the standpipe and associated costs as there was no mention in the legally binding land tribunal agreement that the township has to pay for any standpipe or associated costs that do not benefit the pre-existing homes in colgan.

5. We both agree that the cost of construction as per your staff report for the standpipe and associated infrastrucure was \$3,500,000 and the connection fees that was supposed to be collected on the 644 homes at \$6326.47 per home as per your report was \$4,073,944.

This point is not relevant as I was just confirming the treasurers staff report that the cost to the developer to build the standpipe (water tower) was \$3,500,000 and the total water hook up fees was \$4,073,944.

**7. I have a question on this point and would appreciate it if we could keep the water and wastewater accounts separate as I think you are referring to wastewater when I am referring to water.**

My question is quite simple, you have acknowledged that the developer was given no credit from water connection fees by the township for water infrastructure as the township had drilled the well and put the main pipe all at the township costs that is now part of the water debt of \$5 million. You also acknowledged that the developer gave the township no credit for using our well and main pipe. Based on this the township was required to collect water connection fees of  $\$6326.47 \times 644 \text{ homes} = \$4,073,944$  which to my understanding has not been collected as in point 3 above you confirmed that the developer gave the township no credit for using our existing township infrastructure. So, Technically this \$4,073,944 is still outstanding and should have been collected and used to pay up the water debt and thereby also reduce the water rates. Could you explain why this amount of \$4,073,944 was not collected by keeping the water and wastewater accounts separate.

### 3. Wastewater questions

1. You have stated in your report that the township would have a shortfall of \$19,165,188 can you please explain in detail how you came up with this shortfall amount? Please keep the water and wastewater accounts separate as

they are two separate debts and two separate general ledger account numbers.

I am still awaiting an answer to this question. The reason that I asked for the water and wastewater to be kept separate is because the water and wastewater are two separate general ledger accounts with two separate debts and should not be mixed up together for accounting purposes.

As per your report the total cost for the construction of the wastewater plant was \$35,000,000 (35 million). Could you kindly direct me to the section of the Land Tribunal Decision that required the developer to build the wastewater plant to accommodate the 87 pre-existing homes in Colgan, I could have missed the section?

I am still awaiting an answer to this question as no where in the legally binding land tribunal decision does it state the developer is required to build the plant to accommodate the 87 pre-existing homes nor does it state anywhere in the land tribunal decision the township is required to pay for the additional capacity the developer built to accommodate the pre-existing homes in Colgan. No one from the pre-existing homes in Colgan want to connect to the municipal wastewater system as they all have their own private septic systems.

2. You have stated in your report that Schedule T "the owner (Tribute) would receive a credit towards the wastewater connection fees and the water connection fees in the amount not to exceed the capital costs of the wastewater treatment plant and capital costs of the standpipe and associated infrastructure". This statement conflicts with your point 4 answer where you stated that "The developer was responsible for construction and paying for all the water pipes in the new subdivision as well as construction of a standpipe and water booster station and the cost to connect to the wells in Colgan." Why would the township give a credit for the standpipe, water booster and wastewater plant that benefited the developer. Also, at the same time you have stated in your above response that no credits were given.

I am still awaiting an answer on this question as the treasurers statements conflict. He stated above that no credits were given to the developer and developer gave us no credits. Now, he states in Schedule T that Tribute was to receive credits for capital costs for water and wastewater. But why would Tribute receive credits (payments) when the township paid for the well and main pipe? Why would Tribute receive credits for over sizing the wastewater plant to accommodate the 87 pre-existing homes in Colgan when none of the pre-existing home owners asked to be connected? The legally binding land

tribunal decision makes no mention of the township responsible for paying for any new water and wastewater infrastructure that benefitted the development.

If the township was required to pay the developer to build capacity in the wastewater plant for the 87 per-existing homes, what would the amount be for the 87 pre-existing homes? would the amount the township owes the developer for the per-existing homes be as per you report sewer connection fees  $\$15,260.23 \times 87 \text{ homes} = \$1,327,640,01$  and as per the Watson report approved by council this would have to be put on a 20 year repayment plan with interest.

So, even if the developer paid and built the sewer plant the township would only be liable for the 87 per-existing homes of  $\$1,327,640.01$ .

Still awaiting this answer

3. I was referencing the connection fees and the water and wastewater infrastructure costs in the watson report not the DC Background study. If the wastewater connection fees are required to pay for the capital costs for the \$35 million sewer plant, could you explain to me how the township uses \$23,697 as wastewater connection fees? As  $\$23,697 \times 731$  (644 new homes + 87 per-existing homes) =  $\$17,322,507$  (approximately 17.32 Million and not 35 million).

Where did you get the \$35 million from and did someone give you this figure?

Still waiting for this answer

4 & 5. You have stated that council reports from February 2019 date on are publicly available on our website. However, I have reviewed all the agendas and minutes and cannot find any detailed costing for the wastewater plant besides the one submitted by EXP in 2019. If you are unable to direct me to any staff reports that came to council for approvals with all details is it fair to come to a conclusion that no such detailed financial reports came to council for approvals? As the treasurer you should have been provided with the reports approved by council or if you were not the treasurer at that time you should have some reference to justify how the amount of \$35 million was arrived at in case of an audit and when the report came to council for approval? Especially when your report states the wastewater plant costs \$35 million and the township only used wastewater connection fees of  $\$23,697 \times 731$  homes that came to  $\$17,322,507$ . That is a huge difference of  $\$17,677,493$  when you minus  $\$17,322,507$  from  $\$35,000,000$ .

As many residents from Colgan and I have asked council for the council agendas and minutes when all the detail financials came to council for approvals and I as Mayor at the time have copies of all the council meeting minutes with no such staff reports or minutes I asked the treasurer if he has the copies as the current council cannot provide any copies or records. Given the large amounts of money involved there would have to be a trace of who approved what and how was all these amounts approved based on which staff reports and when were they approved. As the treasurer's staff report puts the cost of the wastewater plant at \$35 million and the wastewater hookup fees at \$23,697 x 731 homes (new homes 644 + 87 pre-existing homes) = 17,322,507 the difference between the hookup fees and the cost of the plant is \$17,677,943 so what is the wastewater plant actual cost?

I look forward to answers to my above questions and a detailed breakdown separate for water and wastewater costing which should help shed more light into this financial problem.

water

I feel the water is pretty straight forward. As you said the township did not give the developer any credit from the water connection fees and the developer did not give the township any credit for the use of our well and main pipe. The developer paid \$3,500,000 for his standpipe and pipes in the development that benefitted his development so the water connection fees of \$4,073,944 is still outstanding to be collected from the developer and used to reduce the water debt and thereby reduce the water rates.

wastewater

1. Please confirm if the final cost for the wastewater plant is \$35 million?
2. If the final cost is \$35 million. Why was \$23,697 used as wastewater connection fees when \$23,697 would only come to \$17,322,507?
3. Was the actual cost of the wastewater plant \$17,322,507 and not \$35 million?

Thank you,  
Floyd Pinto