

2. **MUNSTER HAMLET - WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY - PIPELINE ROUTE SELECTION - CONSULTANT CONTRACT CA9498 - MODIFICATION**

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

That Council approve:

1. **Modification of Contract CA9498 with Conestoga-Rovers and Associates Ltd (CRA), Nepean, for the provision of engineering services to conduct a Route Selection Process for the transfer of wastewater from the Munster Hamlet facility to the Regional sewer collection system, for an additional contract authority of \$120,171;**
2. **An increase in fees in the amount of \$72,400 to allow for greater than anticipated effort on the part of the consultant, CRA, in completing the Wastewater Treatment Alternatives Evaluation Report.**

This request for additional contract authority in the amount of \$192,571 brings the revised total authority for Contract CA9498 to \$462,571.

DOCUMENTATION:

1. Environment and Transportation Commissioner's report dated 01 Dec 98 is immediately attached.
2. Extract of Draft Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee Minute, 05 Jan 99, immediately follows the report and includes a record of all votes.

REGION OF OTTAWA CARLETON
 RÉGION D'OTTAWA CARLETON

REPORT
RAPPORT

Our File/N/Réf. **50 19-92-0027-V**
 Your File/V/Réf.

DATE 1 December 1998

TO/DEST. Co-ordinator
 Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee

FROM/EXP. Acting Deputy Commissioner
 Environment and Transportation Department

SUBJECT/OBJET **MUNSTER HAMLET - WASTEWATER TREATMENT
 FACILITY - PIPELINE ROUTE SELECTION -
 CONSULTANT CONTRACT MODIFICATION**

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and Council approve:

- 1. Modification of Contract CA9498 with Conestoga-Rovers and Associates Ltd (CRA), Nepean, for the provision of engineering services to conduct a Route Selection Process for the transfer of wastewater from the Munster Hamlet facility to the Regional sewer collection system, for an additional contract authority of \$120,171;**
- 2. An increase in fees in the amount of \$72,400 to allow for greater than anticipated effort on the part of the consultant, CRA, in completing the Wastewater Treatment Alternatives Evaluation Report.**

This request for additional contract authority in the amount of \$192,571 brings the revised total authority for Contract CA9498 to \$462,571.

BACKGROUND

The existing wastewater treatment facility in Munster Hamlet consists of a lagoon and spray irrigation system that has several limitations. The lagoons have insufficient capacity for treatment of flows to the facility and the spray field is undersized. In addition, the structural integrity of the lagoons is poor, resulting in inadequate containment of the wastewater. An Environmental Study

Report (ESR) completed in 1996, recommended an upgrade and expansion of the existing lagoon and spray irrigation system.

On 11 March 1998, Council directed that a thorough review be conducted by an independent engineering firm of new and innovative technologies as well as those reviewed in the 1996 Environmental Study Report. As a result of this direction, the firm of Conestoga-Rovers and Associates (CRA) was retained to complete the work and their final report was considered by Planning and Environment Committee on 10 November and Council on 25 November 1998.

CRA's mandate was to complete an open, transparent and independent evaluation of wastewater treatment alternatives for Munster Hamlet. As a result of greater than anticipated level of effort in several areas, CRA has requested consideration of an increase in the fees for the services that were provided in conducting their independent evaluation. A brief description of the rationale for the increase is outlined below.

The evaluation of alternatives included an extensive public and government consultation process. This consultation took the form of the creation of an eleven member Public Liaison Committee (PLC), two formal public meetings, five community newsletters and solicitation of input from various government agencies at two different stages of the project.

The evaluation included information received from the private sector through a Request for Proposal process that saw the submission of five complete proposals to deal with the sewage treatment needs of the community. These proposals were exhaustively reviewed in the evaluation process.

During this process there was greater than anticipated effort required in several areas. Primarily, the public consultation involved more Public Liaison Committee meetings and more community newsletters than had been originally anticipated. There was also a higher than expected level of interest on the part of the community which resulted in the consultant dealing with more than 100 inquiries.

Thirdly, as a result of the detail that was required to be submitted as part of the Request for Proposal, an extraordinary amount of time was spent with the various proponents. This time was to ensure that all aspects of the proposals had been thoroughly reviewed and all requirements met. Due to the fact that some of the proposals dealt with new and highly innovative technologies, more effort was expended than had originally been allowed for.

As a result of this greater increased level of effort, additional authority in the amount of \$72,400 is requested to compensate CRA for their time in completing this unique work package.

ROUTE SELECTION PROCESS

The report prepared by CRA identified that the preferred solution for addressing the wastewater treatment requirements for Munster Hamlet is to construct a pipeline to convey the wastewater to the Region's wastewater collection system.

With the pipeline option now being recommended as the preferred alternative, it remains to determine the most appropriate routing. The original assignment did not include an allowance of time to complete a selection process for a pipeline route.

As a result of the recommendation, staff obtained a proposal from CRA to conduct the Route Selection Process. The proposed workplan includes the review of at least five alternatives:

1. Pumping the wastewater to the Richmond Pumping Station and combining it with the flows from Richmond;
2. Pumping to the South Glen Cairn Trunk Sewer on Eagleson Road;
3. Pumping to the Glen Cairn Trunk Sewer on Eagleson Road near Hazeldean Road;
4. Pumping to and connecting directly into the 500 mm Richmond Forcemain on Eagleson Road between Richmond and Kanata;
5. Pumping the wastewater to the Stittsville Pumping Station.

The Route Selection Process for this project will be divided into two components. The first being the Technical Evaluation and the second being the Public Consultation. The Technical Evaluation will involve the development of evaluation criteria, the collection of background information from government agencies and other involved utilities, a technical comparison of the alternatives and finally, the completion of a technical memorandum outlining the preferred route for the pipeline.

It is anticipated that the work plan proposed by CRA will be completed by late March 1999. At that point it will be possible to complete the required Addendum, submit it to the MOE and place it on the public record for the 30 day review period.

It is staff's recommendation that CRA be retained to provide engineering services to complete the Route Selection process outlined above at a cost of \$120,171.00. This includes a provision for variations of \$10,210 and an allowance for G.S.T. of \$7,861.70.

CONSULTATION

Although not specifically required as a part of the Class Environmental Assessment Process, it is recommended that there be a significant public consultation component to the Route Selection Process. The level of public interest in the Munster Hamlet Wastewater Treatment Alternatives Evaluation indicates that continued involvement is essential for a successful Route Evaluation and subsequent pipeline construction program.

As the selected pipeline route could potentially affect Richmond, Stittsville and Kanata, as well as Munster Hamlet, the existing Public Liaison Committee is not fully representative of the affected public and will have to be modified accordingly. It is recommended that the committee consist of

8-10 members and that they meet regularly throughout the process to ensure adequate interaction with the communities involved.

RATIONALE

Based on their previous involvement with the preparation of the Wastewater Treatment Alternatives Evaluation report, staff are recommending that the firm of Conestoga-Rovers and Associates be retained to conduct the Route Selection Process. A significant amount of time will be saved by retaining CRA as a result of their familiarity with the project elements and the extensive and successful public consultation process developed as part of the original work.

EXPENDITURE JUSTIFICATION

This work is required in order to comply with the provincially legislated Class Environmental Assessment process. In order to implement the recommendation of the Wastewater Treatment Alternatives Evaluation report it is necessary to conduct a route selection process to identify the preferred route. An Addendum to the ESR will then be filed with the Ministry of the Environment.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

	\$
Approved Budget to Date	6,050,000
Total Paid and Committed	<u>(2,276,160)</u>
Balance Available	3,773,840
THIS REQUEST	<u>(192,571)</u>
Balance Remaining	<u>3,581,269</u>

Funds have been provided in the 1998 Capital Budget, Account No. 932-42035-3603, (Reference page 251).

*Approved by
Nancy B. Schepers, P.Eng.*

SF/jw

FINANCE DEPARTMENT COMMENT

Funds are available as indicated.

*Approved by T. Fedec
on behalf of the Finance Commissioner*