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RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that Council endorse the following:

WHEREAS the provision of high quality safe drinking water is a priority of the City of Kingston; and

WHEREAS the requirements of the Safe Drinking Water Act, 2002, requires Council to be informed of the matters regarding the operation of the water system;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT;

Council receive the Annual Compliance Reports for; the Kingston Central Water Treatment Plant, The Kingston West Water Treatment Plant and the Cana Well Water Supply System as required by the terms and conditions outlined in the Certificate of Approvals for the above mentioned Treatment Facilities.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to provide to Council a review of new legislation and regulations developed by the province that have had an impact on the operations of the water distribution system of the City of Kingston by Utilities Kingston.

In addition, this report includes in Appendix A, B and C, Annual Compliance Reports for the treatment facilities owned by the City of Kingston and operated by Utilities Kingston, which are required under the terms of the Certificates of Approval to be presented to Council of which Council must acknowledge receipt of the reports. The compliance reports are also required to be signed by a person designated by Council. Council, in 2003 designated the President and C.E.O. of Utilities Kingston to sign these reports. Also, in Appendix D and E, are the Annual Compliance Reports for the sewage treatment facilities owned by the City of Kingston and operated by Utilities Kingston.
These are not mandated by the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) as are the reports for the water treatment facilities and are for information only.

Following the events of Walkerton in May 2000, the collection, treatment, and distribution of potable water has been subject to considerable review and scrutiny. The scope of the review has been enormous, (the O'Connor Commission) spanning almost two years and has impacted all aspects of the water business. The scope of the changes will have far reaching impacts on day-to-day operations, financial and capital planning, and the decision making of front line staff, management and owners.

The Report of the Walkerton Inquiry contained 28 recommendations in Part One, 93 recommendations in Part Two, and advocated the philosophy of a “multiple barrier approach” to ensure the safety of drinking water in Ontario. The approach involves use of a number of mechanisms to prevent contaminants from reaching the consumers of the municipal drinking water. These barriers include; secure, good quality source water, adequate treatment respecting the water source, disinfection, a secure distribution system, monitoring, and a response plan in the event of adverse water quality. Redundancy is provided should one barrier be compromised, the remaining barriers are sufficient to ensure safe drinking water until the problem can be rectified or contingency plans can be invoked.

Based on this approach, Part Two of the Walkerton report was aimed at addressing and ensuring the implementation of the multiple barrier approach. The recommendations were directed at a number of areas including; source protection, standards, monitoring, laboratories, and treatment, municipal service providers and operator training, provincial government roles and responsibilities, and small water systems. These recommendations can be summarized into several areas of significance to our operations, accountability, quality management of systems and financial sustainability.

To promote accountability for ensuring the effective management and operation of municipal water systems, persons designated by the municipality to oversee the management and operation of its water (i.e. Council) are to be held to a statutory duty of care, similar to that of a Director in a Corporation. The Safe Drinking Water Act 2002, Section 19 provides the following statement:

19. (1) Each of the persons listed in subsection (2) shall

a) exercise the level of care, diligence and skill in respect of a municipal drinking-water system that a reasonably prudent person would be expected to exercise in a similar situation; and

b) act honestly, competently and with integrity, with a view to ensuring the protection and safety of the users of the municipal drinking-water system.
(2) The following are the persons listed for the purposes of subsection (1):

1. The owner of the municipal drinking water system.
2. If the municipal drinking-water system is owned by a corporation other than a municipality, every officer and director of the corporation.
3. If the system is owned by a municipality, every person who, on behalf of the municipality, oversees the accredited operating authority of the system or exercises decision-making authority over the system.

The City of Kingston Council and the Board of Utilities Kingston now have a legislated obligation to be sufficiently knowledgeable and informed about the works which are being undertaken to ensure public protection in the provision of potable water. Establishment of policies to ensure water safety through appropriate levels of funding and resource allocation will be the key roles of Council and the Board. As well, requiring periodic status reports from staff, to be informed of necessary corrective actions and to be satisfied that the appropriate steps are being taken to address concerns and ensure safe drinking water. Decision makers have been made accountable for their roles in the process through this new legislation.

The components of quality management will include peer review and MOE approval of operational plans for each water supply system including the associated distribution system, water quality standards, accreditation as an operating authority, a financial plan for sustainable asset management, and an emergency response plan.

Additional detail is needed through the release of new regulations to determine the full extent of these requirements, however we expect that these components will be time consuming and require significant resources to complete. Upon development and approval we will have the ongoing obligation to consistently maintain, update and implement these plans and documents. This represents new obligations for the City that will impact our fiscal and other resources in the future.

Operational manuals for treatment plant operations are constantly updated and procedures changed to respond to new regulations. The process of documenting procedures and preparing operational manuals for all distribution activity has commenced to address the distribution system, which will be supported through the water model development.

The requirement for financial sustainability has been outlined in the *Sustainable Water and Sewer Infrastructure Act 2002*. No regulations have been passed at this time and interpreting the impact of how water and sewer utilities are to be self sustaining is speculative. The Act requires the preparation of a report concerning the provision of water services and waste water services including an inventory of and management plan for the infrastructure needed to provide the services, certified by an engineer and an assessment of the full cost of providing the services and the revenue obtained to provide
them. These reports may be required to be submitted to the MOE. These costs include items such as source protection measures, operating, financing, and renewal, replacement and improvement costs. What is unclear at this time is how systems which have combined sewers, such as found in parts of Kingston, will be required to account for the “sewer funding”, given that the move to sustainability is based upon user pay systems. The largest impact of this regulation will be in assessing the condition of the existing infrastructure and developing representative life cycle costs for the specific area. This will be a major undertaking for staff.

City of Kingston Drinking Water System

The City of Kingston owns and operates two Class 3 water treatment plants, two Class 3 water distribution systems and a Class 1 communal well (Cana) and Class 1 distribution system (Cana). The two treatment plants draw water from Lake Ontario. There are two water reservoirs, four elevated storage tanks, five water pressure booster stations and 515 kilometers of watermain in the distribution system throughout the City. The estimated replacement value of this infrastructure is $405 million. The City systems fall under the provisions of large waterworks under the *Safe Drinking Water Act 2002*. A summary of the value of the water and wastewater infrastructure is included as Appendix F.

Regulatory Framework

In Ontario, there are a number of pieces of legislation which affect the way water and sewer utilities operate. The following lists the various Acts and Regulations which affects the way Utilities Kingston operates. This list is not exhaustive, nor does it necessarily contain everything, but these are areas which are felt to be particularly important.

**Safe Drinking Water Act 2002**
- O. Reg. 169/03 – Ontario Drinking Water Quality Standards
- O. Reg. 170/03 – Drinking Water Systems
- O. Reg. 171/03 – Definitions of Words and Expressions used in the Act
- O. Reg. 173/03 – Schools, Private Schools and Day Nurseries
- O. Reg. 248/03 – Drinking Water Testing Services

**Sustainable Water and Sewer Infrastructure Act 2002**
- No regulations yet passed

**Building Code Act, 1992**
- Ontario Building Code
- Building Code Statute Law Amendment Act 2002 (O. Reg. 305/03)
Environmental Protection Act
- O. Reg. 347, Amended to O. Reg. 323/02 "General-Waste Management (asbestos, Inert Fill etc)
- Regulation 360, Amended to O. Reg. 62/00, "Spills"
- Section 9 - Air Approvals

Ontario Water Resources Act
- O. Reg. 285/99 "Water Taking and Transfer"
- O. Reg. 435/93, Amended to O. Reg. 539/98 "Water Works and Sewage Works"
- O. Reg. 459/00, Amended to O. Reg. 213/02 "Drinking Water Protection-Larger Water Works"
- O. Reg. 505/01, Drinking Water Protection - "Smaller Water Works Serving Designated Facilities"

Fire Protection and Prevention Act 1997
- Ontario Fire Code
- City of Kingston Bylaw 2000-264 (prohibiting the use of hydrants)

Municipal Act 2001

Impacts

Although it is still too early to determine the full impact of regulatory changes there are several themes that are emerging. These are derived from the requirements of the changing legislation, what is proposed in pending known regulations, how provincial staff are using existing regulations to conduct inspections, discussion with provincial staff and participation in various industry associations. As operations continue in this new environment other impacts may also emerge that will require review and implementation.

Reporting Requirements

Reporting requirements have increased and become more comprehensive now, especially regarding annual reports, compliance reporting and adverse quality reporting. Utilities staff are now spending considerably more time to deal with these issues to the point of diverting resources to manage these requirements.

The requirement to notify various agencies such as the Ministry of Environment or Ministry of Health has changed dramatically regarding adverse water quality results. The documentation needed and the protocol for notification has added to the administrative work load. This is requiring more resources on a daily basis in order to ensure compliance. Through our industry associations we are aware of a number of charges laid in other jurisdictions by the Ministry of Environment in recent months. These can be directly related to the function of reporting and monitoring. An important
note to consider when one hears of these recent charges is that in many instances the violations have not had an adverse affect on the water quality systems being supplied rather the violations were more administrative in nature.

Linked to the reporting requirements is the data needed in order to provide timely and complete reports. Data management needs have sharply increased for operational and analytical data that has to be tracked, measured, recorded, analyzed and reported. We have not yet felt the full impact that this function is going to have on operations.

The requirement to undertake Engineer's Reports was first seen in 2001. The impact of the first round of reports was seen in significant capital improvements being undertaken at all plants operated by the City. For the water treatment plants alone some $2 million has been spent in improvements designed to further improve water quality and automate operations. The 2nd Engineer's Report must be completed 5 years after the first, January 2006.

There has always been a need to maintain certain records for activity undertaken on the water system, be it at the plants or in the distribution system. Utilities' field staff must keep detailed records of work undertaken on the system such as repair to a water valve which could affect the operation, these logs must be signed off by those completing the work and an operator in charge for the system must review these records and take responsibility. This administrative component impacts field staff and the operations centre, which also record activity on the system.

Given the legislative changes that are directed to ensure accountability for drinking water, staff is anticipating the need for frequent reporting to the Utilities Kingston Board and Council on matters impacting the water systems. This is given that Council must make informed decisions to set policy and will therefore have the desire for more information so they can fulfill their fiduciary responsibility.

Inspections

Inspection of treatment plants, reservoirs and the distribution systems by the MOE inspection staff are now a regular occurrence. Annual inspections will be announced with 48 hours notice and once every three years at least, an unannounced or "surprise" inspection will occur. Both treatment plants and distribution systems have been subjected to the new inspection regimes. Since the inspections are new there is uneasiness regarding the process which involves reviewing manuals, operating procedures, logs, sampling, testing and interviewing staff. These inspections have generated considerable administrative work for staff resulting in increased operating and capital expenditures that we have seen in our operating budget. The process of tracking and monitoring compliance to the legislation and regulations has become increasingly complex and administratively difficult due to the many vehicles now available to the MOE to place conditions, orders, fines or penalties on the City for even 'administrative' problems. This has required staff to increase their efforts in documentation and record
keeping far beyond any effort in the past and has meant additional staff time and expense to ensure proper record keeping.

While written operating procedures have existed for treatment plants and facilities the impact of the drinking water regulations and the requirement to produce such documentation during inspections is such that they are not optional any more. This has created the need to continuously review and improve the procedures which is a good thing, however time consuming and costly. This also applies to the distribution system and the process to complete documented standardized procedures has begun.

Training

Training requirements remain as 40 hours per operator annually, however, there is recognition of a potential increase to comply more specifically with drinking water regulations and testing is imminent. This will involve more time for staff to train which takes them away from work as well as the added costs of the training.

Along with the training are the certification requirements needed for staff to be authorized to work on any part of the water system. These requirements have been around for awhile but have now become of more importance to us. Previously employees with significant amounts of experience were grandfathered into the certification process. Under the new requirements those employees will now be required to pass certification exams. This will result in some financial impacts and staffing issues such as succession planning and ensuring the number of trained and licensed staff to an appropriate level are on hand to properly operate systems.

In order to make better use of technology advances both water plants have undergone significant engineering changes with new and technologically advanced equipment being installed. This equipment is changing the way operations are carried out and requires specialized training to operate the new systems such as supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA).

Sampling and Testing

Sampling requirements have increased by a factor of four. In addition in order to ensure compliance and demonstrated water quality more than the minimum required is being undertaken. This is a proactive approach providing additional insurance on ensuring that our water meets or exceeds the minimum requirements. The increased sampling efforts are adding to our operating costs however this is an area where it is in fact prudent to do so. We are seeing increased expenditures as a result due to the use of private labs for the analyses as well as the staff required to do the sampling. The tracking of the results and reporting of the results means increased expenditures that will be reflected in the upcoming budget exercise.
Chemical Usage

Our chemical usage such as chlorine has increased dramatically. This is due to the change in the standard for free chlorine residual (the amount left in the system at any given time) required at the plants and in furthest reaches of the distribution systems. Coagulant usage has also increased due to the need to further optimize the treatment processes at the plants. All of these are a direct impact of new minimum standards being implemented.

Customer Complaints

As we have increased the disinfection of our water to meet standards and maintain compliance, the number of customer complaints due to the higher chlorine residuals has increased. These are being tracked and explained to the residents as simply as possible.

Facility Monitoring

The plan to remotely monitor our facilities has been ongoing for a while now, but the programs have been advanced in timing due to the need to track facility operations. This has a large financial impact as well as training to work with the new technology.

Financial Plans, Operating Plans, Accreditation

Found within the legislation are new requirements that will have to be fulfilled. All of these will ultimately require research and data collection, analysis, preparation of reports and documents, submission to the MOE for approval and implementation. While it appears that the City is in relatively good shape with regard to meeting the intent of financial sustainability given our rate structure we remain concerned over the details that may be found in the regulations governing this legislation given the precedents found within other utility operations such as electricity.

Currently no details have been released as to the content, form, structure or requirements for each of these plans or processes. Based on past experience we expect that in order to comply with the requirement to submit these plans and obtain accreditation significant time and resources will be spent.

Annual Compliance Reports

Utilities Kingston operates and maintains three distinct water treatment facilities and associated water distribution systems for the City of Kingston. These three water systems are The Kingston Central Water Treatment Plant located at 302 King Street West, The Kinston West Water Treatment Plant located at 80 Sunny Acres Road and the Cana Well Water Supply System located in the Cana Subdivision.
Each facility operates under the terms and conditions contained in the Certificate of Approval for each facility. These Certificates of Approval dictate how the facilities are operated and maintained and how information about these systems is reported to the Ministry of the Environment and to the Public using these systems.

The Annual Compliance Report is part of the terms and conditions contained within each Certificate of Approval. It is a requirement of each Certificate of Approval that an Annual Compliance Report be prepared and presented to Council prior to it being submitted to The Ministry of the Environment. Attached in Appendix A, B and C are the individual Annual Compliance Reports for the above mentioned Water Treatment Facilities.

The Annual Compliance Report is intended to be a statement as to the compliance with all of the terms and conditions of the Certificate of Approvals, and gives a detailed description of the measures taken to ensure compliance with the Certificates of Approval including supporting data and other information.

If in the event any non-compliance occurs during the reporting period it is to be reported in the Annual Compliance Report as well as the actions to correct the problem.

Contained within the Annual Compliance Report for each facility is a section under the heading Summary of Compliance with the terms and Conditions of the COA. This section summarizes the activities of the operators of the systems as they relate to water quality, qualifications of the operational staff, and chemical / biological compliance with the Ontario Drinking Water regulations.

The attached Annual Compliance Reports summarize specific instances of non-compliance and adverse water quality during the 2003 reporting period, which are summarized below.

**Kingston Central Water Treatment Plant**

For the Kingston Central Water Treatment Plant, there was one non-compliance event which occurred on November 5, 2003 as a result of failure of two disinfectant pumps. This resulted in the free chlorine residual in the treated water dropping to 0.6 mg/l for 20 minutes. The Certificate of Approval requires that a minimum free chlorine residual of 0.8 mg/l be maintained. This is detailed on Page 1 of the Annual Summary Report 2003 for the Kingston Central Plant (Appendix A).

There were six (6) notifications of Adverse Water Quality Results for this facility during 2003 to the Spill Action Center and to the Environmental Health Division of the local Ministry of Health. In all cases, retesting was carried out which satisfied authorities that there were no concerns regarding the quality and safety of the treated water. Details are presented on Page 3 and 4 of the report.
Kingston West Water Treatment Plant

For the Kingston West Water Treatment Plant, there was an issue of non-compliance regarding a condition in the Certificate of Approval which required that a minimum chlorine level of 3.5 mg/l be maintained in treated water. This was an error in the Certificate of Approval which was amended in April of 2003. Additionally, an adjustment was required to the chlorine residual alarms which are set to ensure the required chlorine residual are maintained. There were no non-compliance issues under the amended Certificate of Approval. Details are on Page 1 of the Annual Summary Report 2003 for Kingston West Water Treatment Plant (Appendix B).

There were two Notifications of Adverse Water Quality Results to the Spills Action Center and to the Environmental Health Division of the local Ministry of Health. One was a result of sampling procedures and the other a result of the August 14th Power Outage.

Cana Well System

For the Cana Well System, there were no issues of non-compliance. There were five notifications of Adverse Water Quality Results to the Spills Action Center and to the Environmental Health Division of the local Ministry of Health. They are detailed on Page 3 and 4 of the Annual Summary Report 2003 for Cana Well System (Appendix C). None of these caused concern for the quality and safety of the treated water.

Financial Impacts

The Annual Compliance Reports have no financial implications.

The new requirements for reporting, and monitoring, new testing and sampling protocols, increased chemical usage to meet regulations data management requirements etc have all contributed to additional expenses in the delivery of safe and reliable water.

In recognition that changes were coming and that further improvements to plant operations were needed a program of refurbishment, replacement and modernization was undertaken. Many of these changes initiated in 2000-2001 have proven to be in line with the new directions including the approximate $2 million spent in 2002 at the Central Water Treatment Plant. The 2003 Capital Budget included $2.3 million to address legislated requirements and continue the process of exceeding the minimum requirements for drinking water in this City at both treatment facilities.
On the distribution side we have continued the process of improvements to watermains, booster stations and elevated storage requirements. We have also made investments in data management and analysis such as the modeling tools and Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) management systems.

**Sewage Treatment Facilities Annual Report**

We have also included for Council information, the Annual Reports for Kingston West Wastewater Plant (Appendix D) and Ravensview Water Pollution Control Plant (Appendix E). These reports are not under the same requirements as those for the Water Treatment Facilities and are for information only.

**River Street Pumping Station**

In addition, we have included the 2003 Annual Flow and By-Pass Summary for River Street Pumping Station (Appendix G). This is the pumping station that pumps the sewage under the Cataraqui River for treatment at Ravensview.

Also for Council's information is an updated version of Utilities Kingston's Overflow Program, prepared in 2002 (Appendix H).

**CONTACTS**

- Kevin Riley, Manager Treatment Group 546-1181, ext. 2224
- Allen Lucas, Engineer Utilities Technical Services 546-1181, ext. 2250
- Jim Keech, President and CEO, 546-1181, ext. 2217

**APPENDICES**

- Appendix A: Kingston Central Water Treatment Plant – Annual Compliance Report
- Appendix B: Kingston West Water Treatment Plant – Annual Compliance Report
- Appendix C: Cana Well System – Annual Compliance Report
- Appendix D: Kingston West Wastewater Plant – Annual Report
- Appendix E: Ravensview Water Pollution Control Plant – Annual Report
- Appendix F: Facilities Valuation Summary
- Appendix G: River Street Pumping Station – Annual Flow and By-Pass Summary
- Appendix H: Overflow Program – Utilities Kingston
J.A. Keech
President and C.E.O.
Utilities Kingston

Bert Meunier
Chief Administrative Officer
RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

1. THAT Council receives the Arena Capacity and Expansion Study Report as prepared by dmA Planning and Management Services;

2. THAT copies of the study report be made widely available to community stakeholders, interested parties and members of the public for review and comment;

3. AND FURTHER THAT the study report together with staff recommendations and any comments received from the public be considered by the Committee of the Whole at its meeting on February 24, 2004

ORIGIN/PURPOSE:

The purpose of this report is to present Council with the Arena Capacity and Expansion Study – Final Report. Staff is recommending that Council only receive the report at this time and refer the matter to the Committee of the Whole on February 24, 2004 for consideration. This will allow time for Councillors and interested parties to review the report findings and formulate opinions. Staff will bring the study report back to Committee of the Whole on February 24th together with a staff recommendation and any public comments received up to that time.

OPTIONS/DISCUSSION:

Background:

The following is a list in chronological order of Council directions to date:

1. In 2002, Council directed staff to undertake an arena study to examine existing infrastructure, present conditions and future capacity to serve the needs of the community ice users.
2. At its meeting on April 1, 2003, Council approved terms of reference for the study (amended to address neighbourhood needs concerning demographics, uniqueness and character), and appointed Councilors’ D. Meers and K. George to the Study Steering Committee with the understanding that they would also participate in the selection of the consulting firm to undertake this study.

3. On June 17, 2003, Council approved the hiring of dmA Planning and Management Services to undertake the Arena Capacity and Expansion Study.

4. On September 23, 2003, Council received an information report providing a status update on the project.

Scope of the Study:

The study is primarily an ice user needs study. It did not undertake to provide an in-depth analysis of complex and competing community uses and needs. Some references have been made recommending further and or more in-depth analysis of an issue.

Study Report Executive Summary

Much of the City’s existing ice capacity is limited by poor infrastructure and dated facilities. These facilities are expensive to operate, and to repair. At minimum, three facilities (Memorial Centre, Harold Harvey and Cooks Brothers) should be replaced in the short term. Wally Elmer should be replaced in the short to medium term. Centre 70 can accommodate a second ice pad with minimal seating, and should be twinned. Future demand for ice facilities will increase with growth, although demand will be mitigated somewhat by changing age demographics, interest trends, and additional regional ice facilities. Over the medium term the City will require at minimum one additional ice pad.

Strategic Directions:
The study recommends that Council adopts a series of high level strategic directions to guide decision-making in the future:

# 1: Ice facilities should be provided in a manner that maximizes cost efficiencies, including operating costs, and maintenance of capital infrastructure.

# 2: Ice facilities should be provided in a manner that maximizes service and program opportunities, consistent with the needs of today’s ice users.

# 3: Ice facilities appropriate to the general public for public skate are important, as are facilities that respond to organized users.

# 4: Appropriate indoor recreation space should be provided to City residents.

# 5: Development and management of arena facilities through a partnership with other providers and sectors should be investigated, and where costs to the City are reduced, and service is not negatively impacted, the City should consider such partnerships.
#6: Arena facilities should be sited to maximize synergies among facility components, to optimize revenues and to provide users with the optimal ancillary and ice space.

Study Recommendations in Summary:
Using the Strategic Directions to maximize cost savings, maximize service to City residents, and to seek partnerships where that is most appropriate, the study recommends that in the immediate to short term (2004-2005):

**Recommendation 1:** The City undertakes to complete a full cultural services master plan. In the context of a full cultural services master plan the City should identify community recreation needs for the communities surrounding Harold Harvey, Wally Elmer and Cooks Brothers arenas. This investigation should assess indoor facility needs and opportunities to repurpose existing facilities to better meet community needs. These facilities however, should be decommissioned as ice facilities.

**Recommendation 2:** The City should introduce a development charge levy for recreation facilities. This levy should not be facility-specific (e.g., not arenas, but recreation centres) to provide the City with future flexibility for provision of growth related recreation facilities.

**Recommendation 3:** The City should develop a three-pad arena facility to replace Memorial Arena, Cooks Brothers Arena and Harold Harvey Arena. One of the three pads should be an event arena with seating accommodation for 5,000. The other two pads should have seating accommodation for 300 to 500. In developing the triple-pad, the addition of a fourth pad in the future should be planned.

**Recommendation 4:** In advance of the tendering process for this project, the City must develop a more detailed space program and capital costing. In addition to the three ice pads (and plans for a fourth pad in the future) the overall plan for the facility should consider other spaces such as gymnasium space, fitness facility, licensed food services and sports medicine and training areas. Other basic components including office and storage space, concession areas and medium size meeting rooms would of course be a component of this facility. The overall plan for the facility should be developed as the basis for tender documents and for determining and assessing partner options.

**Recommendation 5:** The City should identify and assess locations for the three-pad (with a future option of a fourth pad) arena complex. Site locations should be at least 25 acres and have municipal servicing. The site should be well situated with respect to the main urban areas of the City, should have excellent vehicular access, and be prominent with respect to visibility of this major public building.
Recommendation 6: The City should investigate opportunities to develop a capital and operating partnership for the three-pad arena. The specifics of this partnership will need to be carefully assessed with respect to implications for long-term costs, access by the public, implications for existing staff, public risk and liability, long-term maintenance of the infrastructure. The partnership could be for the major event arena only with community rinks remaining as municipally-operated arenas.

Recommendation 7: The design for the three-plex should consider the opportunity to add leisure ice to the end of one of the community ice pads. Alternatively, one of the ice pads could be designed and designated for recreational skating (public skating, shinny hockey, instructional skating). This is particularly appropriate if in the short and medium term (up to 2015) the City chooses to retain Wally Elmer arena.

Recommendation 8: As part of identification and assessment of sites for the multi-pad arena, the City should initiate discussions with the Agricultural Fair Board to confirm the availability and appropriateness of the current Memorial Centre property for an arena/sports complex. Further assessment (through any additional studies or task forces) of the current Memorial Centre site should include a traffic impact study, extensive consultation with the surrounding community and perhaps geotechnical studies, to assess the ability of the site to accommodate the new facility.

Recommendation 9: When the three-plex is completed the City should decommission the current Memorial Centre, Harold Harvey and Cooks Brothers arenas.

Recommendation 10: Design of the three-plex should incorporate aspects of the current Memorial Centre, perhaps including some of the physical elements to provide continuity between the new facility and a facility that was in part constructed as a war memorial.

Recommendation 11: Upon approval in principle, the City should confirm its position with respect to pursuing a partnership with the private sector for the development of the three-pad arena facility. As part of this process of confirmation, the City should decide its position on the option of contracting-in.

Recommendation 12: Upon agreement to develop new arena facilities the City should prepare a base business plan including, at minimum, the points noted in the discussion in section 4.2.3 (point 4). Additionally, this business plan should identify those costs that the City would retain, or add, in a partnership agreement. This business plan should be used in evaluation of proponent submissions.

Recommendation 13: Upon agreement to develop new arena facilities, the City should assess current ice user rates and capital financing requirements and if necessary revise current surcharges. When required surcharges are identified, and prior to proceeding with development of any partnership initiatives, these revised surcharges should be reviewed with and agreed to by user groups.
EXISTING POLICY/BY-LAW: N/A

LINK TO STRATEGIC PLAN:
Arising from the Community Strategic Plan, City Council endorsed Culture (broadly defined to include parks/open space, recreation, sport, leisure, arts, entertainment, cultural heritage and museums) as one of its 8 key strategic priority areas over the next few years. One of the specific action plans within the Cultural Action Plan is entitled “Assets and Opportunities”, which addresses the community needs and demands for cultural facilities and services. This arena capacity and expansion study is an essential component of that action plan. This matter was accelerated for study as a result of the identified urgent need to address the deteriorating state of our arenas/community centres. It is the essential first step to the long term development strategy for service delivery, capital planning requirements and improvements to existing infrastructure.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:
The City of Kingston entered into a contract with dmA Planning and Management Services to undertake the study for a fixed cost of $49,804.00 plus GST. The long-term cost implications of implementing the recommendations of the study must now be determined in the context of the City’s overall program and service demands, immediate budgetary pressures and longer term fiscal strategy.

CONTACTS:
Mark Fluhrer, Manager, Policy and Support Services, Department of Community Services
546 – 4291 ext. 1342

DEPARTMENTS/OTHERS CONSULTED AND AFFECTED:
Cultural Services Division; Planning and Development Department; Operations Department
Corporate Services Department;

Arena Capacity and Expansion Study Steering Committee:
Councillor Kevin George, former Councillor Dave Meers, Barclay Mayhew, Kim Brown, Kris Kullas, Kristine Hebert, Mark Fluhrer, Sonya Bolton

NOTICE PROVISIONS: N.A.

APPENDICES: The Arena Capacity and Expansion Study Final Report – Prepared by dmA Planning & Management Services distributed separately. Copies are available either from the Office of the Commissioner, City Hall or by logging onto the City’s website at www.cityofkingston.ca
Lance Thurston
Commissioner, Department of Community Services

Bert Meunier
Chief Administrative Officer