(a) That Report PW04115 be deferred to the next Strategic Planning and Budgets Committee to be considered with the Corporate Variance Report.

(b) That in the interim, staff provide a list of works included in the portion of the Road's Summer Maintenance Program which will be postponed as per the report recommendation.

(c) That the status of the Federal Government's New Cities Deal proposal on Infrastructure funding be provided.

Sub-section (f) of the following item was amended by changing the name of the steering committee as follows:

3. City Hall Accommodations Project - C3-03-03 Evaluation Status Report (PW03010b/FCS03064b) - (City Wide Implications) (Item 9.2)

(a) That the Consolidated Facility Project C3-03-03, City Hall Accommodations, be terminated and the proponents be thanked for their efforts and participation to date;

(b) That the existing City Hall building be retained and staff be directed to prepare a plan to carry out a comprehensive renovation of City Hall;

(c) That based on a traditional design and construction method and the renovation plan as per recommendation b), staff prepare a detailed project budget and construction implementation plan for inclusion and final approval in the 2005 Capital Budget, and future impacted capital budgets;

(d) That staff be authorized to carry out regular inspections of the existing City Hall building and immediately respond as required to maintain a safe building until the renovation work is complete, subject to Council approval;

(e) That the Real Estate Section of Planning & Development Department be authorized to negotiate longer term leases or purchases in the downtown core with a goal to promote synergies between departments subject to the lease or purchase being economically viable and the location suiting the needs of the department; and

(f) That the Accommodations Steering Committee continue to oversee the processes outlined in Recommendations (b) through (e) of Report PW03010b/FCS03064b.
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## RECOMMENDATION:

(a) That the Consolidated Facility Project C3-03-03, City Hall Accommodations, be terminated and the proponents be thanked for their efforts and participation to date;

(b) That the existing City Hall building be retained and staff be directed to prepare a plan to carry out a comprehensive renovation of City Hall;

(c) That based on a traditional design and construction method and the renovation plan as per recommendation b), staff prepare a detailed project budget and construction implementation plan for inclusion and final approval in the 2005 Capital Budget, and future impacted capital budgets;

(d) That staff be authorized to carry out regular inspections of the existing City Hall building and immediately respond as required to maintain a safe building until the renovation work is complete, subject to Council approval;

(e) That the Real Estate Section of Planning & Development Department be authorized to negotiate longer term leases or purchases in the downtown core with a goal to promote synergies between departments subject to the lease or purchase being economically viable and the location suitin the needs of the department; and
(f) That the City Hall Political Steering Committee continue to oversee the processes outlined in Recommendations (b) through (d) of Report PW03010b/FCS03064b.

Scott Stewart, C.E.T.  
Acting General Manager  
Public Works

Joseph L. Rinaldo  
General Manager  
Finance & Corporate Services

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This report provides Council with an update on the City Hall Accommodation Project and seeks confirmation with respect to the future direction of the project.

In 2002, staff recommended that, due to risks associated with the age of the building, a comprehensive renovation of the existing City Hall building be carried out. A capital investment of about $40 million was estimated in 2002 to perform the renovation work necessary to bring the existing building to a modern building standard. Staff could not support a deferral of major capital repair due to the nature of the building risks.

The existing City Hall building accommodates approximately 400 of the 1,200 City employees that work downtown. Staff analysis in 2002 suggested that, instead of renovating the existing building, it would be less expensive from a long-term perspective to construct a new consolidated facility to accommodate all City employees. Council directed staff to seek out solutions from the private sector for a new consolidated facility that could accommodate all City employees in one building located in the downtown area. Project C3-03-03 was implemented using a two-stage (RFQ/RFP) procurement process to explore possible consolidated facility solutions.

In October 2003 four pre-qualified proponents submitted proposals to construct a new consolidated facility that would accommodate about 1,200 employees at the existing City Hall site. Preliminary analysis of the proposals suggested that none of the proposals were able to satisfy all of the technical requirements specified in the RFP within a financial target of a zero, or minimal, impact to the tax levy. Staff suggested that interviews be held with all four proponents to discuss revising the technical requirements to achieve this financial target.

In March, 2004 Council directed staff to continue the evaluation process and carry out interviews with all four proponents provided the interviews were carried out in an open and transparent manner and provided the proponents understood that proceeding with the continued proposal evaluation did not jeopardize the City's right to cancel the solicitation without award of any contract. Council requested that Councillors Bruckler, Ferguson, and Mitchell be appointed to participate with the Evaluation Team during the interviews. Interviews with the four proponents were subsequently conducted in May, 2004, and the Evaluation Team held several additional meetings subsequent to the interviews.
In July 2004 the Evaluation Team was informed by the Corporate Services Department of the City’s debt financing limitations. Notwithstanding the long-term financial advantages of a consolidated facility, staff concluded that none of the consolidated facility proposals could be delivered within the financial target and that further evaluation of the proposals should therefore be terminated. Staff consequently returned to the 2002 plan to renovate the existing City Hall building. This plan consists of a comprehensive renovation of the existing City Hall building in an organized and planned manner. Approval of this option would require a financial commitment of between $35 million and $47 million. Due to the magnitude of this capital investment, selection of this option would require Council to make a commitment to maintain the existing City Hall architecture and eliminate future demolition of the building. Delivery of this option would address all of the shortcomings of City Hall and would make the building compliant with modern life safety codes.

Staff did consider an alternative renovation option that considered deferral of the outlay of significant short-term capital costs but found, as was determined in 2002, that this was not a feasible option due to the associated risks.

Until the comprehensive renovation of the existing City Hall is completed, staff is requesting authorization to carry out regular inspections of the building and immediately respond as required to maintain a safe working environment. Since the existing building cannot accommodate all 1,200 City employees, it is also recommended that staff be directed to negotiate longer term leases or purchases in the downtown core with a goal to promote synergies between departments and to reduce overall accommodation costs.

BACKGROUND:

Approximately 400 City employees are located at the existing City Hall building. The existing building is more than 40 years old and requires renovation to address several shortcomings (Appendix C).

In addition to the 400 employees located at City Hall, approximately 800 employees are located in alternative downtown leased accommodations or other City-owned facilities outside of the downtown area (i.e. Stoney Creek City Hall).

If no major action is taken, staff predict the accommodation costs for the 1,200 employees will increase by more than 30% over the next 3 years for the following reasons:

- Increased maintenance and emergency repair costs to maintain the existing City Hall building will increase by almost 100%;
- Increased leasing renewal costs will increase by about 35%, and
- Increased operating costs at City owned buildings will increase by more than 15%.

In 2002, staff presented a renovation plan to bring the existing City Hall building to a modern building standard. This renovation plan was based on a comprehensive building assessment of Hamilton City Hall prepared by Trow Consulting Engineers Ltd. in April, 2001. At that time staff did investigate an option to defer all major renovations of the existing building for a period of approximately five years. In a report dated May
21, 2002, staff informed Council that a deferral of a full renovation will create a risk of systems failure, which will require immediate and unforeseen emergency expenditures that will impact the day to day operations of City Hall. The 2002 report recommended the elimination of the risks by performing a comprehensive renovation of City Hall. An initial capital investment of about $40 million was estimated in 2002 to temporarily relocate City Hall functions and complete the renovation work. This investment however, would only address the accommodations for the 400 employees at the existing City Hall building. Staff analysis at the time suggested that it would be less expensive from a long-term perspective to demolish the existing City Hall building and build a new building.

In May 2002, Council directed staff to seek out design-build-finance-operate solutions from the private sector for a new consolidated facility that would accommodate all 1,200 employees in one building located in the downtown area. A two-stage (RFQ/RFP) procurement process would be implemented to investigate the consolidated facility solutions. The new consolidated facility would require approximately 430,000 square feet of office space and could be located at the existing City Hall site or at an alternative downtown location. Council later directed staff to give preference to solutions that provided the required technical requirements for no, or minimal, net increases on the levy, or increases which could be offset by related savings (i.e. current leasing costs). In addition, proponents were encouraged to explore public-private partnerships (P3) that could result in cost savings for the City.

On October 23, 2003, four proponents submitted proposals to the City for a consolidated facility. An Evaluation Team consisting of staff from Public Works, Corporate Services, Planning and Development, and other City departments, and external consultants, completed an analysis of all four proposals. The preliminary analysis of the proposals suggested that none of the proposals were able to satisfy all of the technical requirements within the financial target of a zero, or minimal, impact to the tax levy. However the Evaluation Team suggested that interviews should be held with all four proponents to further discuss the proposals and explore solutions that could achieve the financial target while not significantly impacting the technical requirements.

In March 2004, staff presented an update to Council and sought direction prior to proceeding with the interviews. Council directed staff to continue with the evaluation process provided that all proponents were informed that the City has made no commitment to the completion of the Project C3-03-03 irrespective of the outcome of the evaluation process and that the City continues to rely upon its right to cancel without award of any contract, irrespective of the merits of individual proposals or of the outcome of the evaluation process. Any action between staff and the proponents was to be carried out in an open and transparent fashion. Council requested that staff advise the proponents that should they choose to withdraw their proposals and not participate with the interviews, the City would release their bid securities provided that they execute a Release satisfactory in form and contents to the City Solicitor. Council also requested that Councillors Ferguson, Bruckler, and Mitchell be appointed to participate with the Evaluation Team during the interviews.

All proponents were advised of the Council direction and chose to continue to participate with the interview stage of the project. To ensure that the interviews were
conducted in an open and transparent fashion, the City retained a Fairness Commissioner/Facilitator to chair the meetings. The Fairness Commissioner/Facilitator used for the interviews was the same individual present during private meetings held with the proponents during the proposal preparation period.

The Evaluation Team conducted interviews with the proponents on May 25 and 26, 2004. Each of the four proponents were requested to make a 45-minute presentation followed by a 45-minute question and answer period. To assist with their preparation for the interviews, proponents were given a list of questions/clarification points prior to the interview. The proponents were encouraged to respond to these questions during their presentation. Common questions explored alternatives to move towards a common technical baseline so that a balance of technical content and targeted financial costs could be established. In addition proponents were provided questions that were unique to their specific proposal.

Since May 2004, the Evaluation Team has held several meetings to review the information collected from the interviews. A wide range of technical content and financial costs amongst the proposals was noted. In an attempt to narrow this range, the Evaluation Team applied a common technical requirement to assess all proposals. The results of this analysis identified a total project cost of about $90-$120 million would be required to construct a consolidated facility. The following additional conclusions were summarized from this review:

- the financial target of zero or minimal tax impact could only be achieved if an unacceptable reduction in the technical requirements (i.e. parking, building size, building design) was made;
- pursuing public-private-partnerships (P3) did not result in a solution that met the financial target;
- sharing space with other government entities, the school boards, or other parties such as the YMCA did not result in a solution that met the financial target.

In July 2004, the Evaluation Team was informed by the Corporate Services Department that a financial commitment of $90-120 million, whether it be in the form of a turnkey lease or in City-funded capital costs, is not recommended because other large capital projects already approved by the City have significantly impacted the City’s ability to borrow and finance future capital projects.

As a result of these financial constraints, staff concluded that further evaluation of the consolidated facility proposals should be terminated and the 2002 renovation plan for the existing City Hall building be reviewed and implemented.

A comprehensive renovation of the existing City Hall building to a modern building standard as was recommended by staff in 2002. This work would address the existing shortcomings of the existing building (Appendix C) and would make the building compliant with modern life safety codes. Appendix A summarizes the renovation work that would be carried out under this option.

The total project cost to complete the renovation work for this work is estimated to be between $35 million and $47 million. The work plan would be carried out over the next 5-year period. Due to the nature of the required renovation work it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to carry out the renovation work in smaller work packages
spread out over a longer period of time. For example, if the City elected to replace the exterior cladding of the building, code requirements specify that the existing asbestos in the building must first be removed. In order to remove the asbestos, employees must first be relocated and the existing finishes (ceiling, lighting, mechanical systems) removed. Because of the age of these finishes and the probable damage during asbestos abatement, new finishes would be installed after the asbestos is removed. Since employees would be relocated during this renovation work, it would be most efficient to complete all renovation work before returning employees to the building.

The renovation work would be carried out in an organized and planned manner to minimize the relocation of City Hall functions and the impact to City employees. Prior to commencing the work, swing space would be established to accommodate the temporary relocation. The temporary relocation of the existing City Hall employees would be carried out in multiple swings that are scheduled in advance. City Real Estate staff has identified potential swing space that could be used.

Council support for this approach would make a commitment to maintain the existing City Hall architecture for a minimum of 40 years and would therefore eliminate any option to demolish the building. The work described would address the existing shortcoming of City Hall (Appendix C) and further expansion to the existing building could be considered in the future to provide a consolidated facility solution.

Because a planned, comprehensive renovation of the building will require several years to implement, staff seeks authorization from Council to carry out regular inspections of the building and immediately respond as required to maintain a safe building until the renovation work is complete.

A renovated City Hall will not accommodate all 1,200 City employees. Until such time that a consolidated facility is feasible, City employees will continue to be located in alternative downtown leased accommodations or other City-owned facilities. It is recommended that staff be directed to negotiate longer-term leases or purchases in the downtown core with a goal to promote synergies between departments and to reduce overall accommodation costs.

**ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES:**

Due to the current financial constraints, staff considered a minimal renovation option that could possibly defer the outlay of significant short-term capital costs. However, staff found that the health and safety risks associated with the minimal renovation option were immediate in nature and as such, could not be recommended by staff.

A minimal renovation program could include replacement of the elevators, cleaning of the existing mechanical systems, and general allowances for inspection and performing minor repairs. Appendix B summarizes the renovation work that would be carried out under this scenario. The total project cost to complete this work is estimated to be between $6 million and $10 million.

The main risks associated with this are as follows:

- the existing asbestos in the building will remain and therefore continuing the risk of future air quality and other environmental concerns;
the existing mechanical systems will remain thereby increasing the risks of future system failures, unplanned emergency repairs, increased maintenance costs, deterioration of temperature and humidification control, and further deterioration of air quality in the building;

- the exterior cladding (marble, curtain wall) will not be replaced and further aging will likely create exterior safety concerns, temperature control concerns, continued water infiltration problems, and interior pipe breakage problems;

- once the minimal renovation commences, building code requirements and building official interpretation of the building code may compel the City to carry out the comprehensive renovation;

- the high financial costs associated with throw-away repairs, unplanned emergency repairs, and the disruption to City employees and City Hall activities.

While a contingency plan could be established to address future unplanned emergency repairs, is not expected to yield a lower long term cost solution compared to the comprehensive renovation. Given the age of the building and recent engineering studies conducted on the existing building, there is a risk that building components may fail and the ability to repair these aged components may be difficult as parts no longer become available. This would likely result in replacement costs becoming future throw-away costs in the future when the building is renovated or demolished.

In this scenario, funds would be made available to perform only minor repairs based on regular inspections. In the event that major repair or renovation work was ultimately required due to failures additional, unbudgeted funds would be required. The cost to carry out this additional repair work will be more expensive than adopting a planned renovation. Responding to any one issue, (i.e. heating and air conditioning failure), may result in additional costs being incurred (i.e. asbestos removal), which in turn may result in functional disruption and unplanned relocation of staff and ultimately compel the City to an unplanned comprehensive renovation.

Because of the risks associated with this scenario, staff recommends that a plan be developed for Council’s consideration that would implement the comprehensive renovation. This recommendation is consistent with the recommendation staff presented to Council in 2002 at which time Council was informed that deferral of major renovations was not an option.

**FINANCIAL/STAFFING/LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:**

Financial Implications

The reason for finance not recommending building new for the short-term, was that the corresponding debt charges would overburden the City’s increasing debt capacity. Preliminary 10-year debt forecasts show that the City’s budgeted debt load for tax-supported external debt will be approaching $400 million by the year 2007. Staff therefore recommends that the City limit it’s debt exposure by focusing on non-throwaway, existing City Hall renovations and incorporate this work into a future minimum-cost accommodation solution. Any future consolidated accommodations solution should be completed when the City’s capital capacity has improved.
Legal Implications

The City’s legal department has reviewed the documentation and can confirm that the City can rely upon its right to terminate the Consolidated Facility Project C3-03-03 without award of any contract, irrespective of the merits of individual proposals or of the outcome of the evaluation process.

POLICIES AFFECTING PROPOSALS

N/A

CONSULTATION WITH RELEVANT DEPARTMENTS/AGENCIES:

The following have been involved in the preparation of this report:

- Councillors Bruckler, Ferguson, and Mitchell
- Corporate Management Team
- Public Works: Fleet & Facilities Division
- Planning & Development: Development Planning & Real Estate Division
- Corporate Services: Budget & Finance Division, Financial Services Division (Purchasing), Legal Services
- MHPM Project Managers Inc.

CITY STRATEGIC COMMITMENT:

The analysis presented in this report is consistent with the objectives of Vision 2020 and the approved document entitled “Putting People First: A New Land Use Plan for Downtown Hamilton.” This report is consistent with the following specific Vision 2020 goals.

- **Local Economy:** To promote Hamilton’s environment as a desirable place to live and work;
- **Land Use in the Urban Area:** To redevelop Hamilton’s central core as the regional centre;
- **Community Well Being and Capacity Building:** To develop cultural institutions, public facilities, and parks and open spaces which inspire community pride and a sense of place

Further, in accordance with the Strategic Alignment of 2003 Business Plans with Council Goals, the analysis presented in this report is consistent with the following:

**A City That Spends Wisely and Invests Strategically** - To get the best value for taxpayer dollars and to ensure that we have the financial resources available to invest in our economic development and other community priorities, Council commits to increase the efficiency of our City government.


### Comprehensive Renovation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Building Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Minimum Cost</th>
<th>Maximum Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elevators</td>
<td>Complete removal and replacement of existing passenger elevators with new 400fpm elevators. Complete removal and replacement of service elevator with new 4,500 lb. 400 fpm elevator.</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exterior Walls</td>
<td>Complete replacement of the marble cladding, the existing curtain wall system and the glazed doors.</td>
<td>$8,300,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Asbestos &amp; Interior Building Finishes</td>
<td>Removal of all asbestos and other environmental hazards, install new finishes (carpet, ceiling tile, demising walls, painting) to replace materials demolished to access environmental hazards, create more efficient reception and work areas (assuming most offices will be open concept), minor restoration of existing artwork.</td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
<td>$8,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>Complete replacement of all internal systems (perimeter induction units, air handling systems, ventilation, humidification, plumbing and drainage). The existing cooling tower, chiller, and steam boilers would remain. All other mechanical components are new. Excludes costs of Building Automation System.</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>Replacement of lead cable feed. Replacement of major electrical components (transformers, switch gear, etc.). Remove abandoned wiring. Upgrade existing floor distribution.</td>
<td>$2,900,000</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fire &amp; Life Safety</td>
<td>Complete work to address all known non-conformances as described in engineer’s report.</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Barrier Free</td>
<td>General allowance to provide barrier free upgrades.</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Parking Garage &amp; Wishbone</td>
<td>General allowance for a minimum program of repairs.</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Exterior Works</td>
<td>General allowance to carry out renovation of exterior site features in accordance with Master Plan.</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total: $24,100,000

Engineering design, management, and inspection: $3,000,000

Swing space and moving costs: $3,000,000

Contingency: $5,000,000

Total: $35,100,000
## Minimal Renovation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Building Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Minimum Cost</th>
<th>Maximum Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elevators</td>
<td>Complete removal and replacement of existing passenger elevators with new 400fpm elevators. Complete removal and replacement of service elevator with new 4,500 lb. 400 fpm elevator.</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exterior Walls</td>
<td>Rigorous annual inspection program and repairs of marble cladding and curtain wall glazing</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>Replacement of lead cable feed. Annual inspection program and repairs as required.</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>Removal of asbestos insulation wherever accessible and replacement with new insulation, cleaning of all systems (induction units, airhandling ducts, diffusers, ventilation systems, fans, etc.), replacement of damaged components, introduction of basic humidification units, rebalancing of the entire system, installation of 8 new drinking fountains.</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fire &amp; Life Safety</td>
<td>Sundry containment improvements to conform with code. Sundry egress improvements to conform with code. Provide an exit at west end of garage to comply with code. Install at least one visual signal appliance in restrooms, meeting rooms, hallways, lobbies, and common areas.</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Interior Building Finishes</td>
<td>Upgrade washrooms on the first and second floors, replace carpet as required on floors 3 to 7, replace damaged ceiling tiles and dry wall as required.</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Exterior Works</td>
<td>General allowance for a minimum program of exterior repairs to address safety (tripping hazards) and operations concerns.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Parking Garage &amp; Wishbone</td>
<td>General allowance for a minimum program of repairs.</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Barrier Free</td>
<td>General allowance to provide barrier free upgrades.</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,605,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,750,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering design, management, and inspection</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Swing space and moving costs</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,455,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,150,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Current City Hall Repair Issues and Risks

A summary of the problems and risks associated with existing City Hall building is as follows:

- **Outdated Elevators** – the elevators at City Hall are antiquated, various parts and key components have become obsolete making it very difficult for the service provider to maintain the elevators in a timely fashion. There is a risk that parts will become scarce to a point where the elevators will be down for long periods of time if not permanently. Modern elevators are faster and require less maintenance resulting in decreased waiting time and less operations costs; including currently experienced regular down times.

- **Weathered Building Envelope** – the building exterior is architecturally tired; marble panels and fastenings are in severe distress, cracked panels and significant corrosion of the shelf support angles have resulted in the need for regular shoring audits to maintain safety; curtain wall assembly has broken down and lost functionality resulting in heating and cooling inefficiencies; water penetration; due to the progressing deterioration, a significant exterior wall rehabilitation project will be required eminently.

- **Asbestos Insulation Throughout** – requires regular audits to confirm air quality; any future renovation or new interior plan may require extreme measures to ensure asbestos does not become airborne during construction.

- **Outdated Mechanical Systems** – unable to provide modern fresh air requirements; together with a deteriorated building envelope the mechanical systems are unable to provide desired temperature control; unable to fully employ modern utility cost saving procedures; increased frequency of repair and more difficult to find suitable replacement parts.

- **Outdated Electrical Systems** – major electrical components are well beyond the normal service life of 30 years.

- **Life Safety and Fire Codes** – although the existing building is not non-compliant, it does not meet all modern codes for life safety and fire protection.

- **Universal Accessibility** – similarly the current building does not meet all modern codes for disabled access and the City of Hamilton’s Barrier Free Standards and the requirements of the Ontarians with Disabilities Act.

- **Outdated Building Security** – current building perimeter, building entrances, stairwells, elevator lobbies and department entrances are not meeting modern standards.

- **Inefficient Council Chambers** – limited security of Councillors and staff; poor disabled access.