5. COMMUNICATIONS

5.2 Correspondence respecting Item 11.1 - Modification of the Waste Collection Services Request for Proposal to Include Options for Bi-Weekly Collection of Landfill Waste

*5.2.d Grant Ranalli

*5.2.e Susan Woodrow

*5.2.f Greg Atkinson

*5.2.g Kevin McNally

*5.2.h Pamela F. Wise

Recommendation: Be received and referred to the consideration of Item 11.1.

6. DELEGATION REQUESTS

*6.4 David N. Reed respecting Item 10.1 - Municipal Class Environmental Assessment and Conceptual Design of Ancaster Elevated Water Reservoir (PW17022(b)) (for today's meeting)
10. **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

10.1 Municipal Class Environmental Assessment and Conceptual Design of Ancaster Elevated Water Reservoir (PW17022(b)) (Ward 12)

*10.1.a Revised Report PW17022(b) and Additional Appendix "C"

12. **NOTICES OF MOTION**

*12.1 Ward 1 Multi-Modal Connections Review

*12.2 Transit Shelter Installation at Upper Paradise Road at Wingfield Place (Ward 14)
To the City Clerk,

*Could this letter to the Hamilton Spectator be included in the Agenda of the Public Works Committee meeting scheduled for Monday November 18th.*

I was asked by Councillor J.P. Danko to do so.

That you,

Grant Ranalli

---

A ‘Wasted Opportunity’? Let’s hope not.

On Monday November 18, *(NOTE to Ed: or ‘today’ if this runs Monday)* the Hamilton Public Works Committee will debate and decide on a very important, seven year contract. It’s about a proposed change to the collection of garbage - (landfill waste) from weekly to bi-weekly collection.

Councillors have debated this in the past but it is time to give serious consideration to this proposal, put forth by Councillor John-Paul Danko. New to City Council, Danko is bravely taking on a divisive issue.

First, some basic facts.

Your green cart compost, yard waste, your recyclables (paper and containers) will still be collected every single week, so concerns about green bin stink are unwarranted. They will be collected weekly and the City has offered several strategies to reduce unpleasant odours. Like hosing out the bin weekly when possible. A simple, yet effective practice and rinsing cans and bottles would eliminate odours from the container blue box too.

The only change, is that our garbage bag or pail, would be collected every second week - with no reduction in volume (two bags every two weeks vs. one bag every week) so essentially, we are talking about a change in schedule, *not* a reduction in service as some have erroneously claimed.

Why the controversy?

It all comes down to money - with big savings for the City (residential taxpayers). Due to fewer runs by garbage trucks, the City will save $3M a year. So $3M x 7 year contract = $21 million.

and there would be reduced pollution from trucks with half the trips.
We know that bi-weekly collection leads to increased diversion (i.e. more recycling) so the total volume of garbage collected will decrease. It means the landfill will last longer. A 5% increase in diversion increases the life of our landfill by four years.

Note that landfill sites are hard to find, require costly environmental approvals, and expensive to acquire, prepare and maintain.

Additionally, the value of the space saved by this 5% diversion over four years is estimated to be $63million.

With our infrastructure deficit northwards of $3Billion and the City mulling over a tax increase of an eyebrow-raising 5.5%, every little (million) bit helps.

Danko says “we have a duty to taxpayers to identify savings in our budgets - even if difficult choices must be made”. So really, IS it that difficult a decision?

A few councillors claim that some of their constituents oppose any change. Nothing new here. Many people often oppose change, even if it may be good for them or the City. -

Another said that he did not want to ‘cut corners’. A change in schedule (no reduction in volume) is not cutting anything, except unnecessary costs to the City.

Could it create an increase in illegal dumping? Illegal dumpers have done so in the past and may continue to do so - regardless of any schedules. Illegal dumping, a blight on the city landscape, that requires increased monitoring and possibly a change in penalties.

Other comparable municipalities have bi-weekly pickup (Ottawa, Halton, Toronto and Waterloo).

Listening to constituents is always a good idea, but some may not have all the information councillors possess, or be misinformed, but most of the information I have gathered for this piece had come straight from this very newspaper.

When councillors say they have had ‘opposition from constituents’ I have to ask, ‘How much opposition?’.

A few irate phone calls or was survey taken? If so, how were questions worded? I'll bet if you asked people if you would like a ‘reduction in service’, most would likely say 'No'.

But would it to be the responsible thing, as councillors to first make sure constituents know the and understand the facts so that they understand what they are actually for or against and can make informed choices.
I believe that this is called ‘leadership’.

So, if the question was phrased as, ‘Are you in favour of the City saving millions of dollars and possibly reducing our planned tax increase, extending the life of our landfill, and saving on diesel pollution, if it would require a minor change in your garbage pickup schedule?’
Maybe different results.

Changing our collection schedule is not that big a deal.
Other cities have done it so can’t the ‘Ambitious City’ do it as well?
All it takes is the political will.
Let’s not let this chance to improve diversion, help the environment and save the City huge costs be a wasted opportunity, nor to demonstrate strong leadership on a controversial issue.

Grant Ranalli was a member of the city’s Waste Reduction Task Force
and was co-chair of the environmental committee for the Hamilton Catholic School Board.

Grant Ranalli
Hamilton ON
Dear Mr. Danko

I read in the Spec. today that you are proposing the City consider bi-weekly garbage pick-up.

I strongly believe that this would be a good way of saving money, hopefully encouraging more people to do the "3R's" and divert more away from landfill.

I live in at 299 Limeridge Rd W. The complex has 26 units and there are approx. 9 units, including mine, that do not put out garbage on a weekly basis.

I'm sure there other municipalities that collect on a bi-weekly basis and I hope other Councillors will research your proposal. Please continue putting this idea forward.

Kindest regards,

Susan Woodrow
Dear Mayor Eisenberger,

I am very encouraged and excited at the proposal that Councillor Danko made regarding bi-weekly garbage pick-up. These decisions aren't permanent, so I hope that the rest of council finds the bravery needed to support it. We can suggest cutting a luxury in the interest of future generations, we can experiment and find creative solutions to the challenges it introduces. Hamilton residents have addressed and solved more complicated matters in the past :)

I'm also encouraged by the profile that this will create for the city. Bi-weekly collection could be another line in the list of accomplishments Hamilton caries, I'm proud of Ward 8 for electing someone who is helping us find ways to shake off a decades-long reputation of steel-mills and smoke stacks. I want us to attract employers who care about the environment because it will have a cascading effect throughout our city's culture. Thank you Councillor Danko, please work hard to make this a reality!

Sincerely,

-Greg Atkinson
Good morning Councillor –
I’m writing to you as a property owner in your ward ( ) to let you know that I support Bi-weekly garbage pickup (with weekly green bin and recycling). When I lived in cities with bi-weekly collection and it works. There will be challenges for some people, but it is very possible for an average household to accomplish and I think the City should move in this direction.
It would demonstrate a commitment to waste diversion and if it saves some costs at the same time, even better.
Thanks,

--

Kevin McNally, P.Eng. (ON, BC)
From: PF Wise
Sent: November 15, 2019 2:24 PM
To: Ward 8 Office <ward8@hamilton.ca>; Danko, John-Paul <John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca>
Subject: re: Bi-weekly Waste collection pick-up

Dear Councillor Danko:

As a resident of Ward 6 for the past 40 years, I would like to thank you for the pragmatic and environmentally conscious recommendation of having a bi-weekly waste collection pick-up for Hamilton.

In my household, garbage per se, goes out once a month, if that- since the Green cart and recycling blue box are constantly in use.

Hamiltonians need to take responsibility for their city when it comes to the Environment and be more cognizant of the size of landfills. In addition to addressing the Environment, the bi-weekly waste collection pick-up will also concomitantly result in savings for the city.

I look forward to this positive change for Hamilton's future which will benefit Hamilton's budget and the Environment, and I proudly support this idea.

It would be appreciated if this email is shared with Hamilton councillors. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Pamela F. Wise
(OCsLT)
Form: Request to Speak to Committee of Council
Submitted on Wednesday, November 13, 2019 - 3:44 pm

==Committee Requested==
Committee: Public Works Committee

==Requestor Information==
Name of Individual: David N. Reed

Name of Organization:

Contact Number: [Redacted]

Email Address: [Redacted]

Mailing Address: [Redacted]

Reason(s) for delegation request: November 18, Discuss concerns over the proposed construction of an Elevated Water Reservoir at the Robert E. Wade community park.

Will you be requesting funds from the City? No

Will you be submitting a formal presentation? Yes
CITY OF HAMILTON  
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT  
Hamilton Water Division

TO: Chair and Members  
Public Works Committee

COMMITTEE DATE: November 18, 2019

SUBJECT/REPORT NO: Municipal Class Environmental Assessment and Conceptual Design of Ancaster Elevated Water Reservoir (PW17022(b)) (Ward 12)

WARD(S) AFFECTED: Ward 12

PREPARED BY: Winston Wang (905) 546-2424 Ext. 4092  
Bert Posedowski (905) 546-2424 Ext. 3199

SUBMITTED BY: Mark Bainbridge  
Director, Water and Wastewater Planning and Capital  
Public Works Department

SIGNATURE: 

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That the General Manager, Public Works Department be authorized and directed to file the Notice of Completion and issue the Addendum to Project File Report for the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment and Conceptual Design of Ancaster Elevated Water Reservoir for the mandatory 30-day public review period.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City of Hamilton (City) retained WSP Engineering Group Limited to complete a Schedule B Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) for construction of the Pressure District 18 Elevated Water Reservoir based on recommendations of the City of Hamilton, Water and Wastewater Master Plan (WWMP) Class EA Report (KMK Consultants, 2006). The Elevated Water Reservoir is required to provide water supply for future growth in Pressure District 18 (PD18) primarily in Ancaster. The new Elevated Water Reservoir planned at the preferred location of 385 Jerseyville Road West (Robert E. Wade Park) is projected to be in service by 2023.
Public, Agencies, First Nations, and stakeholder consultation was completed in accordance with the requirements of the Municipal Environmental Association Class EA document and City protocol through Public Information Centres, mail-outs, and a project website. As well the Ward 12 Councillor was consulted.

The recommendation of this staff report will permit the completion of the mandatory 30-day public review period. Following the 30-day review period, provided that no Part II Orders (complete a higher level of environmental assessment) from the Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) are received, the detailed design and implementation of the preferred infrastructure will proceed.

Alternatives for Consideration – See Page 10

FINANCIAL – STAFFING – LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Financial: Financial considerations will be subject to a future Council request that will include a recommendation that an additional $5.73M be incorporated into the 2020 Rate Budget to reflect the evolution of the project over time. This will update the total budget requirement in Project ID No. 5141395354 from $8.77M to $14.5M.

Staffing: Once the elevated reservoir is commissioned, 0.3 FTE will be required to operate and maintain this new infrastructure. This FTE will be recommended in the Operating Budget in the year it is required.

Legal: Depending on which parcel is acquired, a zoning variance application will be required to facilitate the implementation of the elevated reservoir.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The water distribution system in Ancaster is divided into three (3) Pressure Districts (PD’s). PD18 supplies water to the majority of customers in Ancaster and also services a small section of western Dundas. The need for an elevated water reservoir was documented in the City of Hamilton’s Water and Wastewater Master Plan Class EA Report dated November 2006.

According to the current MECP Design Guidelines for Drinking Water Systems (2008), the existing water pumping station does not fully comply with capacity guidelines.

Historically, low-pressure issues have been reported in the high elevation areas of Ancaster. To address these issues as an interim non-standard measure, the City has modified the operations of PD18 Pumping Station to maintain a pressure higher than the
original design, which has resulted in increased water recirculation within the station, low pump efficiency, increased equipment wear and tear, and increased maintenance and energy costs. Therefore, a water servicing strategy assessment has been conducted to support the Class EA (see Technical Memorandum #2 of the Project File Report under a separate cover) to confirm that an elevated water reservoir can cost effectively resolve those issues for water servicing in the Ancaster community.

A project team, including Public Works Department staff and consulting engineers, conducted this Class EA Study. Other key staff and sub-consultants, including Environmental Scientists, Heritage Planners and Archaeologists, were engaged as required to provide support for various components of the Study.

The Class EA was completed as a Schedule B of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process. The Class EA for this project included Public and Review Agency consultation, evaluation of alternatives, assessment of impacts of the proposed works, and identification of measures to mitigate any adverse impacts. Upon completion of the study, a Project File Report documenting the planning and decision-making process and preferred relocation alternative was prepared. This file is ready for public review. Pending approval of the recommendation of this staff report, a separate advertisement will be issued to advise the public and stakeholders of the Notice of Completion of the Class EA.

A total of fifteen (15) alternative sites (Appendix “A” to report PW17022(b): Study Area & Alternative Sites) have been evaluated according to their natural environment, social and cultural environment, economic, and technical impacts/merits. A comparative assessment of the alternative sites was conducted to determine which solution had the least overall impacts. Site #1 is the preferred site as it results in the least overall impact to natural and technical environments and low to moderate impact on the social and cultural environment.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND LEGISLATED REQUIREMENTS

This recommendation is consistent with the Urban Official Plan. Other policies affecting or impacting this Report include:

- *Ontario Environmental Assessment Act*
- *Ontario Environmental Protection Act*
- *Safe Drinking Water Act, 2002*

RELEVANT CONSULTATION

The Ward Councillor has been advised about the completion of the study and the recommendation of the report. Public and Review Agency (Appendix “B” – Agency
Mailing List to report PW17022(b) consultation is an integral and legislated component of any Municipal Class EA study. Stakeholders are initially notified of the study with a formal Notice of Commencement advertised in the local newspaper. Review Agencies are notified directly by mail or email.

Project Stakeholder and Review Agencies lists are developed at the onset of the study and maintained throughout, thus ensuring all interested parties are kept informed. All Stakeholders are invited and encouraged to comment on the project at any time during the study.

The Agency and Stakeholder Contact Lists include the following groups:

- Federal Agencies
- Provincial Ministries and Agencies
- Aboriginals
- Property owners/businesses adjacent to the preferred sites area
- Others (e.g., utilities, school boards, etc.)

Three (3) Public Information Centres (PIC’s) were held in the Ancaster community. The first PIC was held at Ancaster Municipal Building & Library on September 25, 2012 at 300 Wilson Street East; and the second and third PIC’s were held on October 5, 2016 and April 30, 2019 at the Ancaster Old Town Hall at 310 Wilson Street East. Feedback from attendees was constructive, focusing on issues such as water reservoir colour, visual impact, property value decreases due to water reservoir construction, project goals, timelines and location of the elevated reservoir.

Key feedback from review agencies to date is summarized as follows:

- Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) – For the construction of a new elevated water reservoir, MECP acknowledges that a Schedule B Municipal Class EA process is undertaken under the Municipal Engineers Association Class EA Document in order to identify, evaluate and determine the preferred alternative for addressing water servicing issues in Ancaster. MECP noted that this project is subject to the Safe Drinking Water Act, s. 31 (need for approval, permit and licence), which does fit part of the definition of a Drinking Water System (DWS), which includes anything used in the collection, production, treatment, storage, supply or distribution of water (excluding plumbing). Therefore, the MECP requires that a Schedule C Application to the DWS’s Drinking Water Works Permit be required. In addition, the MECP also requires that the Project File be prepared in such a way as to clearly demonstrate that appropriate steps in Phases 1 and 2 have been followed and suitable for easy
review by the public at any time. Also, the MECP requires adequate consultation with affected Aboriginal communities in the project area.

- The Schedule C Application will be submitted in the Detailed Design Phase of the implementation. The Notice of Completion and the complete Project File Report are to be forwarded to the MECP Office for review, filing and potential comments. Consultation with Aboriginal communities has also taken place and has been documented in the Project File for this Class EA.

- Hamilton International Airport Ltd (HIAL) – Due to the height of the proposed elevated water reservoir, HIAL has been consulted and they reviewed the sites to determine the potential impact on airport zoning regulations. HIAL has recommended that the proposal be submitted to Transport Canada and NAV Canada for review to ensure the structure(s) meet lighting requirements, and flight procedures are not impacted. HIAL also expressed interest in continued involvement in the project process until the project implementation phase.

  - The preferred site is supported by both NAV Canada and HIAL. Transport Canada has also been consulted and they have no concerns on this project.

- Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) – Their concerns focused on three (3) areas: archaeological resources including land-based and marine, built heritage resources, and cultural heritage landscapes. In terms of the environmental assessment reporting, they require that all technical heritage studies and their recommendations are to be addressed and incorporated into EA projects. If the screening has identified no known or potential cultural heritage resources, or no impacts to these resources, the EA report or file is required to include the completed checklists and supporting documentation.

  - Technical heritage studies and their recommendations have been incorporated into the Project File Report for this Class EA.

- Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC) – Part of the subject lands are in the Escarpment Natural Area where water infrastructure is permitted. NEC is interested in specific information about environmental impact; for example, Visual Impact Assessment, Shadow Analysis, to determine any effect in the Niagara Escarpment Plan area.

  - Visual impact assessment and Shadow analysis have been submitted to NEC. The preferred site/area is within the NEC Development Control area. A development permit needs to be secured at 90% detailed design and before construction.
• Hamilton Conservation Authority (HCA) – For this project HCA was consulted and they do not have any concerns for the preferred site.
  o The preferred site is located close to the boundary of HCA, but it is not within the HCA regulated area.

• Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) – For this project GRCA is mainly concerned with wetlands and flood plains, water courses and valley lands within the study area.
  o The preferred site is not within GRCA jurisdiction.

The recommendation of this staff report is part of the final stage of consultation which is an inherent part of the Class EA process. If necessary, the project team will receive and attempt to mitigate all stakeholder concerns or requests for a Part II Order that is initiated within the mandatory 30-day review period.

ANALYSIS AND RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION(S)

By applying the Municipal Class EA process, the project followed the legislated multi-phased analysis rationale. Specifically, the narrative of this study is summarized in the text below. Detailed documentation is in the Project File Report under separate cover.

The Class EA Problem/Opportunity Statement was identified as follows:

• A solution is required to mitigate low pressure issues in Ancaster; to improve the operability and efficiency of the pumping station, to provide redundancy and security of supply, to meet MECP guidelines and City design standards, while reducing energy consumption and GHG emissions in accordance with the City’s Corporate Energy Policy.

The objectives of the Schedule B, Class EA project will be to review and compare alternative solutions to address the Problem/Opportunity Statement (and relevant construction impact), in order to address the above-noted concerns and to identify the preferred solution.

All reasonable alternatives that meet the requirements of the Problem/Opportunity Statement were identified. The following is a list of the alternatives considered in water servicing strategy assessment:
### Alternatives for Water Servicing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Alternative 0 - Do Nothing Approach | - Maintain the current mode of operation at Garner Road HD018 Pumping Station  
- Future upgrades include only a replacement of the existing pumps with similar capacity pumps  
- Results in extremely high operations and energy costs  
- Firm capacity deficiency |
| Alternative 1 – Increase the Capacity of HD018 Pumping Station | - Replace the existing pumps with larger capacity pumps (in a new station on the same site as HD018) to achieve a firm capacity  
- Modify the existing ground reservoir HDR018  
- High operations and energy costs  
- Not resolve potential water supply risks |
| Alternative 2 – Construct a new Elevated Storage Reservoir | - Construct an elevated storage reservoir to provide floating storage  
- Provide security of water supply and alleviate low pressure issues in higher elevation areas  
- Provide reliable water supply and reduce pumping cost and GHG emissions  
- Lowest overall cost due to reduced energy cost in the long run |
| Alternative 3 – Construct a New Booster Pumping Station and Increase the Capacity of HD018 Pumping Station | - Construct a new booster pumping station to service the higher elevation areas to create a new pressure district PD-26  
- Replace the existing pumps with larger capacity pumps (in a new station on the same site as HD018) to achieve a firm capacity  
- Increased energy costs and requires standby power to maintain supply during power outages  
- High lifecycle costs |
| Alternative 4 – Construct A New Booster Pumping Station and In-ground Reservoir, and Increase the Capacity of HD018 Pumping Station | - Construct a new booster pumping station to service higher elevation areas to create a new pressure district PD-26  
- Construct an in-ground reservoir to provide pumped storage for the new pressure PD-26 |
Alternatives for Water Servicing | Description
--- | ---
• Replace the existing pumps with larger capacity pumps (in a new station on the same site as HD018) to achieve a firm capacity
• Dependent on HD018 Pumping Station to maintain supply
• Increased energy costs and requires standby power to maintain supply during power outages
• Highest lifecycle costs

Refer to Appendix C to Report PW17022(b) Brief History of Ancaster Water Service and Summary of Financial Analysis by WSP for comparison.

The following is the list of the potential sites for the elevated water reservoir and the preferred sites:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Sites for Elevated Water Reservoir</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site #1 – North-East corner of Martin Road and Jerseyville Road West in the Robert E Wade Ancaster Community Park</td>
<td>• Located within the Niagara Escarpment and near a built heritage area&lt;br&gt;• Contains archaeological potential&lt;br&gt;• High aesthetic impact on the Niagara Escarpment and high impact during construction&lt;br&gt;• Reduced tank height&lt;br&gt;• City owned&lt;br&gt;• The most preferred location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site #2 – West of Fiddler’s Green Road and Garner Road West in James Smith Park</td>
<td>• No longer considered due to objection from NAV Canada and Hamilton International Airport Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site #3, #4, #7 - #12 - South-West corner of Fiddler’s Green Road and Garner Road West</td>
<td>• No longer considered due to objection from NAV Canada and Hamilton International Airport Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site #5 – North-West of Southcote Road and Garner Road East</td>
<td>• No longer considered due to objection from NAV Canada and Hamilton International Airport Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site #6 – North-East of Raymond Road and Rymal Road West</td>
<td>• No longer considered due to objection of NAV Canada and Hamilton International Airport Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternative Sites for Elevated Water Reservoir

| Site #13 – South of Garner Road West, in between Panabaker Drive and Hamilton Drive | No longer considered due to objection from NAV Canada and Hamilton International Airport Ltd |
| Site #14 – North of the Jerseyville Road West and Shaver Road Intersection | No longer considered due to objection from NAV Canada and Hamilton International Airport Ltd |
| Site #15 – South of Jerseyville Road West, between Paddy Green Road and Shaver Road | Part of the site is located within the Grand River Conservation Authority |
| | Greater tank height due to lower ground elevation |
| | Previously a landfill site |
| | City owned |
| | The least preferred location |

Evaluation Criteria reflect the Multiple Bottom Line evaluation methodology. The evaluation criteria established by the project team are summarized below and a detailed breakdown of each category is included in the Project File Report:

- Natural environment
- Economic considerations
- Social and cultural environment
- Technical and operational considerations

The evaluation process focused on identifying three levels of comparison between the evaluation criteria for each of the alternatives relative to each other. The three levels and criteria are as follows:

- Most preferred – the alternatives where the evaluation criterion is the best
- Moderately preferred – when there are no preferences between the alternatives
- Least preferred – the alternatives where the evaluation criterion has a disadvantage

The intent of this method of evaluation is to identify for each evaluation criterion, which alternative or alternatives have an advantage or are preferred. Once this evaluation process is completed for all criteria, it can then be determined which alternative(s) has the overall preference.
Each alternative was screened against the evaluation criteria. The most preferred location for the Elevated Water Reservoir is the area within Site #1 of the Robert E. Wade Ancaster Community Park at 185 Jerseyville Road West, Ancaster.

Mitigation measures for any negative environmental impact of the preferred alternative have been identified and become conditions of the Implementation Phase of the Class EA. Detailed mitigation measures are included in the Project File Report under separate cover.

Public and Stakeholder consultation is an integral part of the Class EA process. The Agency Mailing List is included in Appendix “B” to report PW17022(b). See the Relevant Consultation section of this Report and the Project File for more details.

The final step in the analysis rationale before proceeding to implementation of the preferred alternative is to undertake the mandatory 30-day review. A Notice of Completion of the Class EA as recommended herein will be issued in the immediate month(s) following the approval of the recommendation of this staff report. Notices will be issued via newspaper advertising and direct mail out to all members of the Stakeholder and Agency Contact lists. The Project File Report will be placed on public record along with contact information to receive concerns. All attempts will be made to mitigate all expressed concerns. Should resolution of a concern be unattainable the conflict may be escalated by the opponent to the Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks for a decision.

The above analysis rationale is a prescribed process under that Municipal Class EA. The project was completed and considered to be in full compliance with the Municipal Class EA process.

ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION

The recommended alternative solutions have been identified using an evaluation and screening process that fulfils the requirements under the Municipal Engineers Association Municipal Class EA document for Schedule B projects.

Should Council not wish to approve the filing of the Municipal Class EA and Conceptual Design of Ancaster Elevated Water Reservoir, the Municipal Class EA process would be considered incomplete by the provincial government. As such, the City will not have approval under provincial environmental legislation to have the option to pursue the preferred solution to Ancaster Elevated Water Reservoir as a Schedule B project. The outcome would be equivalent to the “Do Nothing” alternative, which will result in the risk of insufficient firefighting flows, greater impact of watermain breaks, and higher cost of
operation and maintenance, higher greenhouse gas emissions and energy cost in the long run.

ALIGNMENT TO THE 2016 – 2025 STRATEGIC PLAN

Community Engagement and Participation
Hamilton has an open, transparent and accessible approach to City government that engages with and empowers all citizens to be involved in their community.

Healthy and Safe Communities
Hamilton is a safe and supportive City where people are active, healthy, and have a high quality of life.

Clean and Green
Hamilton is environmentally sustainable with a healthy balance of natural and urban spaces.

Built Environment and Infrastructure
Hamilton is supported by state of the art infrastructure, transportation options, buildings and public spaces that create a dynamic City.

Our People and Performance
Hamiltonians have a high level of trust and confidence in their City government.

APPENDICES AND SCHEDULES ATTACHED

Appendix “A” - Study Area and Alternative Sites
Appendix “B” - Agency Mailing List
Appendix “C” - Brief History of Ancaster Water Service and Summary of Financial Analysis by WSP

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.
OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.
OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.
Date: November 13, 2019

From: Winston Wang
Project Manager, Water & Wastewater Planning

To: Councilor Ferguson
Councilor Ward 12

Topic: Brief History of Ancaster Water Service and Summary of Financial Analysis by WSP

Brief History of Ancaster Water Service:

From information obtained in Hamilton Central Library, it is understood that from 1930s to 1970s, water service was provided through nine (9) community wells and three (3) water towers in Ancaster community. When the water towers reached their life span of 30 to 40 years, they were torn down one by one.

In 1979, the pumping station at Highway 53 (Garner Road) was constructed and water service was switched to a lake-based system, pumping from Woodward Avenue water treatment plant for serving a much larger population. The wells and existing water towers were abandoned at the time in favor of a pumping station. It is understood that climate change and green-house gas were not a significant consideration. Electricity supply and costs were also not a concern.

Water Servicing Financial Analysis Conducted by WSP:

In 2016, WSP Canada Inc helped Hamilton Water Division with a financial analysis on water servicing in Ancaster, which includes the following options below. The preferred option was alternative 2 – Water Tower plus Pumping Station Refurbishment

- **Alternative 0: Do Nothing**, which includes maintaining the current mode of operation at the Garner Road Pumping Station (PS), with high energy costs and insufficient capacity for fire protection
- **Alternative 1: Pumping Station (PS) Upgrade Only**, which includes replacing pumps with large capacities to achieve firm capacity and modification of the existing in-ground reservoir.

- **Alternative 2: Water Tower plus Pumping Station (PS) Refurbishment**, which includes the construction of a water tower for maintaining adequate system pressure, plus a minor upgrade of the pumping station.

- **Alternative 3: Pumping Station (PS) Upgrade and New Booster Station**, which includes higher pumping capacity plus a new booster pumping station at the areas of high elevation.

- **Alternative 4: Pumping Station (PS) Upgrade, New Booster Station and In-ground Reservoir**, which includes large capacity pumping station, a new booster pumping station for servicing areas of high elevation, as well as a new in-ground reservoir.

In the WSP Technical Memorandum, the alternative costs comparison, in 2015 dollars and at a 60-year planning horizon, is summarized in the following table and relevant rationales were provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alternative 0</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2 (preferred)</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Cost ($)</td>
<td>2M</td>
<td>20M</td>
<td>20.3M</td>
<td>22.6M</td>
<td>23.4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Cost ($)</td>
<td>19.3M</td>
<td>7.2M</td>
<td>4.4M</td>
<td>6.1M</td>
<td>6.1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Cost ($)</td>
<td>1.3M</td>
<td>489.6K</td>
<td>489.6K</td>
<td>979.2K</td>
<td>979.2K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green House Gas (GHG) (tons)</td>
<td>12,613</td>
<td>7,515</td>
<td>5,681</td>
<td>6,332</td>
<td>6,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>Unsustainable operation, does not meet MECP requirements for firm capacity and fire flow protection, high operations and energy costs</td>
<td>Can satisfy technical requirements; however, results in high energy costs. PS remains the sole source of supply.</td>
<td>Least risky approach. Most robust operation, not as vulnerable to failures in the pressure district. Most efficient operation, reduced energy costs and</td>
<td>Dependence on PS to maintain supply; increased energy costs; requires greater capacity to ensure firm capacity; high lifecycle costs</td>
<td>Dependence on PS to maintain supply; increased energy costs; requires greater capacity to ensure firm capacity; high lifecycle costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Any failure in the station would result in complete loss of supply.

Notes:

1. An inflation rate for construction cost was 3% and a discount rate for net present value (NPV) calculation was 4.5%, as suggested by staff from Deloitte Canada.
2. A sensitivity analysis for 40-year, 60-year and 100-year planning horizons was conducted. Data are available in WSP’s Project File Report on the project website at: https://www.hamilton.ca/city-planning/master-plans-class-eas/ancaster-elevated-water-reservoir
3. Energy costs include the consideration of hourly water supply during off-peak, mid-peak and on-peak for comparing different alternatives. A sensitivity analysis of energy increase rate at both 6% and 7% was performed in WSP’s report. An energy increase rate of 6% was used for the above table.
CITY OF HAMILTON
NOTICE OF MOTION

Public Works Committee: November 18, 2019

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR J.P. DANKO

Ward 1 Multi-Modal Connections Review

WHEREAS, Action 14 of the 2018 Council Approved Transportation Master Plan (TMP) is to integrate cycling infrastructure needs into the 10 Year Capital Budget for all road reconstruction, rehabilitation and new roads as guided by the updated Cycling Master Plan, with an emphasis on achieving physical separation;

WHEREAS, Action 15 of the TMP states that as part of the implementation of the cycling network, an evaluation of alternatives will be undertaken in order to select routes which maximize safety for cyclists and promote continuity of the network across the City;

WHEREAS, a number of local and collector streets within Ward 1 offer the potential to improve connections for cyclists, provide improved connections to transit and, with minor modifications, improve safety for all road users;

WHEREAS, the concept of neighborhood greenways involves use of small scale measures such as traffic calming and signage to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists on residential streets with lower traffic volumes and potential for lower speeds;

WHEREAS, the changes to the arterial road network associated with Light Rail Transit will present opportunities for, and a demand for, improved multi-modal connections;

WHEREAS, initial candidates for multi-modal improvements or neighborhood greenway interventions include Pearl Street, Kent Street, Breadalbane Street, Leland Street, Emerson Street, Longwood Road South, and various intersections along King Street/Main Street;

WHEREAS, advance planning and design work is required to assess the current list of candidate opportunities for multi-modal connections in Ward 1 and subsequent consideration in the capital budgeting process;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:
(a) That staff be authorized and directed to undertake a review of opportunities for improved multi-modal connections in Ward 1 and report back to Public Works Committee with an implementation plan and costs for the resultant package of measures identified;

(b) That the estimated cost of $125,000 to retain a consultant to undertake a feasibility assessment and develop concept designs for short-listed opportunities be funded from the Ward 1 Area Rating Reserve Fund (108051); and,

(c) That the Mayor and City Clerk be authorized and directed to execute any required agreement(s) and ancillary documents, with such terms and conditions in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor.
CITY OF HAMILTON
NOTICE OF MOTION

Public Works Committee: November 18, 2019

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR T. WHITEHEAD..........................................................

Transit Shelter Installation at Upper Paradise Road at Wingfield Place (Ward 14)

WHEREAS, the City of Hamilton’s Transit Division’s strategic direction is to make transit your first choice, by providing customer-focused service that is safe and reliable;

WHEREAS, the City of Hamilton’s transit stops act as gateways to residents in accessing transit services and transit shelters provide weather protection for transit customers;

WHEREAS, the Transit Division has received requests from residents through the Ward 14 Councillor office in 2018, and 2019, to install a transit shelter at the subject location; and,

WHEREAS, the Ward 14 Councillor has confirmed support for the installation of a transit shelter at the subject location to meet the transit needs of Ward 14 residents;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

(a) That staff be authorized and directed to install a transit shelter and transit shelter pad at the bus stop on the northeast corner of Upper Paradise Road and Wingfield Place, to be funded from the Ward 14 Area Rating Reserve Fund (108064) at a cost of approximately $15,000, with the installation to take place during the transit shelter installation schedule in 2020; and,

(b) That the Mayor and City Clerk be authorized and directed to execute any required agreement(s) and ancillary documents, with such terms and conditions in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor.