TO: Bert Meunier, Chief Administrative Officer
FROM: Terry Willing, Acting Commissioner, Planning & Development Services
PREPARED BY: Wendy Carman, Senior Policy Planner
DATE OF MEETING: July 13, 2004
SUBJECT: Urban Growth Strategy Report

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL:

WHEREAS the purpose of the Urban Growth Strategy was to provide direction for future growth and infrastructure upgrading or extensions, and, the City’s capital budget to 2026;

AND WHEREAS the project commenced in June 2002 in accordance with the Council approved Terms of Reference;

AND WHEREAS Council, through Report No. 03-266, approved on August 12, 2003, expanded the Urban Growth Strategy project to include an additional growth alternative (Growth Alternative No. 1A), and to undertake a more comprehensive financial analysis of the infrastructure costs of the growth alternatives and also to include further public consultation;

AND WHEREAS since June 2002 there have been four public consultation opportunities and any comments received from the public have been considered by the consulting team;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that it be recommended to Council that the “Final Report, City of Kingston, Urban Growth Strategy,” dated July 2004, be accepted in fulfillment of the Terms of Reference and that the Study’s conclusions, recommendations and means of implementation be approved in principle;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the study be referred to the Planning Division for implementation by amending the appropriate Officials Plans with public consultation under the Planning Act and for incorporation of the Study recommendations, where appropriate in the preparation of the new Official Plan;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the study be forwarded to affected municipal divisions for further study or implementation, as warranted.
ORIGIN/PURPOSE:

The purpose of this report is to request Council's consideration of the Urban Growth Strategy Final Report, dated July, 2004, and to briefly outline some of the steps and key points in the study's preparation.

OPTIONS/DISCUSSION:

The Urban Growth Strategy is to guide the City's growth, infrastructure, services and capital investment for the next twenty-five years. It has involved planning, hard and soft service infrastructure, transportation, sanitary sewers, water servicing, and financial analysis. The study will form the framework for the new City of Kingston Official Plan. On July 13, 2004, it is scheduled that J.L. Richards and Associates will be formally presenting the Urban Growth Strategy project to Council.

Study Team

The Urban Growth Strategy was undertaken by a multi-disciplinary consulting team led by J.L. Richards & Associates Limited in accordance with Council Resolutions of January 29, 2002, (adopting the Terms of Reference); June 4, 2002 (selecting the consulting team) and on August 13, 2003 (expanding the scope of the Urban Growth Strategy project). The consulting team further included representatives from the following firms: C.N. Watson (financial), R.V. Anderson Associates (environmental assessment), XCG Consultants Limited (engineering) and Williamson Consulting (public consultation).

The City's Executive Management Team (EMT) undertook the administrative direction of the study. A Technical Resource Group comprised of staff from Planning and Development Services, several other City departments, and Utilities Kingston assisted the Executive Management Team, provided technical assistance and access to City information. A Technical Advisory Group, comprised of representatives from City departments, appointees from Kingston Environmental Advisory Forum (KEAF), the Rural Affairs Committee, and outside agencies provided additional assistance as required.

Study Products

The study has resulted in the preparation of the Final Report, Urban Growth Strategy, dated July, 2004, (under a separate cover) which includes: a Water Servicing Concept Plan, a Sanitary Sewer Servicing Concept Plan, a Financial Plan and draft Official Plan Amendments as appendices. Interim Report No. 1, "Developing the Growth Alternatives" and Interim Report No. 2, "Evaluating the Growth Alternatives" were also prepared during the course of the study and provide background information on the process, considerations and supporting information leading to the final report.

Integration with Other Studies

The Urban Growth Strategy has been integrated with a number of studies including the Population and Housing Projections Model prepared by Stevens Associates (housing, population and employment projections), the Transportation Master Plan (transportation infrastructure, costs, timing, growth/non-growth shares) undertaken by Dillon Consulting; the Sanitary Sewer Systems Model and the Water Distribution Model prepared for Utilities Kingston by R.V. Anderson. Water, sanitary sewer and transportation infrastructure costs, timing, growth/non-growth shares has been provided to the Development Charges Study which is being undertaken by C.N. Watson.
OPTIONS/DISCUSSION: (Cont’d)

Public Consultation Process
Since June 2002, there have been four public consultation opportunities, as well as, a lengthy period following each public consultation event for comments. These public consultation opportunities included a request for input in the summer of 2002 on how the City should address growth and development needs over the next 25 years; a Public Open House on November 13, 2002, on the draft evaluation criteria and Draft Interim Report No. 1; a Public Open House on April 30, 2003, on Draft Interim Report No. 2; and a Public Open House on June 3, 2004, on the additional review of the evaluation results and the Draft Final Urban Growth Strategy Report which included drafts of the Water Servicing Concept Plan, the Sanitary Sewer Concept Plan, the Financial Plan and the Official Plan Amendments. The last date for public comment was June 30, 2004.

Throughout the project, the consulting team has received, reviewed and considered the public comments and made revisions where appropriate. Also, the study team met with various landowner groups and interested persons/groups as needed and requested additional information or supporting documents to ensure that they had all of the pertinent information.

Process Chart
The Urban Growth Strategy project process chart is shown on Appendix “A”. It provides an overview of the major steps that have been undertaken in the project.

Some Key Points about the Undertaking of the Urban Growth Strategy Project
- This study has been the first comprehensive review of where and how growth occurs in the amalgamated City. This study has been comprehensive as it has:
  - involved a planning, engineering, financial and transportation analysis and includes current environmental information;
  - involved all City departments and Utilities Kingston, outside agencies and service providers, the EMT, Planning Committee and Council in various stages of the project;
  - had extensive public consultation since 2002;
  - been expanded by Council to address issues raised during the public consultation process; and,
  - integrated with a number of studies including the Transportation Master Plan and the Population and Housing Projections model. Sanitary sewer, water and transportation infrastructure costs, timing of work and details on growth and non-growth shares has been provided to the Development Charges Study.
- Each of the three former municipalities had a different approach to growth. This study provides a unified approach to guide the future growth and development of the City to 2026.
- The study has ensured that adequate land is available to accommodate housing and employment growth to the Year 2026, and further to ensure that sufficient land for housing would be available to achieve a competitive market and housing affordability.
- Interim Report No. 1 and Interim Report No. 2 provide documentation of the analysis, considerations and recommendations for the study as it was being undertaken and leading up to the preparation of the final report. Also, they identify that the various growth alternatives were evaluated using identical criteria, all with equal value, therefore showing that the consideration of the growth alternatives was as objective as possible (used a process of ranking commonly used in the environmental assessment process).
OPTIONS/DISCUSSION: (Cont’d)

- The Urban Growth Strategy report identifies the conclusions and recommendations of the study and details an integrated strategy for development. The Water Servicing Plan and the Sanitary Sewer Concept Plans identify the type, cost, location and timing of improvements needed to the water system and the sanitary system. The Financial Plan addresses future financing of the capital works required to service the lands proposed for future development and is based upon sanitary sewer, water and transportation infrastructure costs, timing of works, growth and non-growth shares identified through the comprehensive analysis of this project. The draft Official Plan Amendments provide specific policies and mapping to direct where, how and when development will occur. These will proceed further as amendments to the Official Plans under the statutory requirements of the Planning Act.
- The study will be implemented by various municipal departments through the Urban Growth Strategy Report, the Water Servicing Concept Plan, the Sanitary Servicing Concept Plan, the Financial Plan and the draft Official Plan Amendments and they will assist in the preparation of the City’s capital budget.
- The study should be monitored in five year intervals to assess the effectiveness of the strategy and the need for changes to it.

EXISTING POLICY/BY-LAW:

The Official Plans for the three former municipalities contain different policies on growth, services and utilities, transportation, public works, and land use that were prepared by the three former municipalities within the boundaries of their individual jurisdictions. This study examines and creates a unified approach to development. The City has current by-laws with respect to Development Charges and Impost Fees which detail requirements for new development. A Development Charges/Impost Fees Background Study is presently being undertaken by the City.

LINK TO THE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The Urban Growth Strategy has been a multi-disciplinary study with planning, sanitary sewer, water and water servicing components, financial and other hard/soft infrastructure considerations. Therefore, it has been linked to a number of initiatives of the Community Strategic Plan, adopted by Council on October 24, 2000, including the Official Plan Initiative, and the Long Range Infrastructure Plan Initiative. Also, there have been links to the Transportation Master Plan, the Culture, Heritage, Parks and Recreation Strategy, the Economic Prosperity Initiative, as well as the Environmental Initiative.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:

The Urban Growth Strategy Report contains a financial plan to provide a strategy to address the recommended infrastructure requirements. This can be used to assist in future capital budgeting. Interim Report No. 2 contains the financial analysis of the growth alternatives.
CONTACTS:

Bianca M.V. Bielski, Manager, Planning Division, 384-1770, ext. 3250
Cherie Mills, Supervisor, Land Use Policy, Planning Division, 384-1770, ext. 3289
Wendy Carman, Senior Policy Planner, Land Use Policy, Planning Division, 384-1770, ext. 3186

DEPARTMENTS/OTHERS CONSULTED AND AFFECTED:

Affected and consulted during this project:

Executive Management Team
- Bert Meunier, CAO, 546-4291, ext. 1245
- Terry Willing, Acting Commissioner, Planning & Development Services, 384-1770, ext. 1150
- Cynthia Beach, Commissioner, Planning & Development Services, 384-1770, ext. 3240
- Denis Leger, Commissioner, Dept. of Corporate Services, 546-4291, ext. 1328
- Mark Segsworth, Commissioner, Dept. of Operations, 546-4291, ext. 1345
- Jim Keech, President & CEO, Utilities Kingston, 546-1181, ext. 2217
- Lance Thurston, Commissioner, Dept. of Community Services, 546-4291, ext. 1250

Urban Growth Strategy – Technical Resource Group
- Terry Willing, Acting Commissioner, Planning & Development Services, 384-1770, ext. 1150
- Cynthia Beach, Commissioner, Planning & Development Services, 384-1770, ext. 3240
- Cindie Ashton, Communications Officer, Strategic Initiatives & Corporate Communications, 384-1770, ext. 3116
- Bianca M.V. Bielski, Manager, Planning Division, 384-1770, ext. 3250
- Cherie Mills, Supervisor, Land Use Policy, Planning Division, 384-1770, ext. 3289
- Wendy Carman, Senior Policy Planner, Land Use Planning, Planning Division, 384-1770, ext. 3186
- Speros Kanellos, Manager, Engineering Division, PDS, 384-1770, ext. 3133
- Kim Brown, Project Engineer Infrastructure, Engineering Division, PDS, 384-1770, ext. 3132
- Mark Van Buren, Storm Water Engineer, Engineering Division, PDS, 384-1770, ext. 3218
- Paul MacLatchy, Manager, Environmental Services, PDS, 384-1770, ext. 3134
- Beth Sills, Environmental Engineer, Environmental Services, PDS, 384-1770, ext. 3120
- Gerard Hunt, Manager of Finance, Dept. of Corporate Services, 546-4291, ext. 2205
- Derek Hart, Capital Budget Analyst, Dept. of Corporate Services, 546-4291, ext. 2370
- Shawna Guernsey, Financial Analyst, Dept. of Corporate Services, 546-4291, ext. 2341
- Malcolm Morris, Manager, Transit, Dept. of Operations, 546-4291, ext. 2260
- Tony Fleming, Senior Legal Counsel, Dept. of Corporate Services, 546-4291, ext. 1293
- Jim Miller, Manager, Administration, Utilities Technical Services, 546-1181, ext. 2475
- Allen Lucas, Engineer, Engineering, Utilities Technical Services, 546-1181, ext. 2250
- Stephen Kelly, President & CEO, KEDCO, 544-2725
- Margo Lienhard, Acting Manager, Community Planning & Development, 548-4304, ext. 24
- Rob McRae, Resource Planner, CRCA, 546-4228, ext. 224
- Alan Revill, Committee Member, Rural Affairs Committee, 384-4481
- Bardi Vorster, Committee Member, KEAF, 547-7884
- Wilf Sorensen, Committee Member, KEAF, 542-4045
Urban Growth Strategy, Technical Advisory Group

- Chris Phippen, Engineer, Utilities Technical Services, Utilities Kingston, 546-1181, ext. 2335
- Bob McConnachie, Treasurer & Manager, Regulatory Affairs, Utilities Kingston, 546-1181, ext. 2383
- Kevin Riley, Manager, Treatment Group, Utilities Kingston, 546-1181, ext. 2224
- Don Quinn, Manager, Underground Infrastructure, Utilities Kingston, 546-1181, ext. 2243
- Mark Doherty, Engineering Assistant, Utilities Technical Services, Utilities Kingston, 546-1181, ext. 2483
- Mark Campbell, Manager, Electric and Fibre Communications, Utilities Kingston, 546-1181, ext. 2207
- Harold Tulk, Fire Chief, Fire & Rescue, 548-4001, ext. 5204
- John Cross, Manager, Policy & Support Services, Commissioner’s Office, Community Services, 546-4291, ext. 1249
- Debra Defoe, Chief Librarian, CEO, Kingston Frontenac Public Library, (KFPL) 549-8888, ext. 1230
- John Feenstra, Manager, Facilities & Financial Services, KFPL, 549-8888, ext. 1370
- David Morgan, former Manager, Culture & Recreation
- Mark Fluhrer, Manager, Policy & Support Services, 546-4291, ext. 1342
- Kristine Hebert, Parks & Open Space Planning Coordinator, Cultural Services Division, Dept. of Community Services, 546-4291, ext. 1256
- Greg Grange, Manager, Housing, Dept. of Community Services, 546-4291, ext. 1265
- Mila Kolokolnikova, Supervisor, Housing, Dept. of Community Services, 546-4291, ext. 1372
- Stan Dafoe, Hydro One, 705-876-8994
- Ashley LeBel, Hydro One, 613-966-9237
- John Clements, Limestone District School Board, 544-6925, ext. 212
- Doug Campbell, Algonquin & Lakeshore District Separate School Board, 354-2255
- Steven Wowk, Manager, Tri-Board Student Transportation Services, 354-1981, ext. 324
- John Giles, Manager, Solid Waste, Department of Operations, 546-4291, ext. 2701
- Jean Ma, Queen’s University, Director, Campus Planning & Development, 533-6191
- Lt. Col. Ian Hunt, Deputy Base Commander; Maj. Claude Bellerose, Engineering Services Officer; and W.O. Joe Walsh, Planning and Utilities, CFB Kingston, 541-5010
- John Johnson, Assistant Executive Director, Planning & Facilities, Hotel Dieu, 544-3310

NOTICE PROVISIONS:

Notice requirements are not a consideration for this report.

APPENDICES:

Appendix “A” – Revised Approach to Urban Growth Strategy
Appendix “B” – Under Separate Cover

Final Report – Urban Growth Strategy dated July 2004 which includes:
- Water Servicing Concept Plan;
- Sanitary Sewer Concept Plan;
- Financial Plan; and
- Draft Official Plan Amendments.
Terry Willing,
Acting Commissioner of Planning & Development Services

Bert Meunier,
Chief Administrative Officer
REVISED APPROACH TO URBAN GROWTH STRATEGY

Combined Planning / Engineering Study and Public Consultation Program

GKA 2041 Demographic Model

Further Analysis, Evaluation and Data Collection (if necessary)

Planning Analysis & Evaluation, Data Collection, Hard/Soft Infrastructure Analysis

Additional projections Population Model

Data reconciliation between GIS & Utilities

Scenario Development and Select Location(s) for Growth

Committed Development Area (CDA)

CDA & Growth Alt. #2

CDA & Growth Alt. #3

CDA & Growth Alt. #4

CDA & Growth Alt. #5

SCENARIO COMPARISON

Combined Planning, Environmental, Engineering & Financial Analysis

Further Public Consultation

Sewer/Water Analysis of Alternatives CDA plus 1A, 2, 3, 4 & 5 – Financial analysis, growth/non-growth, sources of funding

Growth Alternative 1(a) Added

Preferred Development Concept

Urban Growth Strategy Report

Further public consultation (Open House & comments) Planning Committee & Council meetings

Transportation Master Plan Model Growth Alternative #1, plus 2, 3, 4 & 5

Transportation financial analysis – Committed Development Area (CDA) plus Growth Alternatives 1A, 2, 3, 4 & 5, growth/non-growth sources of funding to transportation infrastructure

Official Plan Amendments

Sanitary Servicing Concept Plan

Water Servicing Concept Plan

Financial Plan
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CITY OF KINGSTON
REPORT TO COUNCIL

TO: Bert Meunier, Chief Administrative Officer
FROM: Terry Willing, Acting Commissioner, Planning & Development Services
PREPARED BY: Shirley Bailey, Senior Policy Planner, Land Use Policy
DATE OF MEETING: July 13, 2004
SUBJECT: Final Report – Kingston Transportation Master Plan

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL:

WHEREAS the Kingston Transportation Master Plan (KTMP) was initiated in early 2001, in order to respond to the considerable public interest in developing a more strategic approach to planning transportation infrastructure;

AND WHEREAS the public has been consulted in a thorough manner during the preparation of the Kingston Transportation Master Plan;

AND WHEREAS the members of a Technical Steering Committee comprised of staff met on an ongoing basis to assist in developing the KTMP, and have reviewed the draft report;

AND WHEREAS Council directed staff in December, 2002, to develop a draft Transportation Master Plan based on the broadly supported scenario, “A New Direction” based on encouraging alternative modes of travel within the City;

AND WHEREAS the draft Kingston Transportation Master Plan, dated August, 2003, was most recently the subject of a public open house in September, 2003, and was widely available for review and comment;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that it be recommended to Council that the Kingston Transportation Master Plan, dated July 2004, be accepted in fulfillment of the Terms of Reference and that the Study recommendations be approved in principle;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Study be referred to the Planning Division for incorporation of the Study recommendations, where appropriate, in the preparation of the new Official Plan;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Study be forwarded to the appropriate Municipal Divisions for implementation in accordance with approved budget allocations.
ORIGIN/PURPOSE:

The purpose of this report is to present the *Kingston Transportation Master Plan* and to briefly outline the process undertaken in the study’s preparation.

OPTIONS/DISCUSSION:

The purpose of the *Kingston Transportation Master Plan* (The *Kingston Transportation Master Plan* without the Technical Appendices will be circulated under separate cover), is to formalize an integrated approach to long-term planning for all modes of transportation in this city. This study originated in the Council approved Community Strategic Plan which acknowledged the widespread public interest in developing a more strategic approach to planning transportation infrastructure.

**Process Highlights:**

Early in 2001, a team of consultants lead by Dillon Consulting began the work for the *KTMP*. In accordance with the study’s workplan, the consultants carried out an extensive public consultation process, including:

- a talk back line in operation for nearly two years;
- a dedicated e-mail address for the *KTMP* project;
- four (4) newsletters developed in coordination with the consultant, which were posted on the City’s website, and also widely distributed in hard copy;
- different forms of public meetings, including visioning sessions and focus group meetings held at different venues, the results from which were summarized in previous reports to Council; and,
- numerous other meetings held with special interest groups, such as Bicycle Advisory Committee, and the business community (including the Kingston Construction Association; Chamber of Commerce, Downtown Kingston! BIA and Kingston Homebuilders Association in June 2002 and April 2003).

A Technical Steering Committee comprised of Staff members from different departments met a number of times through the Study process – individuals on the Committee are listed at the end of this report.

Selection of the Strategic Direction was an important milestone in this process. In June 2002, at a series of public sessions, the consultants presented three possible scenarios for transportation goals: No.1 Staying on Track, No. 2, Switching Gears, and No. 3, A New Direction. The consultants recommended the third strategic direction, subject to public input and review by the Steering Committee. This scenario emphasizes non-automobile modes (walking, cycling, and public transit) as the preferred methods of transportation. It identifies the facilities, programs and policies necessary to encourage the shift away from the automobile over time. Public consultation sessions reflected that more than half of the public respondents favoured the third scenario. The New Direction scenario was therefore recommended as the preferred scenario, with some refinements for clarification, such as providing more explanation as to relative importance of the different factors, clarification of rural versus urban needs, etc. In December, 2002, Council recommended approval in principle of this strategic direction, which allowed developing the draft *KTMP*. 
OPTIONS/DISCUSSION: (Cont’d)

Process Highlights: (Cont’d)

Considerable time and effort has been spent coordinating this project with other related studies, such as the Cycling and Pathways Study, the Parking Advisory Committee, the Kingston Transit Operational Review, Urban Growth Strategy, and the Development Charges/Impost Fee Background Study. A brief project summary is set out below:

- October 2000 - Terms of Reference Approved by Council
- April 2001 - Consulting Team Retained with Dillon as lead consultant
- Late 2001 - Series of nine visioning session – public, staff and Council
- Early 2002 - Household Travel Survey
- Mid 2002 - Series of six focus group sessions and public review of Strategic Direction
- Nov/Dec 2002 - Announcement and Council approval of Recommended Strategic Direction
- Spring 2003 - Meetings with representatives of the business community, staff and Council on Issues and Opportunities
- September 2003 - Public Presentation of Draft Kingston Transportation Master Plan
- Fall 2003 - Financial Assessment of the Road Infrastructure Network for Urban Growth Strategy*
- Spring 2004 - Road Infrastructure Assessment for Development Charges By-law*
- July 2004 - Staff recommendation for approval in principle for implementation by affected Divisions.

*under separate contract between City and Dillon Consulting

The finalization of the KTMP has been as a result of linking the study's progress with other ongoing studies, particularly with the Urban Growth Strategy, and work on the Development Charges by-law.

Public Open House for Draft KTMP

A public open house for the Draft KTMP was held on September 15, 2003 in Memorial Hall, City Hall. The purpose of the open house was to provide the public with an opportunity to obtain information, ask questions directly to the study consultant and make comments on the draft plan. Comments were received on an ongoing basis on this project. The comments from both the public open house and those received in writing were reviewed, evaluated and incorporated where appropriate in the document.

As a result of the public open house, eighteen written comments were received on the draft Kingston Transportation Master Plan. Each of the comments was reviewed and where possible incorporated into the final document. The majority of the comments received were supportive. As occurred earlier in the process, considerable interest has been shown in supporting the project, and in particular, an improved pathway system, an improved transit system, a range of traffic management issues, including traffic calming, and timing on traffic lights. A range of other comments were also provided individually, with comments on individual road projects, like the Third Crossing, Wellington Street, and a range of technical comments such as concerns about the household survey, wanting more of the assumptions used in the modeling exercise, along with numerous editorial comments. It should also be noted that there were also several editorial comments that were reviewed in detail and incorporated in the document.
OPTIONS/DISCUSSION: (Cont’d)

Implementation Highlights

The KTMP identified the strategic direction for transportation, and in several areas, the next steps in the implementation have begun even prior to the finalization of this document. These other initiatives include:

- The Cycling and Pathways Study, supported widely by pedestrians and cyclists, has been completed, brought forward and supported by Council.
- The Parking Advisory Committee has been in operation for many months and working hard to improve parking situation in the downtown and the Queen’s and K.G.H. areas.
- Kingston Transit has initiated its Operational Review to develop its five year business plan.
- Planning on several major road segments continues, such as Counter Street, Wellington-Mid Block, Centennial, etc.

A traffic model was developed to assist the City to monitor transportation patterns and adjustments in the long term. This important tool will provide the City with the ability to undertake regular review of the City’s progress in implementing the KTMP recommendations. The model will be transferred at an appropriate time.

The plan recommends that staff time be dedicated to its implementation. This issue has been the subject of considerable discussion. How does the City implement such a Plan that crosses all departments within the City? What are the long-term repercussions for pedestrians, cyclists, transit riders, and drivers if the plan is not implemented in a coordinated way? It has been suggested that the Technical Steering Committee, adapted perhaps to include Council and user group representation, should continue to act as a body for implementation to help guide the Plan’s implementation across the City. Efforts should also be made to work with private organizations across the City to achieve the goals of the strategic direction. Dedicated staff time should also assume the role of maintaining and monitoring the travel demand model set up by Dillon for the City.

The City is moving to a Standing Committee structure, but how this will be established has not been determined. Until that time, staff will not be able to make recommendations on how best to implement the KTMP.

EXISTING POLICY / BY-LAW:

This project will institute a comprehensive multi-modal transportation master plan for the City to provide direction for cost effective infrastructure planning. Many recommendations in the proposed plan were not considered to be an extreme change in policy as many of the aspects are being applied in the absence of a formal written policy.

During the preparation of the last Development Charges By-law, the development community wanted the City to prepare additional documentation to justify its case for covering the cost of its roads. The road infrastructure program developed through the KTMP served as the basis for the roads component of the DC by-law.
LINK TO THE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The study will link to a number of initiatives of the Community Strategic Plan, adopted by Council on October 24, 2000. The initiatives include the Transportation Master Plan. The most recent “FOCUS” Strategic Plan Working Document (May 2002) sets out a number of priority areas, and in particular, Priority Area No. 7 addresses Planning: Official Plan and Transportation Master Plan, setting out short and long term progress indicators for these initiatives.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:

Implementation will be by individual budget allocations specific to the affected City Divisions.

TECHNICAL STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Cindie Ashton, Communications Officer, Strategic Initiatives & Corporate Communications  
Shirley Bailey, Senior Policy Planner and Project Manager, Planning Division  
Bianca M.V. Bielski, Manager, Planning Division, Planning and Development Services  
Kim Brown, Infrastructure Engineer, Engineering Division, Planning and Development Services  
Deanna Green, Traffic Engineer, Engineering Division, Planning and Development Services  
Gerard Hunt, Manager of Finance, Corporate Services  
Cherie Mills, Supervisor, Land Use Policy, Planning Division, Planning and Development Services  
Speros Kanellos, Manager, Engineering, Engineering Division, Planning and Development Services  
Al Lucas, Engineer, Utilities Technical Services, Utilities Kingston  
Malcolm Morris, Manager, Transit, Operations  
Paula Nichols, Manager, Parking Services, Operations  
Mark Segsworth, Commissioner, Operations

CONTACTS:

Shirley Bailey, Senior Policy Planner, Land Use Policy, Planning Division, 384-1770, ext. 3253  
Cherie Mills, Supervisor, Land Use Policy, Planning Division, 384-1770, ext. 3289  
Bianca M.V. Bielski, Manager, Planning Division, 384-1770, ext. 3250

DEPARTMENTS/OTHERS CONSULTED AND AFFECTED:

Through Consultation with the Technical Steering Committee

NOTICE PROVISIONS:

N/A

APPENDICES:

Appendix 1 – Kingston Transportation Master Plan (to be forwarded under separate cover)
Spencer Kaneda
Terry Willing
Acting Commissioner, Planning & Development Services

Bert Meunier
Chief Administrative Officer
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TO: Mayor and Members of Council
FROM: Bert Meunier, Chief Administrative Officer
PREPARED BY: Same
DATE OF MEETING: 04/07/13
SUBJECT: Process for the LVEC Project

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL:
It is recommended that Council:

1. Proceed as soon as possible with the appointment of a Steering Committee, with a mixed composition of elected officials and members of the public, having certain expertise to assist the project with a maximum number of seven.
2. That the CAO be appointed as a non-voting member of the Steering Committee.
3. That a 2004 budget of $235,000 be approved to be funded from the Operating Budget contingency with the initial costs to be reimburse to the Working Fund Reserve in 2005 once the permanent source of financing is identified, with it being understood that if the project does not proceed, the reserve will not be reimbursed.
4. That the CAO be authorized to proceed with the selection of a Project Manager as a contract position.
5. That the CAO and staff be authorized to initiate the various functional studies and appraisals listed in this report and report back to Council through the Steering Committee.
6. That the CAO and staff be authorized to initiate the process to prepare a RFQ and RFP for the LVEC Project and report back to Council through the Steering Committee.
7. That the Steering Committee be required to form a “Stakeholders Group” in a timely fashion to provide input on the proposed project.

ORIGIN/PURPOSE:
This report will provide Council with advice on the process upon which the recommendations for the LVEC Project can proceed and the costs of the related studies as requested by Council at its meeting of June 16, 2004.
The following motion, clause 5 of report 63, was approved on that date:

THAT the “Mayor’s Large Venue Entertainment Centre Task Force Report”, dated March 21, 2004, be the basis upon which to move forward with the completion of a Large Venue Entertainment Centre for the City of Kingston,

-and further-

THAT staff be requested to provide a report as to the process upon which the recommendations will be followed and related costs of the studies that will be required.

OPTIONS/DISCUSSION:

A number of approaches can be used, and have been used by various municipalities, to develop similar projects. The Task Force’s report itself makes a number of process recommendations that are based on identifying some best practices from other municipalities.

It is our view that Council may want to consider the following elements of a process and structure in order to successfully implement such a project:

1. Initial structure and support
2. Initial functional studies and preliminary negotiations
3. Suggested approach
4. Budget and general timeline

1. Initial Structure and Support

We concur with the Task Force’s recommendation that a Steering Committee be created to guide the detailed implementation of this project. This Council-appointed committee would report to Council and the community regularly on progress, to obtain any decisions required and to consider study recommendations. The role of the Steering Committee would be to provide overall general direction (steering not rowing) to the process and advice to Council on key decisions required. It is our view that the committee should not be a management committee as the Project Manager and staff will be required to do or oversee the work with the assistance and advice of the appropriate consultants and the “construction, design and operation team” once appointed.

The potential composition of the committee would be as follows with a recommended size of five and a maximum of seven voting members:

- Up to three members of Council
- Up to three members of the community
- The CAO as a non-voting member
Members of the community would preferably have large project management experience or related experience for such a large venue entertainment project. Appointed members of Council will provide representative contribution to the committee and linkages to the political process. An example of community members with the suggested credentials would be persons with a background in architecture, engineering or private business development.

We also concur with the need to have a dedicated implementation “Project Manager” to coordinate and support all the required activities and tasks associated to the project implementation. This person would administratively report to the CAO and support the Steering Committee and the project full-time.

Both the Steering Committee and the Project Manager will also require staff support and a variety of technical support and advice. Initially, the support would be provided by the CAO’s office and, when required, term support staff will be hired for the project.

We would form an internal “Technical Advisory Group” made of staff professionals from various departments to advise the Project Manager. The coordination with existing processes and responsibilities and various departments is key to the success of the project and is necessary to make sure that it proceeds in an expeditious fashion. Other successful projects in other municipalities have indicated the importance of such a requirement and, as such, the priority for this project by Council needs to be made clear at the outset. This project is presently planned as a Council high priority and will require progressive involvement across the corporation of staff.

Once the design phase gets underway, we would also recommend forming a “Stakeholders Group” to provide input from the eventual user groups, the community interest, and other supporters or affected parties like the surrounding residents and the Downtown BIA. A specific process and/or structure will also have to address the repurposing of the Memorial Centre grounds, including the interests of the local citizens for parkland and recreational facilities, the Agricultural Society and the yearly Fair and the Hockey Hall of Fame.

We recommend that Council appoint the Steering Committee and that the CAO proceed with the hiring of a contractual Project Manager as soon as possible and, with the advice of EMT, proceed to form a Technical Advisory Group. We also recommend the formation of a “Stakeholders Group” in a timely manner.

2. **Initial Functional Studies and Preliminary Negotiations**

In parallel with the suggested approach, we suggest that staff initiate a number of preliminary functional studies and hire the required consultants to assist with the suggested process, and provide the next layer of technical information to confirm, or not, the feasibility of the proposed site selection.

Although one option might be to require proponents to perform these initial studies at their cost, we think it is preferable for the municipality to take the lead on preparing such background information at this time. This approach would ensure that the municipality will be seen and will perform these analyses in an objective way, without the perceived conflict that a third party might have in forcing
the project to “work” at any cost. The second reason is one of timeline and level of initial resources. If we wait to see the outcome of the suggested process before proceeding, we would lose the advantage of doing the research in parallel and also require others to perform the work without any assurances that the project would proceed in its proposed location.

Base on the above, we suggest that the following studies be initiated immediately by staff at this time:

- Base plan survey
- Preliminary draft site plan concept
- Environmental site assessments
- Geotechnical investigations
- Archaeological assessment
- Traffic impact study
- Transportation/Parking impact study
- Storm water management plan

Additional costs may be reduced if we are able to do some of the basic activities with existing staff such as the survey, but we expect that we will be required to hire a number of consultants for these studies.

We also suggest that staff proceed with obtaining property appraisals required to initiate preliminary negotiations with the property owners and businesses affected by the proposed site location. We will also require initial concurrence from the land owners at the proposed site to have access to their properties and information they may have as required by the above studies.

We recommend that the CAO and the Project Manager be given the authority to proceed with the functional studies and appraisals required and the preliminary negotiations for the site under the general direction of the Steering Committee.

3. **Suggested Approach**

As mentioned previously, the municipality could proceed using various approaches to implement this project, including the classical tender process where the City hires an architect, designs a project, prepares a tender, and awards its construction.

Given the recommendations of the LVEC Task Force, the information on some of the best practices in other similar projects, and the goal of the municipality to develop such a project while limiting the impact on the existing tax base, the following two alternatives were considered with a recommended option. The recommended process, we suggest, would allow the possibility of blending the two alternatives at the discretion of the City, if and when required.

For the sake of simplicity, we will refer to the first one as the “Partnership Approach” and the second the “Construction Management Approach”.
A) Partnership Approach

Under this approach, the municipality is looking for a private/public partner to take on certain risks associated with the designing, building, financing, and operating aspects of the project. In a co-operative venture, an allocation of risk is negotiated to the satisfaction of the parties and should be based on the expertise of each partner.

The City would generally evaluate the initial Request for Qualification (RFQ) on two components: 1) the quality of the team and 2) the quality of the opportunity. The City then selects a short list of the most qualified respondents and requests that they respond to a Request For Proposals (RFP). From the detailed proposals, one partner is selected and negotiations take place to finalize the contract and the business case if the proposal is financially sound and the value proposition is judged to be good for the municipality. Various forms of financing and ownership structure can be negotiated as part of the agreement that would achieve the City’s objectives.

As recommended by the LVEC Task Force, the preferred solution would be to have all major skills upfront as part of a consortium where the future operator is teamed with the designer and the builder throughout the process. Some municipalities have used a Fairness Commissioner to assist in the selection and decision-making process to ensure its integrity.

The group then proceeds to design and build the project, which is then operated upon completion by the partner according to the agreement.
B) Construction Management

The municipality can opt to take a more hands-on approach where they are responsible for more of the risks and direct the implementation of the project. Without going to a traditional tender route, the municipality would hire individually upfront, each of three main skills required for the project.

Under this approach, the City hires the Operator, the Designer, and the Construction Management Firm under separate contracts, and pays fixed fees for the services provided. The municipality is also responsible for the risks and the direct decisions of each aspect of the project with the advice of those firms. Rather than a general tender, the municipality and the consultants manage the sub-trades for each element of the construction.

We recommend that Council consider the partnership approach and if we were unable to find a suitable partner, we could default to the second model by signing specific contracts with the desired firms and retaining the overall direct implementation of the project. Given the objectives of the municipality, and the desire to find a partner that would have an interest in investing in the project and taking on some of the risk, we feel it is incumbent on the City to “pursue vigorously” a possible partnership as recommended by the Task Force. Given the preliminary interest in this project, we feel there is a real possibility that this could be achievable.

We recommend that the CAO and the Project Manager be authorized to initiate the partnership model with the RFQ and RFP processes under the general direction of the Steering Committee.

4. Budget and General Timeline

On the basis that this project will be financed off the tax base, these initial additional associated costs should be tracked separately. Any initial funding required using existing sources of funding for 2004, should later be reimbursed once the permanent financing plan and business case are developed and the sources of funding are identified.
In the eventuality that this project was not to proceed, Council should understand that they would then have to consider another permanent source of financing for the initial investment, such as the Working Fund Reserve.

For the balance of 2004, the initial budget requirements are estimated as follows:

- Initial support (4 months) $85,000
- Initial functional studies $100,000
- RFQ & RFP process (without negotiations) $50,000

Total $235,000

For 2004, as an initial source of funding, we recommend using the Operating Budget contingency. This amount and future initial investment in 2005 should be funded by the Working Fund Reserve until the permanent project financing is in place.

By the end of August 2004, the Steering Committee and the Project Manager should be in place. The various initial functional studies would be completed between the August and October/November timeframe. The RFQ process could be completed towards the end of September/beginning of October. The RFP process could be prepared but, in our view, not launched until Council has reviewed and approved the required functional studies.

Once the Steering Committee is in place and the Project Manager hired, a more detailed project charter can be developed and refined.

EXISTING POLICY/BY-LAW:
The standard employment hiring practices and purchase by-law processes should be followed.

LINK TO STRATEGIC PLAN:
The LVEC project is linked to both the economic prosperity and the culture initiative and will be instrumental in achieving some of the long-term outcomes of the strategic plan.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:
Budget expenses and revenues of $235,000 are required for the balance of 2004 and it is recommended that they be funded from the 2004 Operating Budget contingency which has been budgeted at $500,000. The source of funding of the 2004 contingency is from the Working Fund Reserve and it is suggested that once permanent sources of funding for the project are identified and the project proceeds, that the reserve be refunded in 2005.
CONTACTS:
Bert Meunier, Chief Administrative Officer
5446-4291, Ext. 1214

DEPARTMENTS/OTHERS CONSULTED AND AFFECTED:
Executive Management Team (EMT)
Manager of Finance
Manager of Engineering

NOTICE PROVISIONS:
Not required if the budget contingency is used.

APPENDICES:
N/A