

File

A G E N D A

For the meeting of Council to be held in the Council Chambers  
on Monday, January 28, 1957 at 7:30 p.m.

1. Present:

Confirmation of the minutes of the meeting held January 14, 1957.

2. Correspondence:

- 1. Red Deer Hospital re: Letter of Thanks
- 2. Alta. Land Surveyors Assoc. re: Mr. Snell's survey records
- 3. City Commissioner re: Reconstruction of Gaetz Ave.
- 4. Provincial Treasurer re: Reconstruction of Gaetz Ave.

3. Aldermen's New Business:

4. Reports:

- 1. Re: Street Lighting ✓ *agreed in principle Council Jan 29/57*
- 2. Re: Car Plub-ins on City Streets
- 3. Re: Daily Garbage Pick-up
- 54. Re: Reconstruction of Gaetz Avenue - *+ additional + motion #1*
- 45. Re: Road & Sidewalk Program - 1957 -

5. New Business:

- 1. Payment of Accounts

CORRESPONDENCE:

1.

LETTER NO. 1

November 7, 1956

Mr. H. Gilchrist  
City Office  
Red Deer, Alberta

Dear Mr. Gilchrist:

I wish to thank you most heartily for the lovely tomatoes which your men have sent to this Hospital from time to time.

We do enjoy them I can assure you.

Yours very truly,

Miss K. Macalister  
Matron  
Red Deer Municipal Hospital

NOTE:

The above is brought to the attention of Council as Mr. Gilchrist grows these tomatoes in the greenhouse after he planted the flowers in the spring.

COMMISSIONERS

---

LETTER NO. 2

ALBERTA LAND SURVEYOR'S ASSOCIATION

Edmonton, Alberta  
January 14, 1957

Dear Mr. Newman:

In reply to yours of the 27th ultimo with regard to Mr. Snell's survey records, my opinions on the matter are as follows:

The situation as I understand it is that Mr. Snell, as a result of having been for many years the only regularly practising surveyor at Red Deer, possesses a good deal of information, mostly about the location of survey marks and property corners, which is not officially recorded on plans in the Land Titles Office and which enables him to execute new surveys or re-surveys more expeditiously than any other surveyor. Some of that information he carries in his head, but I suppose that he has recorded a lot of it in the form of field notes and notations on plans.

There is no doubt that this information is valuable not only to him but to the City and his other clients at Red Deer. In certain cases it would enable him to step right in and proceed to make a survey, whereas another surveyor might have to spend a good deal of preliminary time in finding or re-establishing the old corners to which the new survey has to be tied. This saving of time, of course, would mean a saving of costs, hence it can be said that Mr. Snell can generally do survey work at Red Deer more confidently, rapidly and inexpensively than any other surveyor could.

I do not think, however, that Mr. Snell's private survey information, valuable though it may be, is indispensable. The only survey records which the law officially recognizes are the plans and descriptions of land which are filed in the Land Titles Office and the office of the Director of Surveys. So far as Red Deer is concerned, those records (thanks mainly to Mr. Snell's work over the years) are comprehensive and ample enough to enable any surveyor to do work there without fear of running into trouble. This is a much different situation from what exists in many other places where most of the old survey marks have been destroyed and never replaced.

In the older part of Red Deer, Mr. Snell has at different times re-established and re-marked many lot and block corners and has recorded that work on the plans which have been filed in the Land Titles Office. In the more recently developed parts of the City, the lot and block corners in the newer subdivisions are still mostly in good shape, and are fully recorded in the Land Titles Office. I would therefore say that by consulting the official records, another surveyor could easily ascertain which would be the governing marks on which he would have to base any new survey and that he could readily locate enough of them (although probably not as readily as Mr. Snell could) to permit him to make the survey properly.

I therefore do not think that the City would be placed in an embarrassing position if Mr. Snell's private information became unavailable. Reliable and accurate surveys could still be made, but in some cases the costs might be somewhat higher.

Neither do I think it would be advisable for the City to purchase Mr. Snell's records. In the first place, I would imagine that they are not organized or indexed in any systematic fashion and it would probably be difficult for anyone except Mr. Snell to interpret them. Secondly, in order to obtain a valuation, it would have to be determined how much of this information is not officially recorded and how much of it may be duplicated in some form or other in the Land Titles Office records. That, again, would be difficult and time-consuming. Thirdly, there may be much of it which no one but Mr. Snell could certify as valid. Quite often a surveyor has to re-establish the position of an old corner by means of evidence, the value of which he must judge for himself, and when he shows that re-establishment on a plan which bears his personal affidavit to back it up, the Land Titles Office generally accepts it. But the Land Titles Office will not accept that sort of evidence if it cannot be sworn to by the surveyor who has actually done or supervised the work on the ground. It is probable that Mr. Snell's records contain a good deal of uncertified material of that nature and that very little of it could be officially utilized by another surveyor.

To sum up, I would say, first, that Mr. Snell probably possesses a good deal of information which he can use himself as need may arise and which is valuable to him and his clients, but that it would be of little value to anyone else; secondly, that if that information were not available the existence of good official records and the generally good condition of survey marks in the City would enable any other surveyor to operate quite effectively there.

It may be argued that the City should in some manner remunerate Mr. Snell for the use of his private records, and there is no doubt in my mind that their existence has saved the City considerable money in survey costs. But it can be equally well contended that he has been benefitting from them anyway, because his knowledge of Red Deer surveys has brought him work that might otherwise have gone to other surveyors. In fact, on more than one occasion, I have heard of Edmonton surveyors who have been asked to do work at Red Deer and have referred the parties concerned to Mr. Snell because they knew he could do it more quickly and at lower cost. What usually happens when a surveyor in that position gets up in years is that he takes in a partner who is prepared to pay him something for the privilege of sharing his practice and having access to his private information. Or, if the old-timer retires without having acquired a partner, another surveyor will usually come in and buy his practice including his private records. Either of these alternatives would be open to Mr. Snell if he wishes to obtain some monetary recognition of the knowledge and records which he possesses. In view of this I do not think the City can be said to be under any special obligation to him, any more than any other of his clients.

I hope the above information will be of some value to the City Council and that it will help to relieve them of any misgivings they may have had over this matter. As stated before, the opinions expressed here are my own, but I am sure they would be shared by most surveyors who are acquainted with the situation at Red Deer. If there are any points on which I can give you further advise, I shall be pleased to do so on hearing from you.

NOTE: above information was  
requested by Council.

COMMISSIONERS

J.H. Houoway  
Secretary-Treasurer & Registrar

LETTER NO. 3

January 11, 1957

The Honorable E.W. Hinman  
Provincial Treasurer  
Legislative Building  
Edmonton, Alberta

Dear Sir:

Re: Reconstruction of No. 2 Highway within the City Limits  
of Red Deer

We read in a recent edition of the Edmonton Journal that as at the end of 1956, there was a little over \$6,000,000.00 left in the Capital Expenditures Loans Fund.

From our recent meeting in connection with the newly formed Municipal Financing Corporation, we gathered future monies might be around the 5% interest rate.

An agreement between the Department of Highways and ourselves has just been signed, in which the Provincial Government will bear half the cost of the reconstruction of the above mentioned highway. The breakdown of estimated costs are as follows:

	Total Cost	City's Share	Provincial Share
Road Construction	550,000.00	292,000.00	258,000.00
Sidewalks and Underground Cables		96,000.00	
Light Standards		<u>12,000.00</u>	
	TOTAL	\$400,000.00	including engineering contingencies

We are writing you Sir, with this thought in mind. As it is impossible to prepare our advertising, our deventure by-law and obtain approval from the Board of Public Utility Commissioner before the end of your fiscal year, Is there any possibility of the City's share on the above mentioned project being reserved out of the Capital Expenditure Fund?

As this is a Provincial-City shared project we sincerely hope that the above mentioned suggestion will receive your favourable consideration.

The contracts for the work have been let and the City are therefore committed to the work and must raise the necessary funds. We are proceeding with the advertising and preparation of a By-law immediately and would appreciate your reply which we trust will be favourable at your early convenience.

Yours truly,

E. Newman  
City Commissioner

January 1, 1957

Mr. E. Newman  
City Commissioner  
City of Red Deer

Dear Mr. Newman:

Re: Construction of No. 2 Highway within  
the City Limits of Red Deer.

I note that the City is proposing to spend some \$400,000 on this project.

Your letter indicates that you will not be able to do the necessary ground work to get the loan approved before the end of this fiscal year.

I am sorry that I cannot give you assurance that we could set aside a sum to look after this particular project. To date no such provisions have ever been made. It is necessary that the application be approved before the close of our fiscal year as all unspent appropriations must be returned to general revenue.

Yours very truly,

"E.W. Hinman"  
Provincial Treasurer

NOTE:

The above mentioned letter was written with the thought that we might prevail upon Government to reserve the \$400,000 until we have completed our debenture etc. However, if Council accept the frontage charge for Gaetz Ave., then we can possibly complete our debenture before the end of the Government fiscal year and obtain our money at the lower interest rate.

COMMISSIONERS

Report on Streetlighting

A plan of progressive street lighting can probably be formulated, but will depend on how much money is available and to what extent improvement is desired. The following is submitted for comments.

Investigation of streetlighting equipment seems to indicate that at this time it might be a bit foolish to lay down a fixed policy in streetlighting improvement. Some equipment now in process of manufacture and forecast for manufacture are so far ahead of anything now on the market that it is just short of fantastic. For instance our 400 watt mercury-vapour unit is considered the best light source presently on the market as it puts out 20,000 lumens. There is also a much smarter looking unit on the market, a fluorescent that puts out 16,000 lumens but one manufacturer has developed a fluorescent lamp that almost doubles the output and by using this new lamp the fluorescent fixture would put out about 30,000 lumens. This might be something to lookforward to in further improving our downtown lighting.

At present the best buy in residential district lighting appears to be the Westinghouse AK - 6 unit which uses 200 watt incandescent lamps and can be easily converted to mercury-vapour at 175 watts. We have several of these incandescent units on the approaches to the Michener Hill bridge, particularly noticeable on the 49 Street approach. One of these units in mercury vapour is installed on a trial basis on 55 Street in the 4700 block and might mention that we have had several favorable comments on this particular unit. However, the Canadian Line Material people are coming out with a new unit competitive with the AK - 6 and claim superior performance. General Electric also promise a superior unit, but probably will not be on the market until mid-1957. Powerlite (Northern Electric) have a similar unit but recommend the 125 watt lamp for theirs. So far have been unable to obtain a sample of this unit despite frequent requests for same. It is doubtful if it will compete with the 175 watt unit as the basic lamp output is considerably lower.

At the moment it would appear that a continuation of 400 watt mercury-vapour should be made in the Commercial section of the City. The logical pattern for this would seem to indicate that next on the program would be Ross Street in the City Hall Block, and 49th Street from 49 Avenue to 51 Ave. However, being that bases and wiring are being installed on Gaetz Avenue from 42nd St. to 48 St., and from 52 St. to 55 St. we will be more or less forced to install standards in this area. This will require 40 units at about \$275.00 each or \$11,000.00. Ross Street would require 8 units and 49 Street 11 units, or 19 at \$275.00 each making \$5225.00. Labour and material for installing bases and wiring would be extra to the above. Being that underground wiring and bases are being installed on Gaetz Avenue by contract, it is suggested that the other three blocks be installed with overhead wiring until these streets are to be repaved at which time under ground could be installed if required.

It is also noted that no provision has yet been made to light South Hill section of the highway. This will be doubly dark coming off the brightly lighted area at 42 St. and perhaps this section should be lighted to the Gaetz Ave. Standard at this time.

To improve the residential district streetlighting I would suggest we purchase a quantity of AK - 6 mercury vapour units and install on all main through roads, 55 St. 50 St., (47 Ave. East) 43 Ave., (50 St. south), 43 St. (50 Ave. West), 48 Ave. (Waskasoo Park to 55 St.), 59 St. (west of highway). This would free a quantity of good lighting units to install elsewhere but in addition we should buy a quantity of good incandescent units to replace our old street lighting fixtures. Would suggest we buy 50 type AK-6 mercury vapour units at \$30.20 each and 50 of the same type incandescent at \$38.90 each (lamps extra at \$11.85 for MV and .55 incandescent) early in 1957 and attempt to have these installed by summer of 1957. A further order of 50 units should be placed to accommodate new subdivisions and additions to the older areas.

You will note that I have recommended an expenditure of \$8,500.00 for lighting fixtures for residential districts. This will certainly not complete the modernization of streetlighting but would be a good start and if a like amount were spent each year we could complete the program in three years, or a lesser amount could be spent in succeeding years and prolong the project. But I would recommend the first year be handled in one project if at all possible. Labour and wiring materials would bring the above estimate to about \$10,000.00.

To recapitulate the various proposals:-

<u>Gaetz Avenue</u>	
40 lighting units @ \$275.00 each	11,000.00
Labour & Materials for bases & Wiring	?
<u>Ross Street</u>	
19 units @ \$275.00 each	5,225.00
Labour & Materials (overhead wiring)	600.00
<u>South Hill (Highway)</u>	
12 units @ \$275.00	3,300.00
Labour & Materials (overhead wiring)	500.00
<u>Residential - replacement</u>	
50 - AK-6 MV @ \$92.05	4,602.50
50 - AK-6 incandescent @ \$39.45	1,972.50
Labour & materials	1,500.00
<u>Residential - new</u>	
50 - AK-6 incandescent @ \$39.45	1,972.50
Labour & Materials	<u>800.00</u>
Total Cost of Streetlighting	31,472.50
plus cost of underground wiring on Gaetz Ave.	

If we eliminate the Gaetz Ave. project from our calculations, this job already being contracted, it would take \$47,516.75 to bring out streetlighting up to date. By spending \$20,000.00 this year would leave \$27,000 to be handled later, and with an expenditure of \$10,000.00 per year we should be able to replace and enlarge existing lighting and provide new lighting in the new subdivisions and be caught up in from four to five years.

The foregoing estimate would permit us to make a good show of streetlighting improvement but as mentioned previously would not complete the job. For instance, it has been suggested that to light 56 St. properly would require 8 units of the 175 watt MV type and four steel poles. The large number of units here is due to the size and quantity of trees, and it is therefore necessary to light the sidewalks from the opposite side of the street. To do this the trees would have to be trimmed up a minimum of 5 ft. from the ground to allow light to penetrate under them. To properly light this street would mean an expenditure of about \$2,000.00. Would suggest we appropriate four of the proposed new units (175W MV) as a start for this street and install the balance another year.

Another problem that comes up is that all streets leading off the highly lighted streets will appear dark in comparison. It would therefore be advisable to install extra lighting on streets adjacent to those lighted with mercury-vapour. This is particularly noticeable on 51 Ave. both north and south of Ross Street and again at 48 Ave. and Ross Street. Is also very noticeable at 47 avenue and Ross Street where the incandescent now take over. This situation would be somewhat bettered by installing a small mercury-vapour fixture just off of these brightly lighted streets, and taper down to a good incandescent.

The before mentioned estimates are based on overhead wiring being acceptable and in any area where this would be objectionable the costs would be proportionately higher in the "labour and materials" item on an average of six to one. This average ration of six to one could be cut down to about four to one in residential districts, if we can get the wire in at just the right time; the right time being between the completion of sidewalks and the start of lawns. In some residential blocks underground wiring will be our only means of providing adequate streetlighting so it might be worthwhile to plan on this type for all residential street lighting.

To light a 500 foot block using steel poles and underground wiring, and using 175 W MV units would cost about \$1,500.00. Some economies might be possible in this estimate, as it includes Union Metal poles at \$125.00 each while I understand Edmonton are using drillstem at a considerable saving. Have been unable to obtain costs on this proposal but would presume a saving of \$30.00 per block might be obtained if drill-stem is suitable and obtainable.

It is hoped that this report will indicate what can be done for various sums of money, and perhaps a formula may be figured out from this to provide a program of

7,

modernization. A gradual change would perhaps be preferable from the point of expenditures, but a large change would certainly be more effective. If a large change is required, materials should be placed on order quite soon in order to ensure delivery on time. Also, we usually have more staff available early in the year rather than in the fall so it would be desirable to have this project started early. In any case the standards for Gaetz Avenue should be ordered by the middle of January and any other standards required should be ordered at the same to get the best discount and freight rates possible.

Any comments or instructions would be gratefully received so that a program can be inaugurated.

Respectfully submitted,

O.C. Mills, Elec. Supt.

NOTE:

The above report is submitted for Council's consideration and any suggestions they may have in connection with streetlighting in both residential and commercial areas.

The City Hall block and Ross Street is quite a problem and we have not touched this up to now as we have a lot of overhead wires on the south side to serve the City Hall. When a new building is erected these lines would be strung in the lane behind the telephone office and the City Hall will be served by underground lines from the corner of 48 Ave. and Ross St.

This could be done now but would prove rather costly operation - approximately \$8,000.

If Council agree that we should hold off with the underground wiring to the City Hall until such time as we have a new building, then we can, if Council wish, complete the mercury vapour lighting in this block with overhead wiring and correctly place steel poles between our existing wooden poles.

COMMISSIONERS.

Jan. 17, 1957

City Commissioners  
City of Red Deer

Gentlemen:

Memo #4231 - Re: Car Plug-ins on City Streets

This subject has come up periodically for the past several years but there seems to be no suitable solution to the problem. We have referred the matter to the Electrical Inspection Branch on various occasions, and while the local staff seem to agree that something should be done to control the situation, their head office in Edmonton will not authorize them to act. I am not clear as to the thinking of the Electrical Branch head office, but being that their sole purpose for existence is the protection of persons and property from the hazards of electricity and they are considered as top authority in this work, I must come to the conclusion that the electrical hazard to these installations is negligible.

My personal opinion is that there is some hazard to these installations the amount of hazard depending on the type of installation. If a good, heavy rubber cord, and rubber connectors are used and maintained in good condition, there is very little hazard from the cord. However, if ordinary dropcord or other cheap cord is used there is quite a serious hazard, and if metal sockets or connectors are used the hazard is multiplied. I have not heard of an actual occurrence, but there is always the danger of an insulation breakdown in the block heater and if this did occur the whole car could be "hot" to ground, and any person touching the car could receive a severe shock. Children playing with these cords could be endangered but if the cord is a good one as outlined above the danger is quite remote (but always possible).

On the other hand, it has been noted that cars left in the street are usually not bothered by children, they tend more to play around cars parked off the street. Another point worth noting is that where cars are parked on the street there is usually a good layer of snow and snow itself is a reasonably good insulator so danger of shock is lessened. Wet snow is another matter, but when snow is wet it is usually warm and block heaters are not in use.

In view of the attitude of the Provincial Electrical Inspection Branch I would suggest that the City would be out of line in attempting to make electrical regulations covering these installations. I would therefore recommend that the City take no action at this time, except perhaps to have the Police remove any installations that obstruct the sidewalks.

Respectfully submitted

O.C. Mills  
Elec. Supt.

Re: Above Report

By-law No. 1843, Part 2, Section 17 outlaws the use of cords across sidewalks. Would suggest we give this matter some publicity and a warning that if said wires are not removed by a certain time said by-law will be enforced.

COMMISSIONERS

Re: Daily Garbage Pick Up in Downtown Commercial Area

Several meeting ago Council indicated they would give consideration to financing an extra garbage truck to provide a daily garbage pick up in the downtown area.

The following prices of trucks have been obtained.

1957 Dodge 1½ ton	2,778.00
1956 Ford	2,750.00
1957 Studebaker 1½ ton	3,466.60
1957 Chevrolet	3,105.00
G.M.C. Model 9543	2,750.00
G.M.C. Model 9653	3,200.00

Mr. Perlick has studied the various bids and specifications and states the 1957 Dodge is the most suitable for his requirement.

He can obtain a 14' garbage body for \$1,725.48 installed, the same type of body he uses on his Studebaker.

The total financing involved is:

1957 Dodge 1½ ton truck	2,778.00
14' Garbage Body	<u>1,725.48</u>
	4,503.48

It will take a month for delivery of above and if Council agree to this proposal further details re garbage pick up charges and payments to the contractor will be submitted for your consideration.

The area to be covered by the daily pick up is as follows:

One Block east and one block west of Gaetz Avenue extending from the foot of the South Hill to the traffic bridge, one block North of Ross Street from Griff's Taxi Stand to the Knox Church, and one block South of Ross St. from the paramount Theatre to the Buffalo Hotel.

COMMISSIONERS

To: City Commissioner

10

Road and Sidewalk Programme 1957

The road and sidewalk programme for 1957 is divided into three parts:

- (i) Gaetz Avenue reconstruction
- (ii) Sideroads of Gaetz Avenue project (49th Ave., 51st Ave., 54th Street)
- (iii) Balance of programme.

The Gaetz Avenue contract has been signed and will involve the City in an expenditure of about \$400,000 a portion of which will be recovered by frontage charges.

The side roads were excluded from the Gaetz Avenue project and are estimated to cost about \$100,000.

The balance of the work which it is desirable to undertake in 1957 is estimated to cost \$360,000 plus about \$40,000 for a Storm Sewer on 40th Avenue making \$400,000 in all.

It will be observed that this programme as a whole would involve the expenditure of about \$850,000 on roads and sidewalks in 1957 exclusive of the contribution of the Province estimated at \$259,323 making in all about ~~\$1,109,323~~.

Expenditures over the last two years on roads and sidewalks have been as follows:-

1955	General Construction	\$556,500	Actual Cost Completed
1956	Poole Construction	\$372,800	Contract price incomplete

The above proposals require careful analysis of our anticipated overall capital expenditures for 1957 and these are given below.

A. Commitments for 1957.

(i) Trunk Sanitary Sewer. Ross to 55th and 55th to River (Commitment of Council to put on Programme)	\$125,000
(ii) Filtration Heating Plant (Under contract)	\$ 18,000.
(iii) Gaetz Avenue (Under Contract)	<u>\$400,000</u>
	\$543,000

B. Anticipated for 1957

(i) Sewer and Water (Exclusive of A (i) above)	\$200,000
(ii) Gard property	\$200,000
(iii) Lanes	\$ 17,500
(iv) Culvert or bridge Pipers Creek	\$15,000 - \$20,000
(v) Side roads Gaetz Avenue	\$100,000
(vi) Road and Sidewalk programme including 40th Avenue Storm Sewer	<u>\$399,000</u>
	<u>\$936,500</u>
	<u>\$1,479,500</u>

This programme compares with 1955 and 1956 capital works programmes of \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ respectively.

It is considered that the only item on which a reduction might be made is item B (vi)

A plan is attached showing in yellow, red and blue the three categories of road work and the Storm Sewer included in this \$400,000 item and an approximate breakdown in costs is given below:-

Yellow - New construction	11,784 lineal feet	\$181,126
Red - Paving on gravel	13,162 " "	83,900
Blue - Gravel for future paving	2,590 " "	21,713
Black - Storm Sewer 40th Avenue		40,000
Curbs, gutters and sidewalk		59,809
Catchbasins and leads		<u>12,322</u>
		<u>398,870</u>

It is suggested that if the amount of this programme is to be reduced that the following item be considered.

(i) 40th Avenue from Ross to P.T.S. driveway

The estimated cost of this work including curbs, gutters, sidewalks and catchbasins amounts to \$38,300 and if excluded from the programme would eliminate the necessity of constructing the Storm Sewer on 40th Avenue estimated at about \$40,000 making a total reduction of about \$79,000.

(ii) 48th Avenue from Ross to 55th Street

The estimated cost of this work including curbs, gutters, sidewalks and catchbasins amounts to \$50,600.

NOTE: As both Gaetz Avenue and 49th Avenue from Ross to 55th Street are scheduled for reconstruction in 1957, there is considerable merit in eliminating this work.

(iii) 45th Avenue from 55th Street to the River

The estimated cost of this work including curbs, gutters, sidewalks and catchbasins amounts to \$28,000.

NOTE: Trunk Sanitary Sewers are to be constructed from Waskasoo Crescent (S) to the river on this road and possibly one year should be allowed for settlement.

(iv) 47th Avenue from Ross to Fairgrounds gate

The estimated cost of this work including gutters, sidewalks, curbs and catchbasins is estimated at \$39,400. A trunk Sewer was laid down this road in 1956 and the steel water line must be replaced and is proposed for 1957.

These four roads with Curbs, gutters, sidewalks, catchbasins and the Storm Sewer total \$197,000 out of the \$399,000 shown as item B (vi).

This \$197,000 is made up as follows.

Roadwork	\$122,900
Storm Sewers	\$40,000
S.C.G. C/G	\$34,100

The effect of taking these four roads off the program would be to revise the categories of work as follows:

New construction (revised)	\$58,226
Paving on gravel as before	83,900
Gravel roads " "	21,713
Storm Sewer (revised)	-
Curbs, gutters and Sidewalks (revised)	
and catchbasins and leads.	<u>38,000</u>
	<u>201,839</u>

It is proposed that New construction and the Curbs, Gutters, Sidewalks etcetra should be contracted and the balance undertaken by City crews.

This would mean \$6,226 of work by contract and \$105,613 by City crews.

It is considered that very high bids would be obtained on the open

market for this work and that bids should be invited by Poole and Voice. Voice has agreed to do the paving work for \$9.00 per ton which is considered reasonable and it is recommended bids should be invited with or without paving to allow for the possibility that Poole's bid would be low on construction and high on paving.

Yours truly,

N. Deck,  
City Engineer

To City Commissioners:

Gaetz Avenue

<u>Roadway:</u>	<u>City (53.1%)</u>	<u>Province (46.9%)</u>	<u>Total</u>
Voice Contract	253,736	224,110	477,846
Royalties on Gravel	1,328	1,172	2,500
Engineering @ 7%	17,854	15,770	33,624
Contingencies @ 8%	20,405	18,023	38,428
	<u>293,323</u>	<u>259,075</u>	<u>552,398</u>
 <u>Sidewalks, Curbs &amp; Gutters</u>			
Voice Contract	66,172		66,172
Engineering @ 7%	4,632		4,632
Contingencies @ 8%	5,294		5,294
	<u>76,098</u>		<u>76,098</u>
 <u>Lighting</u>			
Voice Contract	22,000		22,000
Standards	12,100		12,100
Engineering	2,387		2,387
Contingencies	2,728		2,728
	<u>39,215</u>		<u>39,215</u>

Breakdown of Roadway Costs

Roadway will cost	552,398
Provincial Share	<u>259,075</u>
City Share	<u>293,323</u>

Total length 8556 feet

Cost to City per lineal foot	\$34,283
Cost to Province per lineal foot	<u>30,279</u>
Total cost per lineal foot	<u>\$64,562</u>

Apportioned cost per lineal foot each side of road including flankage intersections etc. \$17,142

Total assessable frontage and flankage	7,406'
City owned frontage (parking lots, Parks, etc.)	<u>1,661'</u>
Total lot frontage	<u>9,067'</u>
Total frontage of all kinds	17,112

Standard charge for paved road after 25% increase for 1957 \$7.25 (cash)

Annual payment over 20 years allowing interest at 3 1/2% 50 cents p.a.

Recoveries on basis of standard charge  
7,406' x \$7.25 \$53,693.50

Recoveries on basis of maximum charge  
7,406' x \$17.142 \$126,953.65

If the City share of the roadway cost is split 50:50 between the owners and the City, \$8.57 per assessable foot would be the charge. This would mean a sharing of costs on the following basis.

Allocation of costs per lineal foot each side of road.

	Property Owner	City	Provincial Gov't	Total
Roadway along assessable frontage & flankage	\$8.57	\$8.57	\$15.14	32.28
7406' -	\$63,469	\$63,469	112,128	239,066
Roadway across intersections and along car parks, City properties and non-assess- able property	----- \$-----	\$17.14 166,360	\$15.14 146,950	32.28 313,310
9706'				
17,112'	\$63,469	229,829	259,078	552,376

If the standard charge of \$7.25 is made the apportionment would be as follows:

<u>Property Owner</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Province</u>	<u>Total</u>
53,694	239,604	259,078	552,376

It is recommended that the City charge the standard amount of \$7.25 as the recovery of an extra \$10,000 would necessitate special treatment of this project, would increase frontage charges by about 16%. whereas the City's overall contribution would be reduced by less than 5%, and the division of costs would be approximately in line with the benefit derived by the Province, the citizens at large and the property owners.

It should be noted that on standard City major thoroughfares 48' wide the City contributes about 50% of the cost.

Yours truly,

Denis Cole

To City Commissioners:

Gaetz Avenue (continued)

Sidewalks, Curbs and Gutters

COSTS

The cost is made up as follows:-

Voice Contract	\$66,172
Engineering & Supervision @ 7%	4,632
Contingencies @ 8%	<u>5,294</u>
	<u>\$76,098</u>

A detailed breakdown is given below:-

11' Sidewalk, Curb and Gutter

4800' Breaking and Removing	\$2.20	
4800' Construction	\$7.50	
Total 4800' at	\$9.70	\$46,560
730' Crossings at	\$10.70	<u>7,811</u>
Total length = 5530' at average of \$9.83 =		54,371
Add 7% Engineering & Supervision plus 8% Cont.		<u>8,155</u>
Average cost per foot for 5530' =	<u>\$11.31</u>	<u>\$62,526</u>

5' Sidewalk, Curb and Gutter

150' Breaking & Removing	\$1.00	
150' Construction	\$4.50	
Total 150' @	5.50	\$ 825
50' Crossings @	6.00	<u>300</u>
Total length - 200' at average of \$5.63		1125
Add 7% Engineering & Supervision plus 8% Cont.		<u>169</u>
Average cost per foot for 200' =	\$6.47	<u>1294</u>

Curb and Gutter

600' Breaking & Removing	0.30	180
2700' Construction	2.25	<u>6075</u>
Total length - 2700' at average of \$2.32		6255
Add 7% Eng. & Sup. plus 8% Cont.		<u>938</u>
Average cost per foot for 2700' =	\$2.66	<u>7193</u>

Miscellaneous

1200 lbs reinforcing	240
450 cubic yards extra excavation	900
470 tons pit run gravel	705
9500 s.y. overhaul	475
Retaining wall removal	300
Retaining wall reconstruction) Anglican Church	1600
Laboratory Tests	201
Total	<u>4421</u>
Add 7% to Engineering & Sup. plus 8% Cont.	<u>664</u>
Total	<u>5085</u>

GRAND TOTAL \$76,098

Sidewalks, Curbs and GuttersRECOVERIES AND DIVISION  
OF COSTS

The miscellaneous items amounting to \$5,085 have been excluded from the calculations of unit costs for the purpose of recoveries as they include major items which cannot justifiably be shared by the property owners.

11' Sidewalk, Curb and Gutter

Total cost (excluding miscellaneous)	\$62,526
Cost per lineal foot	<u>\$11.31</u>
Length of construction along frontage and flankage (assessable)	3887'
Length of construction along intersections, parks City properties and exempt properties	<u>1643'</u>
Total length of construction	<u>5530'</u>

Note 1. 1955 and 1956 charges.

63¢ for 15 years @ 3½% produced \$7.53 plus interest. \$7.53 per foot was prepayment charge. New sidewalks in downtown area will be 6" thick instead of 4½", will have 3000 lb. concrete instead of 2500 lb. and costs include removal of existing sidewalk.

It is recommended that the standard charges for 11' sidewalk, curb and gutter be raised to 70¢ per foot per annum for 20 years which will produce \$10.18 plus interest at 3½% as against a cost of \$11.31. This new charge to apply to all downtown commercial sidewalks in 1957.

On this basis the recoveries and general benefit allocation would be as follows:-

<u>Recovery</u>	3887' of assessable frontage & flankage @ \$10.18	-	39,558
<u>General Benefit</u>	3887' @ \$1.13	-	4391
	1643' @ \$11.31	-	<u>18577</u>
	<u>Total Cost</u>		<u>\$62,526</u>

Note 2. According to our figures the total length of construction has been over estimated by about 700'. If this is the case it will reduce the total cost and the General Benefit cost by about \$7,000. This is being investigated.

5' Sidewalk, Curb and Gutter

Total cost (excluding miscellaneous)	\$1,294
Assessable frontage or flankage	<u>-</u>

<u>Recovery</u>		nil
<u>General Benefit</u>	200' @ \$6.47	<u>\$1,294</u>
	<u>Total Cost</u>	<u>\$1,294</u>

Curb and Gutter

Total Cost (excluding miscellaneous)	\$7,193
Cost per lineal foot (2700')	\$2.66
Assessable frontage construction	572'
Construction along intersections and non assessable lands	2128'

Note 1. 1955 and 1956 charges

21¢ per foot for 20 years. @ 3½% which produced \$3.00 plus interest and was chargeable on frontage only, a share of the cost of the flanking being included in this charge.

In view of the fact that this standard charge more than covers the actual cost of construction per lineal foot it is considered that we retain this charge for Gaetz Avenue.

On this basis the recoveries and general benefit allocation would be as follows:-

<u>Recovery</u> 572' @ \$3.00	1716
<u>General Benefit</u> balance of cost	<u>5477</u>
<u>Total Cost</u>	<u>\$7,193</u>

Note 2. According to our figures the total length of construction is about 1000' and not 2700'. It is believed that the asphalt curb on the South Hill has been included in error. This is being investigated. If this is the case it would reduce the General Benefit cost and the total cost by 1700' x \$2.58 = \$4420.

Ornamental LightingCOSTSVoice Contract

(i) Underground ducts for lighting (existing & new)	
(ii) Supplying and drawing wire	
(iii) Underground ducts for future traffic lights	
(iv) Bases for standards	\$22,000

City Work

(i) Supply 40 light standards complete	\$11,000
(ii) Installation	1,100
Engineering @ 7%	2,387
Contingencies @ 8%	<u>2,728</u>
<u>TOTAL COST</u>	<u>\$39,215</u>

RECOVERIES

In 1955 and 1956 a nominal charge of 10¢ per foot frontage for 10 years was made which produces about 85¢ plus interest per foot frontage.

The total frontage to be served by new lights is 4837 feet. The cost of the standards and luminaires alone exclusive of wiring installation or any other expense is \$11,000.

It is recommended that the charge be increased to 20¢ per foot frontage for 10 years which will produce \$1.70 per foot frontage plus interest.

If this recommendation is adopted the share of costs will be divided as follows:

<u>Recoveries</u>	4837 feet @ \$1.70	\$ 8,223
<u>General Benefit</u>	Balance	\$30,992
		<u>\$39,215</u>

S U M M A R Y

The following unit rates are recommended.

<u>Road</u> - flankage to be charged as frontage		
50¢ for 20 years ( at 3½%)	=	<u>\$7.25</u>
<u>11' Sidewalk, curb and gutter</u> - flankage to be charged as frontage		
70¢ for 20 years ( at 3½%)		<u>\$10.18</u>
<u>5' Sidewalk, curb and gutter</u> - applicable to frontage only		
39¢ for 20 years ( at 3½%)		<u>\$5.70</u>
<u>Curb and gutter</u> - applicable to frontage only		
21¢ for 20 years ( at 3½%)		<u>\$3.00</u>
<u>Ornamental Lighting</u>		
20¢ for 10 years ( at 3%)		<u>\$1.70</u>

On this basis the cost of the Gaetz Avenue project will be divided as follows:-

<u>Item</u>	<u>Province</u>	<u>Property Owner</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Total</u>
Road	259,078	53,694	239,604	552,376
11' Sidewalks, curbs & Gutters	--	39,558	22,968	62,526
5' Sidewalks, curbs & gutters	--	--	1,294	1,294
Curb and gutter	--	--	5,477	7,193
Miscellaneous re: sidewalk, curb & gutter items	--	--	5,084	5,084
Ornamental lighting		8,223	30,992	39,215
Waskasoo Creek structure	25,000	--	--	--
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>284,078</b>	<b>103,191</b>	<b>305,419</b>	<b>692,688</b>

5.

NOTE: The City share may well be reduced by up to \$12,000 if our estimates of the length of 11' sidewalk and separate curb and gutter are correct.

The sum of \$305,419 would be chargeable to general benefit in respect of a City asset costing \$692,688. If funds can be obtained at  $3\frac{1}{2}\%$ , the annual cost to the City at large will be about \$21,000 per annum for 20 yrs.

If the interest due on this debenture is 5% and the frontage charges remain the same, the total net recoveries will be reduced by about 16% i.e. from \$103,191 to about \$87,000 and the City will be liable for the higher charges on about \$320,000 which would be in the neighbourhood of \$26,000 per annum.

It is estimated that the cost of patching the paving in 1955 and 1956 was not less than \$4,000 per annum.

\$21,000 per annum represents about 2 miles on the present assessment and will represent less as the City expands and total assessment increases

It is suggested that most people from out of town judge the City by the condition of Gaetz Avenue and that this project will ultimately reap benefits for the City as a whole and will more than compensate for the heavy expenditure.

Submitted for consideration.

Yours truly,

"Denis Cole"