

April 16, 2019

Memorandum to: Suzanne Mammel
HHHBA

From: Daryl Keleher, Senior Director
Altus Group Economic Consulting

Subject: Hamilton DC Review
Our File: P-6088

Altus Group Economic Consulting was retained by the Hamilton-Halton Home Builders' Association (HHHBA) to review the City of Hamilton's 2019 Development Charges Background Study and proposed DC By-law. This memorandum presents our questions and comments.

Population, Household and Employment Forecasts

- 1) As the proposed DC by-law would remove the exemption for student residences (and the current DC by-law already charges for off-campus student housing), should the existing and projected student population growth and growth in student housing units be incorporated into the population and household forecast used throughout the DC calculation? Other municipalities with significant student populations (i.e., Waterloo Region) include student population and housing in the calculation of DCs. According to the 2014 Waterloo Region DC study:

Full-time students are included in all population figures in this study because the need for municipal services is in part driven by development triggered by student growth.

General Questions

Accounting for Debt Financed Facilities in LOS Inventory

- 2) There are a number of items for which debt principal and interest costs are included in the capital project lists for recovery through the DC, that are also listed in the Level of Service inventory used for the purposes of setting the maximum allowable funding envelope. Some examples include the Division 30 Headquarters, the Shared Training Facility (Police and Fire), etc. Deductions to the GFA in the LOS inventory should be made that are proportionate to the debt principal being recovered through the DC for these items.

Inclusion of Funding of Exemptions / Discounts

- 3) The figure on page 4-10 of the 2019 DC Study shows the addition of \$40.8 million in "funding of exemptions/discounts". Is this amount meant to show all exemptions granted over the life of the current in-force DC by-law, or does this represent the cost of only the exemptions/discounts granted over 2018 so as to adjust the 2018 year-end balance as needed (with all discounts/exemptions in prior years already incorporated into the pre-adjusted 2018 year-end balance)?

Questions Regarding Level of Service Analysis

Parking

- 4) The header for the parking LOS inventory shows the 2019 value as being expressed in “\$/space including land”, but this appears to actually be expressed in terms of the value of the lots. Can you please confirm what value is being shown, and advise what the underlying per space and per hectare land values were used to reach the per parking lot values?

Parkland Development

- 5) What are the “Non-City-Owned Lands” being referred to on page B-45 as being parklands that the City maintains?
- 6) For the “School Lands” included in the City LOS inventory, which are assigned a value of \$34,000 per acre – does the City contribute any costs towards the development of amenities on these lands, or are these amenities provided by the area’s school boards?
- 7) What is the difference between “Parks on Utility Lands” and “Other Utility Lands”, and why are these each assigned the same value per acre of \$10,600 – what City amenities are provided on these lands? Does the public have access to these lands?
- 8) Why is the value of Ivor Wynne Stadium \$1,585 per sf when the new Tim Horton’s Field is valued at \$443 per sf?
- 9) The LOS inventory includes numerous items related to Confederation Park and Wild Water Works, which is owned and operated by Conservation Hamilton. As these facilities are not owned by the City or a City board, these items and other items owned by Conservation Halton should be removed from the LOS inventory.

Questions Regarding Capital Projects

Services Related to a Highway

- 10) What is the nature of the “Street Lighting Enhancement Program” and why is the BTE allocation only 5%? Are these works to be done to enhance existing street lights?
- 11) What is the nature of the “Intersection Pedestrian Signal” program and why is the BTE allocation only 5%? Are these works being done to improve pedestrian signals at existing or new intersections?
- 12) Does the City know the location of the works to be done under the “New Sidewalk Program”? Are these to be sidewalks built in existing rights-of-way that do not have sidewalks? Are sidewalks associated with identified road projects included into those project costs?
- 13) There are several projects in the City’s 2019 capital budget forecast for which there are “Pre-2019” amounts shown. One such example is the East-West Road Corridor (Waterdown Bypass) project. The capital budget shows \$42.36 million in total costs for the project, of which \$23.66 million are identified as “Pre-2019” costs, with the remaining \$18.7 million in 2019. However, the 2019 DC Study shows what appears to be the full capital cost (\$52.2 million) with no accounting for what appears to have been spent in years prior to 2019. It is understood that the DC reserve funds were adjusted for “funding for projects that have already partial received DC funding”, we would like to understand what

comprises the adjustment made to the reserve fund balances. In the case of the East-West Road Corridor project alone, there is \$23.6 million in previous funding, but the total adjustment made for the Services Related to a Highway is shown on page 4-10 of the DC Study as being only \$14.9 million. The figure below shows all of the projects with “pre-2019” funding in the 2019 capital budget.

Figure 1

Examples of Projects with "Pre-2019" Costs in 2019 Capital Budget Included in Costs within 2019 DC Study

	2019 DC Study	Capital Budget (2019 Onwards)	Capital Budget (Incl. Pre-2019)	% Change	Timing (From DC Study)
		<i>Dollars</i>		<i>Percent</i>	
E-W Road Corridor (Waterdown By-Pass) - Dundas Street to Highway 6	52,207,000	18,700,000	42,360,000	23%	2019-2031
Cordon Count Program	330,000	160,000	270,000	22%	2019-2031
Nebo Road - Rymal Road to Twenty Road	5,870,000	4,800,000	5,020,000	17%	2020
Rymal Road - Fletcher Road to Upper Centennial	15,717,000	12,100,000	12,870,000	22%	2019
Highway 8 (Dundas) - Hillcrest to Park Ave	2,566,000	1,610,000	1,840,000	39%	2019-2031

Source: Altus Group based on Watson & Associates, City of Hamilton 2019 DC Background Study & 2019-2028 Capital Budget, City of Hamilton

- 14) A 15% BTE is applied to Active Transportation projects - page 9 of the Dillon report appended to the DC Study states that this is based on the notion that bicycle lands and active transportation works reduces the capital infrastructure needs for things such as road widenings, and that the “principle reason for implementing this approach is to help accommodate growth.” Conversely, the City’s 2014 DC Study, in Appendix E applied a 50% BTE to Commuter Trails and Bicycle Facilities with a rationale that “a 50/50 split has been allocated to acknowledge that new and existing growth will equally benefit from active transportation improvements.” We would suggest that the approach taken in the 2014 DC Study was more reflective of the benefit and ultimate usage of these additions to the City’s active transportation network.
- 15) There are numerous projects with significant cost increases over and above what is shown in the City of Hamilton capital budget forecast. We would like to understand the reasons for the differences in costs between the two documents. The figure below lists the projects for which we are seeing significant cost increases over the City’s 2019 capital budget.

Figure 2

Change in Capital Costs of Services Related to a Highway Projects, 2019 DC Study and 2019-2028 Capital Budget, City of Hamilton

	2019 DC Study	Capital Budget (2019 Onwards)	Capital Budget (Incl. Pre-2019)	% Change	Timing (From DC Study)
		<i>Dollars</i>		<i>Percent</i>	
White Church Road - Glancaster Road to Highway 6	19,651,000	1,240,000	1,240,000	1485%	2023-2031
Mapping Update Program	6,500,000	890,000	890,000	630%	2019-2031
Airport Road* - Butter Road to Glancaster Road	7,470,000	1,280,000	1,280,000	484%	2023-2031
Southcote Road* - Garner to Twenty Road extension	9,306,000	3,400,000	3,400,000	174%	2023-2031
Highway 8 (Stoney Creek) - Fruitland Road to East City Limit	20,674,000	7,660,000	7,660,000	170%	2023-2031
Fletcher Road - Binbrook Road to Golf Club Road	17,568,000	6,610,000	6,610,000	166%	2026
Southcote Road - Twenty Road extension to Book Road	8,541,000	3,400,000	3,400,000	151%	2023-2031
Twenty Road extension - Southcote Road to Glancaster Road	14,296,000	6,100,000	6,100,000	134%	2023-2031
Arvin Avenue - McNeilly to Existing west end	2,201,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	120%	2023-2031
Butter Rd/Airport Rd - Glancaster to Fiddlers Green (AEGD)	16,097,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	115%	2023-2031
Fifty Road - Q.E.W (South Service Road) to Highway 8	5,277,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	88%	2019-2031
Carlisle Road East - Fiddler's Green Road to Glancaster Road	6,291,000	3,410,000	3,410,000	84%	2023-2031
Millen Road - Barton Street to South Service Road	6,118,000	3,410,000	3,410,000	79%	2023-2031
Multi-modal Level of Service Guidelines	8,761,000	5,280,000	5,280,000	66%	2019-2022
Development Road Urbanization	250,000	160,000	160,000	56%	2019-2031
Binbrook Road - Royal Winter Dr/Binhaven Rd to Fletcher Road	6,840,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	52%	2019
Highway 8 (Stoney Creek)* - Dewitt Road to Fruitland Road	6,534,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	56%	2030
Golf Links Road - McNiven Road to Kitty Murray Lane	4,646,000	3,070,000	3,070,000	51%	2025

Source: Altus Group based on Watson & Associates, City of Hamilton 2019 DC Background Study & 2019-2028 Capital Budget, City of Hamilton

16) There are several projects that are within the City's 2019 DC study project list, with timing prior to 2031 that are shown in the City's 2019 capital budget forecast as having timing beyond 2031. Any such projects deemed by Council to be post-2031 projects can be identified in the DC Study but should have a full Post Period Benefit allocation made. The figure below lists the projects where this is an issue.

Figure 3 2019 DC Study Projects with Post-2031 Timing in City 2019 Capital Budget

	2019-2028 Capital Budget		2019 DC Study			
	Start Date	Gross Cost	Timing	2019 DC Study	Post Period Benefit	Net Capital Cost
		Dollars			Dollars	
Jones Road - Barton Street to South Service Road	2032	2,930,000	2023-2031	3,739,000	-	3,739,000
Miles Road - Rymal Road to Hydro Corridor	2032	7,970,000	2023-2031	10,769,000	-	10,769,000
Southcote Road - Twenty Road extension to Book Road	2032	3,400,000	2023-2031	8,541,000	-	8,541,000
Glover Road - Twenty Road to Rymal Road	2033	8,480,000	2023-2031	9,400,000	-	9,400,000
Lewis Road - Barton Street to South Service Road	2034	2,600,000	2023-2031	3,402,000	-	3,402,000
Butter Rd/Airport Rd - Glancaster to Fiddlers Green (AEGD)	2034	7,500,000	2023-2041	16,097,000	12,136,000	3,961,000
Millen Road - Barton Street to South Service Road	2034	3,410,000	2023-2031	6,118,000	-	6,118,000
Trinity Church Road - Binbrook Road to Golf Club Road	2034	8,120,000	2023-2031	9,032,000	-	9,032,000
Twenty Road - Aldercrest Avenue to 600m west of Nebo Road	2034	14,500,000	2023-2031	16,290,000	-	16,290,000
Centre Road - Northlawn to Parkside Drive	2034	4,620,000	2019-2022	2,434,000	-	2,434,000
Garth Street extension (oversizing) - Dickenson Road to Collector 2E	2034	4,080,000	2023-2031	1,359,000	-	1,359,000
Dickenson Road Extension - Smith Road to Glancaster Road	2034	4,150,000	2023-2031	6,149,000	-	6,149,000
Airport Rd - U. James to Glancaster (AEGD)	2034	10,550,000	2019-2031	14,185,000	-	14,185,000
Twenty Road extension - Southcote Road to Glancaster Road	2034	6,100,000	2023-2031	14,296,000	-	14,296,000

Source: Altus Group based on Watson & Associates, City of Hamilton 2019 DC Background Study & 2019-2028 Capital Budget, City of Hamilton

17) The unit costs used in the 2014 and 2019 DC studies have increased only slightly, most in the range of 7-15% (see Figure 4 below). However, when we look at how the project costs by improvement type have changed, the costs per kilometre for road improvements have increased in the range of 36% to 58% (see Figure 5), which is far above the percentage increase seen in almost any single unit cost (of all unit costs where comparisons were available, only installation of maintenance manholes increased by more than 36%). Can you please explain how the project costs (\$/km) increased so much more significantly than the unit costs that supposedly comprise the bulk of project costs?

Figure 4 Comparison of Unit Costs, City of Hamilton 2014 and 2019 DC Studies

Item	Unit	2014 DC Study	2019 DC Study	% Change
				Percent
Clearing and Grubbing (Area)	m2	3.50	3.93	12%
Excavation	m3	18.11	14.84	-18%
Remove Concrete Sidewalk/Driveway	m2	15.00	16.86	12%
Remove Culverts (Including headwalls/sewers)	m	28.53	32.07	12%
Remove Catchbasin (single)	each	706.88	427.71	-39%
Remove Concrete Curb and Gutter	m	9.28	10.43	12%
Remove Manholes (full depth)	each	494.40	555.71	12%
Remove Manholes (partial depth)	each	494.40	668.58	35%
Remove Concrete Curb Outlets	each	9.28	10.43	12%
Remove Catchbasin (double)	each	692.76	778.66	12%
Cold plane exist. Asphalt	m2	13.66	9.41	-31%
Full Depth Asphalt Removal	m2	3.42	3.93	15%
Granular A - Roadway	m3	51.10	54.73	7%
Granular B - Roadway	m3	40.76	48.59	19%
Tack Coat	m2	0.50	0.61	22%
Hot Mix HL3 (40mm)	tonne	124.68	133.79	7%
150mm DIA non perforated sub drain	m	23.60	27.27	16%
Concrete Sidewalk (not including granular or excavation)	m2	56.44	60.70	8%
Concrete Sidewalk (including granular base)	m2	65.99	85.68	30%
Install Concrete Curb & Gutter (OPSD600.040)	m	98.74	105.56	7%
Topsoil and Sod (300mm)	m2	17.14	20.41	19%
Supply and Install Storm, Sewer Pipes (300mm min.)	m	331.47	350.26	6%
Supply and Install Catchbasin Leads including appropriate fittings, Class 'B' bedding and Granular Backfill (single, 250mm DIA)	m	332.03	373.20	12%
Supply and Install Catchbasin (single, OPSD 705.010)	each	2,446.86	3,180.28	30%
Supply and Install Catchbasin (double, OPSD 705.020)	each	3,540.87	3,979.94	12%
Supply and Install Manhole, Maintenance Holes (OPSD701.01)	each	3,762.41	6,426.00	71%
Pavement Markings	m	2.59	3.21	24%
Fire Hydrant	each	5,579.65	6,588.73	18%

Source: City of Hamilton 2014 and 2019 DC Studies - 2014 Appendix H, HDR, 2019 Appendix H, Dillon

Figure 5 Comparison of Project Costs by Improvement Type, City of Hamilton 2014 and 2019 DC Studies

Improvement Type	Code	2014 DC Study	2019 DC Study	% Change
		Dollars per Kilometre		Percent
Collector Rural Residential	2r	1,418,600	2,241,620	58%
Rural 3 Lanes	3r	1,529,900	2,344,853	53%
Rural 4 Lanes	4r	2,512,800	3,681,788	47%
Collector Urban Residential	2u	2,417,600	3,615,428	50%
Urban 3 Lanes Arterial/Collector	3u	2,686,600	3,929,403	46%
Urban 4 Lanes Arterial	4u	3,548,500	5,177,191	46%
Urban 5 Lanes Arterial	5u	4,281,200	6,040,438	41%
Collector Rural Residential to Industrial Collector 2 Lanes	2r-2i	2,458,800	3,556,562	45%
Collector Rural Residential to Collector Urban Residential	2r-2u	2,644,000	3,825,719	45%
Collector Rural Residential to 4 Lanes Urban Arterial	2r-4u	3,439,800	4,702,224	37%
Collector Rural Residential to 5 Lanes Urban Arterial	2r-5u	4,120,900	5,591,273	36%
Collector Urban Residential to 4 Lanes Urban Arterial	2u-4u	3,475,300	4,984,283	43%
3 Lanes Rural to 3 Lanes Urban	3r-3u	2,774,700	4,080,044	47%
4 Lanes Rural to 5 Lanes Urban	4r-5u	3,988,500	5,895,207	48%
4 Lanes Urban to 5 Lanes Urban	4u-5u	4,275,400	6,276,960	47%

Source: City of Hamilton 2014 and 2019 DC Studies - 2014 Appendix H, HDR, 2019 Appendix H, Dillon

Water and Wastewater

- 18) Do the water and wastewater line items for “New Growth-Related Financing” relate to anticipated debt financing? If so:
- a. What assumptions were made regarding borrowing terms?
 - b. Why is the City assuming the need to borrow \$32.1 million for water if there is an existing surplus in the reserve fund of \$26.2 million?
- 19) The costs for both sections of the Dickenson Road Trunk Sewer are shown as \$44.2 million, despite significantly different lengths (Upper James to Miles Road is 2,900 metres, while Miles Road to RR56 is 6,800 metres). Is one of these cost estimates shown in error, or are they meant to be the same amounts? In the 2014 DC study, a similar sewer to the Upper James to Miles Road sewer had a cost of \$11.48 million.
- 20) Why has the cost of the “HC011-Calvin St SPS Upgrades” increased from \$230,000 in the 2014 DC Study to \$3,500,000 in the 2019 DC Study?
- 21) The cost of “Intensification Infrastructure Upgrades – Wastewater” for the initial five-year period after the by-law comes into force has increased from \$5.0 million in the 2014 DC Study to \$15.0 million in the 2019 DC Study. Does the City have any data to share about recent expenditures that can justify the new annual amount being incorporated into the DC calculation?
- 22) The 2019 DC Study has a cost of \$15.0 million for a “West Harbour Sanitary Pumping Station and Forcemain”, with 10% of the costs attributable to the City/BTE. The 2014 DC Study had a cost of \$2.7 million for the SPS and \$590,000 for West Harbour Servicing (for a total of \$3.3 million), with the costs for each allocated 50% to the City/BTE. What are the reasons for the cost increase and the reduced allocation to the City/BTE?
- 23) The costs for the Woodward WTP include \$8,008,501 for “Internal Staffing Cost Allocation”. What is the nature of these costs, and are they better classified as operating costs?

Storm Drainage

- 24) The land costs for stormwater management facilities is a significant cost in the City’s DC calculation. There are roughly \$97 million in gross costs associated with residential stormwater management facilities. The lands for these facilities are valued at roughly \$1.6 million to \$1.8 million per hectare. We would like to understand what the City’s typical acquisition price would be for stormwater management facility lands, based on recent experience.
- 25) The table in Appendix G-1 shows the estimated footprints of various SWM ponds under two scenarios - 1) based on either 4% or 6% of the drainage area (as per the conditions in the local service guidelines) or 2) based on the study or draft plan the need for the SWM facility was based on. In cases where both calculations are made, the amount from the draft plan is used, and in almost all of these cases, the draft plan estimate is significantly larger than the 4%/6% method. Some of the draft plans these SWMF areas are based on are somewhat dated. The figure below shows the size of the SWMF land areas. Are the footprints identified in older studies still deemed to be reasonable and in keeping with current practices of stormwater management?

Figure 6

Stormwater Management Facilities - Footprints Used in City of Hamilton 2019 DC Study

Project Title	Year of Plan	Drainage Area	Estimated Footprint (4%/6%)	Study/Draft Plan Footprint	Footprint Used in DC Study	Footprint Used as % of Drainage Area
			Hectares			Percent
Meadowlands Phase IV		6.00	0.36	0.60	0.60	10%
Binbrook Settlement Area	Jul-05	22.72	1.36	1.80	1.80	8%
Mewburn and Sheldon Neighbourhoods Master Servicing Plan	Jul-05	15.90	0.95	1.25	1.25	8%
Upper Wellington and Stonechurch		14.00	0.84	1.40	1.40	10%
SCUBE Subwatershed Study (Phase 3)	May-13	26.40	1.58	2.64	2.64	10%
SCUBE Subwatershed Study (Phase 3 - Block2)	Sep-18	16.40	0.98	1.64	1.64	10%
SCUBE Subwatershed Study (Phase 3 - Block 2)	Sep-18	27.60	1.66	2.76	2.76	10%
SCUBE Subwatershed Study (Phase 3)	May-13	54.00	3.24	5.40	5.40	10%
SCUBE Subwatershed Study (Phase 3)	May-13	23.10	1.39	2.31	2.31	10%
SCUBE Subwatershed Study (Phase 3)	May-13	39.80	2.39	3.98	3.98	10%
SCUBE Subwatershed Study (Phase 3)	May-13	24.50	1.47	2.45	2.45	10%
Montgomery Creek Nash Orchards		22.49	0.90	1.35	1.35	6%
Fieldgate Estates - FelkerCommunity Functional SWM	Nov-08	30.00	1.80	1.87	1.87	6%
Mtview Heights	Jul-13	41.06	2.46	2.98	2.60	6%
Mtview Heights	Jul-13	12.71	0.76	1.56	1.56	12%
Waterdown North Master Drainage Plan	Feb-07	9.70	0.00	1.75	1.75	18%

Source: Watson & Associates, City of Hamilton 2019 DC Background Study

- 26) In addition to the approach taken regarding land footprints outlined above, there is also a contingency line item included in the capital program, for “Land Footprint Contingency” on the assumption that “10 facilities will exceed the estimated land footprint by 20%”, resulting in \$3.5 million in additional costs being included in the charge. Is this contingency item necessary given the specificity for which land areas are identified elsewhere in the study and given how the footprints in the draft plans appear to be relatively liberal estimates of necessary land areas?
- 27) There are also \$6.84 million in costs for “Frontage Costs” to capture ‘road frontage costs for 38 residential SWM facilities’, calculated on the basis of 120 metres per facility, at a cost of \$1,500 per metre. Wouldn’t the land area already estimated for each SWM pond already be assuming that the lands that front onto the road allowances?
- 28) There are also two separate line items for unspecified works – one for “Unidentified SWM works” with a cost of \$5.0 million, and a second for “Unidentified – Within Combined Sewershed” with a cost of \$6.0 million. Can you explain the need for having two unspecified works line items?
- 29) There are also separate line items for “Unidentified Volume Contingency”, one on the assumption that “1 out of 10 facilities will exceed the estimated volume by 10%”, and the other on the assumption that “1 out of 10 facilities will encourage unanticipated 9000 m3 rock”. In particular, for the first item, if the facility is exceeding the estimated volume, would the associated expenditure to fix that deficiency be an ongoing maintenance/repair expenditure or a capital expenditure?

Public Works

- 30) What is the nature of the “Water & Wastewater Office / Storage Expansion” project, with a cost of \$17.25 million?

Transit

- 31) According to Appendix I, the Transit Maintenance and Storage Facility will include administrative, corporate and operational departments, as well as a 205,230 square foot bus storage garage.

Excluding land costs, this facility has a gross cost of \$272 million. Our questions related to this project are as follows:

- a. How much square footage will non-garage elements combine for?
- b. Even assuming the non-garage elements amount to 100,000 square feet, a 305,000 sf facility, at the current capital cost would equate to nearly \$900 per sf. According to the 2019 Altus Group Cost Guide, the cost per sf for a Bus Terminal/Garage ranges from \$260 to \$340 per sf. Please explain how the \$272 million cost was arrived at.

Parkland Development

- 32) The capital program includes several items for Confederation Park (items 41 through 65 of the capital program), which amounts to a development charge for capital works identified by Hamilton Conservation Authority. This is contrary to the OMB decision that found that a charge for a conservation authority is not within the purview of the *Development Charges Act* because capital charges are approved by the province, and that therefore the Conservation authority is an independent entity separate from the City of Hamilton.
- 33) There is an \$11.2 million item for the implementation of items identified in a "Skateboard Study", with 0% allocation to benefit to existing development. The City's Skateboard Study identified numerous geographic gaps in the existing provision of skate parks and found that the current City-wide provision of 1 facility per 13,357 persons aged 10-19 was worse than the recommended provision target of 1 community-level facility per 7,500 residents aged 10-19 and 1 neighbourhood-level facility per 15,000 residents aged 10-19. Can you please explain the rationale for a 0% BTE allocation?

Indoor Recreation

- 34) Does the \$1.0 million (before the 10% statutory deduction) included in the DC for the Ancaster Tennis Bubble accurately represent the City's share of costs for the project? Based on news articles from mid-2018, the City is providing a \$290,000 loan to the Ancaster Tennis Club and a \$60,000 grant. The Tennis Club has raised \$200,000 of its own money and is seeking additional grants from upper levels of government for the remainder of the costs.¹
- 35) What terms were assumed for future debt associated with the Riverdale Community Hub and Sir Wilfrid Laurier Gymnasium?
- 36) Should the William Connell Ice Loop, which is an outdoor recreation amenity, be included in the Parkland Development DC capital program instead?
- 37) The Indoor Recreation capital program also includes several items related to Confederation Park (items 20-22). Similar to the analysis presented regarding the Confederation Park items in the Parkland Development DC, these items should be removed from the City's DC calculation.

¹ <https://www.hamiltonnews.com/news-story/8657427-ancaster-tennis-club-and-hamilton-team-up-for-winning-dome-project/>