RECOMMENDATION TO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE:

It is recommended to Council that:

1. A community centre project steering committee be established to develop, recommend and then oversee the implementation of a detailed work plan for the planning, site selection and construction of a community centre that will include up to 4 ice pads, ancillary community space and possibly other complementary uses, either now or in the future, as may be determined by Council and as outlined in general terms in the Arena Capacity Study Report prepared by dmA Consulting and dated January 2004.

2. The steering committee be composed of three (3) members of Council and report to the Committee of the Whole until December 31, 2004 after which it shall report to the Community Services Standing Committee.

3. The term of the Steering Committee shall end upon start-up and commissioning of the new community centre. It is the expectation that construction will commence mid-2006 and be completed in the last quarter 2007/early 2008.

4. A 2005 project budget of $25,000 be approved within the capital budget of the Office of the Commissioner, Community Services in addition to ensuring adequate clerical support to the committee.

5. The detailed terms of reference of the steering committee be approved as set out in Appendix “A” to this report (Report No. 04-404).

6. A Community Advisory Group comprised of members of the public and representatives of current recreational partner groups, be established to provide ongoing, timely advice and opinion to the Steering Committee on all elements of the project implementation strategy. This group will also serve in the same capacity for the LVEC project.

7. A staff advisory group be established to provide advice to the project manager and the steering committee.
ORIGIN/PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to recommend a process for investigating and implementing the findings of the Arena Capacity and Expansion Study Report prepared by dmA Consulting and dated January 2004.

At its June 15, 2004 meeting, Council adopted the Arena Capacity & Expansion Study recommendations in principle and directed staff to develop a comprehensive City of Kingston Arena Implementation Strategy to be reported back to Committee of the Whole for further consideration; it being understood that this strategy will have regard to Council’s decision concerning the Large Venue Entertainment Centre (LVEC) and will include a detailed long-term capital financial plan.

At its priority setting workshops in late September and early October of this year Councillors ranked this community centre project as among the top three capital priorities for this Council. This ranking is expected to be validated by Council at its meeting on October 26, 2004.

OPTIONS/DISCUSSION:

(A) Strategic Directions
The Arena Capacity and Expansion Study Report as adopted in principle by Council sets out the following strategic directions to guide decision making:

Strategic Directions:
- Ice facilities should be provided in a manner that maximizes cost efficiencies, including operating costs and maintenance of capital infrastructure.
- Ice facilities should be provided in a manner that maximizes service and program opportunities, consistent with the needs of today’s users.
- Ice facilities appropriate to the general public for public skate are important, as are facilities that respond to organized users.
- Appropriate indoor recreation space should be provided to City residents.
- 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.
- 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.

(B) Specific Recommendations (2004-2005)
The dmA Report makes specific recommendations for Council’s consideration. The recommendations were made prior to Council’s decision to initiate the Large Venue Entertainment Centre project. Consequently, the context for some of the recommendations made in the dmA report
may have changed. Staff has reviewed each of the study recommendations in light of the changed context and offers the following analysis for Council’s consideration.

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.

Staff Update: This is underway. The Cultural Services Division has initiated development of the Cultural Framework Strategy as part of the Community Strategic Management program, which will lead to the development of a cultural services master plan. As part of that exercise, indoor facility needs and opportunities to better address needs in the neighbourhoods surrounding Harold Harvey, Wally Elmer and Cooks Brothers centres will be assessed.

Recommendation 2

The City should introduce a development charge levy for recreation facilities. This levy should not be facility-specific (e.g., not arenas or pool; rather recreation centres) to provide the City with future flexibility for provision of growth related recreation facilities.

Staff Update: This has been done. Council recently approved the new Development Charges and Impost Fee By-Law. Included in this new By-Law are new D.C. charges for growth related recreational facilities. While this is certainly a significant step forward in the City’s capital planning program, it must be cautioned that the amount of money being raised on an annual basis for recreation purposes from development charges is still relatively modest and is of course tied to the rate of growth we experience.

Recommendation 3

The City should develop a three-pad arena facility (with a fourth as an option) to replace Memorial Centre, 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.

Staff Comment: This recommendation remains valid and is not changed by a decision to consider developing the proposed LVEC separate from the multiplex facility. The study recommendation was premised on the Memorial Centre being replaced by a facility that caters to community use in a similar manner. Approximately 75% of the ice time available at the Memorial Centre is used by not-for-profit community groups, the majority of which are youth oriented.

Accessibility is measured both in terms of availability of ice time and space, and in the affordability of fee and rental rates to community groups. While early indications suggest that the LVEC will have ice time and space available for community groups to use, it is not yet clear just how accessible the LVEC will be for community purposes. With a business model emphasising more large entertainment events and limited or no municipal subsidy, there is reason to believe that ice and space rentals will be less available and more costly than at present in the Memorial Centre.
The Arena Study also calls for the replacement of Wally Elmer in time and the twinning of Centre 70. The need therefore for a fourth pad remains, either now or in the not-to-distant future.

**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.*

**Staff Comment:** The study specifically focuses on ice needs and ancillary uses only. It noted however that there are needs in the community for other cultural facilities (recreation, leisure, arts, etc) that should be considered when developing and designing this project. Community Services staff concurs with this suggestion. Over the past few years a number of groups in the community have identified a range of needs and desires for improved or additional facilities (including a pool, library, gymnasium, community space). As an information note, identifying and developing strategies to address community needs will be a prominent part of the Cultural Strategic Framework exercise being undertaken by the Cultural Services Division as part of the community strategic management initiative FOCUS Kingston.

This community centre project is an exceptional and timely opportunity for the City to consider the merits of including these needs/demands/initiatives into the plan and design for this community centre. The report recommends that Council consider partnership opportunities with other community groups to address these needs.

It is suggested that Council explore these opportunities by considering development options that would include not only the traditional model of municipal service deliver in which the City owns and operates the facility, but also possible ownership/operating partnerships with private sector parties, other public agencies, and/or not-for-profit groups. Comparing the merits of different delivery models would provide Council with a comprehensive view of what is possible and what is acceptable to the community.

To explore such partnership opportunities it is suggested that consideration be given to the adoption of a formal Expression of Interest (EOI) process for gauging the level of interest among community groups in entering into some type of partnership opportunity with the City in building a community centre facility. If the results of that process are promising, Council could then, if it so chooses, consider specific partnership proposals through a detailed Request for Proposals process (RFP).

**Recommendation 5**

*The City should identify and assess potential 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.*

**Staff Comment:** The question of facility location is of course a critical consideration that must be factored into any analysis of development options. There are different ways to approach this; from
the more traditional approach in which the City pre-selects a specific location and uses that as the basis for comparing development options; or a more flexible approach in which the question of location is not pre-determined. Staff favours the more flexible approach as it should lead to a wider range of options being identified for Council's consideration.

To be effective, this flexible approach would have to establish, at the outset, a list of preferred location criteria to be considered. Such a facility should be, for example: centrally located; on major roads; on transit routes; be fully serviced; accessible to the community; compatible with adjoining uses, etc. Such criteria would form part of any formal RFP process.

This raises the issue of the Memorial Centre site, which has been the focus of considerable public interest in connection with this project and the LVEC project. It is our expectation that the Memorial Centre site would be considered as a possible location for this community centre project. Although the LVEC Task Force has suggested that Council consider selling the Memorial Centre site (whole or in part) as one means of financing the new LVEC on the proposed Anglin Bay site, no Council decision has been made on the Anglin Bay location or the fate of the Memorial Centre site. Therefore, it would seem reasonable to include the Memorial Centre site as part of this review process. This matter should be clarified at the outset to avoid misunderstandings later in the project development process.

**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.*

**Staff Comment:** This is spoken to in the item above. It is recommended that Council thoroughly investigate municipal experiences throughout Ontario and Canada in which such partnership arrangements have been undertaken. The experience of others and learning about what has worked and not worked elsewhere will assist Council in its decision for adoption of the appropriate course of action or strategy to undertake.

**Recommendation 7**

*The design for the multi-plex should consider the opportunity to add leisure ice to the end of one of the 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 the City chooses to retain Wally Elmer arena.*

**Staff Comment:** Council can easily address this by adding this to the specifications cited within adopted EOI and RFP processes.

**Recommendation 8**

*As part of the identification and assessment of sites for the multi-plex, 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.

Staff Comment: If the Memorial Centre site is indeed a location to be considered in this review, then the issues related to the relationship with the Fair Board, the war memorial, and the Sports Hall of Fame are indeed factors that will have to be addressed. As with any site under consideration, the geo-technical characteristics of the site, its environmental status and development impacts on the neighbourhood would have to be explored and documented at the appropriate time in the process. These are matters that would need to be addressed in any event should Council decide to redevelop the site (or portion thereof) for other uses in connection with the LVEC project.

Recommendation 9

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

Staff Comment: It is being recommended by staff that the mandate of the Steering Committee include addressing the issues surrounding the possible decommissioning and/or repurposing of whatever smaller ice arenas are to be slated for closure resulting from this process. It is suggested that such a plan should be developed once a decision on the development model for the multiplex has been made and before construction begins- early 2006.

A significant issue that must be considered as part of any such review is the City’s ongoing commitment to the Province in regards to the use of SuperBuild funds. In 2002 the City was successful in its application to receive SuperBuild funds, which were earmarked specifically for specific health and safety initiatives within the City’s community arenas, including the Memorial Centre. Access to SuperBuild funds understandably comes with certain strings attached, as specified in the 2002 agreement, including the following:

- March 31, 2006 is the deadline for eligible project costs to be incurred
- March 31, 2007 is the deadline for requesting final payments of SuperBuild assistance from the Province
- The City can not transfer the ownership of all or part of a facility that has been the subject of SuperBuild assistance, without Provincial approval, prior to March 31, 2027
- In the event such a facility was sold or discontinued, the City may be required to repay some or all of the SuperBuild assistance that was provided, in an amount to be determined by the Ministry and within the period specified by the Ministry
- The City is not permitted to lease, license the use of, mortgage, charge or encumber a facility or any part thereof without consent of the Province
- A specific number of health and safety projects must be completed by specific end dates each year. In 2003 we deferred spending on SuperBuild projects as we awaited completion of the Arena Capacity and Expansion Study and Council’s decision on the recommendations. SuperBuild officials have been understanding and patient with us in this regard, however we are obligated to submit a revised list of intended 2005 projects to the Province in November, 2004. If we are not in a position to make such a commitment,
due to the ongoing arena study, we will need to be in touch with Ministry officials to determine what latitude may be possible.

- The City is required to submit a long term capital management plan annually to the Province outlining how we intend to meet financial and other commitments for maintaining affected facilities on an ongoing basis - including plans to recover the full operating costs through service charges, where appropriate.

- The SuperBuild agreement requires the City to secure $46,200 from community groups cited in the City’s application. This fund raising activity was curtailed in view of the ongoing arena review.

To date, we have completed 34% of the projects specified in the agreement with the Province, as noted in the table on the following page. The completed projects are valued at about $326,000. The complete health and safety program is valued at about $1.2 Million. These projects have involved most of our arenas including the Memorial Centre. The remaining projects have been on hold since last year pending Council’s decision on the arenas question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT MILESTONES &amp; ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>LOCATIONS (if bundled project)</th>
<th>PROJECT STATUS*</th>
<th>CLAIM TO-DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Sprinkler systems, fire suppression system</td>
<td>Centre 70 Arena</td>
<td>ON GOING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cook Brothers Arena</td>
<td>ON GOING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wally Elmer Youth Centre</td>
<td>ON GOING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harold Harvey Arena</td>
<td>ON GOING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Dehumidifiers-purchase and install units</td>
<td>Wally Elmer Youth Centre</td>
<td>ON GOING</td>
<td>$28,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cook Brothers Arena</td>
<td>ON GOING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harold Harvey Arena</td>
<td>ON GOING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Front entrance accessibility</td>
<td>Wally Elmer Youth Centre</td>
<td>ON GOING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cook Brothers Arena</td>
<td>ON GOING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Washroom retrofits</td>
<td>Wally Elmer Youth Centre</td>
<td>ON GOING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cook Brothers Arena</td>
<td>ON GOING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Lift gates replacement</td>
<td>Centre 70 Arena</td>
<td>COMPLETED</td>
<td>$20,315.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catarataui Centre</td>
<td>COMPLETED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Stairway reconfiguration</td>
<td>Memorial Centre</td>
<td>COMPLETED</td>
<td>$8,834.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Interior sheet metal sheathing</td>
<td>Centre 70 Arena</td>
<td>ON GOING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cook Brothers Arena</td>
<td>ON GOING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harold Harvey Arena</td>
<td>COMPLETED</td>
<td>$34,538.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Spectator netting, arena glass &amp; dasherboards</td>
<td>Catarataui Centre</td>
<td>COMPLETED</td>
<td>$25,860.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centre 70 Arena</td>
<td>COMPLETED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cook Brothers Arena</td>
<td>ON GOING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wally Elmer Youth Centre</td>
<td>ON GOING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harold Harvey Arena</td>
<td>ON GOING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memorial Centre</td>
<td>ON GOING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>4 ft * 8 ft sign</td>
<td>COMPLETED</td>
<td>$1,065.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Eligible Project Costs</td>
<td>$1,202,576.00</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$326,804.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Projects</td>
<td>23 Completed 8 = 34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * As of May 2004
The above-noted terms of the SuperBuild agreement pose a challenge for the City. We are compelled to spend the money on specific projects by the end of March, 2007, or return it to the Province. In addition, any decision to decommission, repurpose or sell any facilities, in which we have invested SuperBuild funds, prior to 2027 will require Provincial approval and/or may necessitate the return of some or all of the SuperBuild funds expended to date.

The Province is aware of the status of our arena study and the decisions facing Council. Staff has had preliminary discussions with Ministry officials to better understand the Provincial position on this matter and the degree of latitude we may be allowed.

Compounding the situation is the stark reality that most of our facilities are in dire need of significant and costly capital repairs immediately if we are going to continue to use them as arenas, even if only for the next few years.

**Recommendation 10**

*Design of the multiplex 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.*

**Staff Comment:** This recommendation was made in the context of a new multiplex centre, inclusive of a replacement for the Memorial Centre, being erected on the site of the Memorial Centre. This is an important and highly sensitive issue to be addressed by Council as it considers the merits of the LVEC project and the multiplex project. While there is no more that staff can add at this time to this specific consideration, it is essential that the issue remain prominent in the public review of these projects and that the public and particular communities of interest on this issue be engaged in the dialogue.

**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 multiplex facility. As part of this process of confirmation, the City should decide its position on the option of contracting-in.*

**Staff Comment:** It is recommended that the terms of reference for the proposed Implementation Committee include the investigation of possible partnership/sponsorship arrangements with the public, private and not-for-profit sectors for capital financing and/or ongoing management of the facilities. The issue of alternative service delivery therefore will be a consideration in this review. This is an extremely sensitive issue that must be addressed in an open and inclusive manner with employees and their bargaining agents. It is recommended that Input from employees and the participation of the bargaining agent, in this case the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) be an integral part of the review process.

**Recommendation 12**

*Upon agreement to develop new arena facilities the City should prepare a detailed business plan. Such plan should identify those costs that the City would retain, or add, in a partnership agreement (if applicable). This business plan should be used in evaluation of proponent submissions.*
Staff Comment: If Council chooses to seek interest in and proposals for alternative development options, the elements of the business plan cited in the study should form a part of the submission requirements in a formal RFP process. The results from this RFP process would then serve the basis for finalizing plans for whatever development option Council chooses.

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.

Staff Comment: This consideration is an essential element to the financial analysis of any options to be considered. It would form an important part of the terms of reference for the Implementation Committee.

Recommendation 14

The City should twin Centre 70 with an NHL size ice pad and seating for 300 – 500.

Staff Comment: Council approved the twinning of Centre 70 as part of the 2003 budget. It placed this project on hold in 2004, however, to allow for an opportunity to consider the recommendations of the Arena Needs and Capacity Study. The project remains on hold.

The twinning of Centre 70 was put forth in 2002 by staff as a strategy for building some additional ice capacity in the City relatively quickly (by 2004/05) in order to ease some of the user pressures on the current arenas and to allow for an extended shutdown of an existing ice pad (scheduled or unscheduled) without undue disruption to ice users. Without the added capacity, an extended shutdown of any of the arenas (depending on the time of year) would result in significant disruption to the users and risk the cancellation of many events and league schedules.

It should be remembered that when Council initially approved the twinning of Centre 70 it had yet to consider the Arena Needs and Capacity Study and there was no indication that a decision on replacing or refurbishing some of the older rinks was in the offing. Therefore staff recommended the immediate addition of a new ice pad to provide the City with some “breathing room” while the bigger decisions on arenas were being considered.

Time and circumstance appear to have overtaken the Centre 70 twinning project. With the delay in the twinning project and the consequential advancement of the community arenas and LVEC as two of Council’s top capital building project priorities for 2005-2007, the Centre 70 twinning project appears to have lost much of its initial advantage. Reconsideration of its strategic value to the overall arenas program therefore is warranted at this time. It is suggested that one of the first orders of business for the new community arena implementation committee should be to consider the fate of the Centre 70 project in light of current circumstances. Is it still considered good value for the money, or would the City be better-off in the long run to spend the $4.6 M earmarked for Centre 70 on the new multiplex? The economies of scale of adding the ice pad to Centre 70 as compared to adding a four pad to the recommended 3 pad multiplex should be carefully assessed.

The twinning of Centre 70 has an approved capital budget of $4.6 million. If the decision is made to terminate this project then consideration should be given to the appropriateness of reallocating this budget to the multiplex community centre project as an element of its financial plan.
Another matter to be considered at that time is the allocation of $300,000 from the cash-in-lieu parkland reserve to help finance the Centre 70 project. Consideration should be given to the appropriateness of reallocating those funds back to the reserve for parkland purposes depending on the nature of the multiplex development proposal chosen.

(c) Review Process Options

There are options available to Council in how it wishes to proceed with the implementation of the Arena Capacity and Expansion Study results. The three primary options appear to be:

- Do Nothing at this time; or
- Delegate the matter to staff to proceed with, reporting to Council on an ongoing and appropriate basis; or
- Appoint a committee to oversee the process and report to Council

Council appears to have decided against the “do nothing” option by declaring, at its recent priority setting workshops, the multiplex community centre project as one of its top three capital project priorities for 2005-2007.

Authorizing and directing staff to undertake the review and management of this project as an administrative matter is possible and may be expeditious in many ways, however it is not recommended. A project of this large size (dollar value and community impact), the degree of public interest in the issue (and need to address often competing interests), and the range of significant public policy issues to be considered and decided, all strongly suggest the need for and the appropriateness of a politically-led and highly inclusive implementation process. Staff is suggesting that a committee of Council be appointed to head up this implementation initiative, from beginning to end, supported by staff and community partners as required.

Committee composition and size are two critical success factors that Council should consider very carefully. Council of course has the option to appoint any number of members other than or in addition to Councillors to such a committee. There are advantages and disadvantages to various scenarios. On balance however, staff recommends the appointment of a Councillor-only steering committee of limited size. This will ensure that the process does not become unwieldy and can be somewhat “nimble” in its processes and timelines. In addition, experience has shown that attempting to limit community membership on a committee of this nature would be problematic for Council; where would one draw the line between communities of interest, user groups, etc?

Meaningful, broad public involvement is critical to the success of this project. To ensure ongoing public and user consultation and participation throughout the implementation process, the creation of a community advisory group is strongly recommended. The precise terms of reference for such a group would be one of the first orders of business for the new steering committee.

It has been suggested that there may be merit in appointing a joint community advisory group to provide input and advice for both the LVEC project and the community centre project. While the communities of interest may vary somewhat between the two projects, for the most part they are common to both. Such a joint group would provide a valuable common, grass roots connection between the two projects.

It is recommended that the steering committee be required to develop and have Council approve an inclusive public consultation and involvement program that reaches beyond the formal user groups.
and communities of interest. Community consultation and involvement in the process will be required regarding location, design, and development phasing decisions.

A number of technical issues will arise over the course of this project that will require the expertise and involvement of many different City departments and other technical experts. It is suggested that the steering committee consider the establishment of a technical staff advisory group to provide assistance and advice to the committee and the project manager.

**EXISTING POLICY/BY-LAW:**
N.A.

**LINK TO STRATEGIC PLAN:**
Council has adopted the multiplex community centre as one of its top 3 capital project priorities for 2005-2007.

**FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:**

(a) Project Costs
It is unknown at this time what the precise cost to develop a four pad facility might be; final costs depend on so many variables such as land costs, servicing, architectural treatment, interior finish, partnership agreements if applicable, cost of materials, etc. In very broad terms it is anticipated that a reasonably well appointed four ice pad facility (not too fancy but not Spartan) with some associated community space would cost in the range of $15-25 million. That is a lot of money for this community to spend and therefore one of the primary considerations of the steering committee will be to review and compare the financial implications of proceeding with different development options and to assess strategies for reducing both the capital and operating costs of such a complex; ultimately recommending a project that is affordable, functional and meets the needs of the community now and into the future.

In view of Council’s stated priority for this project, it is being included for the first time in the City’s revised 10-Year Capital projection. Assuming no significant delays in moving this process forward, construction can reasonably be expected to commence in mid 2006.

Being mindful of the City’s financial constraints, staff is recommending that Council consider a number of development options and strategies from which to make a decision; a consideration that should balance financial considerations against other public policy considerations such as accessibility/inclusivity, wealth redistribution, community development, and health and safety issues. A long-term financing plan will be developed to support the recommended development option based on a solid and achievable business plan.

(b) Decommissioning/Repurposing Costs
In addition to considering the development and operating costs of the project, consideration must be given to the costs of decommissioning/repurposing the older ice arenas that will ultimately be replaced by the multiplex. Capital and operating costs for potential alternatives should be an important part of developing any such strategy. Such a strategy should be developed in 2006 and ideally be in place as construction begins.
(c) Project Management
Mark Fluhrer, a Manager of Policy and Support Services in the Commissioner’s Office, will serve as the Project Manager. It is not known at this time what sort of project management budget may be required to ensure the smooth operation of the committee and its work plan. For 2004 it is suggested that a small budget amount of $1,000 be set aside for incidental items such as advertising; this will be absorbed within the budget of the Commissioner’s Office, Community Services. In 2005 an amount of $25,000 is being suggested to cover the costs of such things as advertising, printing, technical supports such as real estate opinions and business case reviews, meeting expenses. Additional project management costs may be identified as the process unfolds and certainly will be brought to Council’s attention appropriately.

(d) Committee Clerk Support
In addition, it is being recommended that administrative and process support for the steering committee and the community advisory committee be provided by the Council Support Division of Corporate Services. Additional staffing resources may well be required in the Clerk’s Office in order to address this and other emerging needs within that Office, particularly in light of the creation of the new committee system in 2005.

CONTACTS:
Lance Thurston, Commissioner, Department of Community Services, 546-4291, ext. 1250
Mark Fluhrer, Manager, Policy & Support Services, Community Services 546 – 4291 ext. 1342

DEPARTMENTS/OTHERS CONSULTED AND AFFECTED:
The following staff persons were contacted in the preparation of this report. The check mark beside the names indicates those who responded to the circulation of a draft report and provided comments. All comments have been incorporated into the body of the report.
✓ Ann Pappert, Manager, Cultural Services, 546 – 4291 ext. 1341
✓ Gerard Hunt, Manager of Finance Division, 546 – 4291 ext. 2205
Barclay Mayhew, Manager of Properties 546 – 4291 ext. 1233
✓ Carolyn Downs, Manager Council Support Services, 546 - 4291, ext. 1245
✓ Don Gedge, LVEC Project Manager, 546-4291, ext. 1271

NOTICE PROVISIONS: None
APPENDICES:
Appendix “A” Proposed Terms of Reference for Community Arena Steering Committee

C.A.O. Comment- At this time based on the rationale provided in the report, I would recommend that Council make the immediate decision not to twin Centre 70 and amend the recommended terms of reference for the steering committee (Appendix “A”) accordingly.

Bert Meunier
Chief Administrative Officer
APPENDIX “A”

Terms of Reference
Multiplex Community Centre Steering Committee

Established: Council Resolution No. ........, October..... 2004
Composition: 3 members of Council
Reporting To: Committee of the Whole until December 31, 2004; Community
Services Standing Committee as of January 1, 2005
Term Ends: Upon commissioning of new multiplex community centre
Project Management: Office of the Commissioner, Department of Community Services
Clerical Support: Council Support Division

Mandate:

1. To develop, recommend and then oversee the implementation of a detailed work plan for the
   planning, site selection and construction of a community centre commencing in the first
   quarter of 2006 that includes up to 4 ice pads, ancillary community space and possibly other
   complementary uses, either now or in the future, as may be determined by Council and as
   outlined in general terms in the Arena Capacity Study Report prepared by dma Consulting.

2. To consider and make recommendations with respect to the merits of the following
   community centre development options, either as a stand alone facility or in conjunction with
   other capital projects in the community:
   a. City owned and operated
   b. City owned and operated by a third party
   c. Owned and operated by a third party

3. To consider the financial implications of each development option noted in (ii) above,
   including:
   a. All operational costs (direct and indirect)
   b. Staffing structure/organization
   c. Hours of operation; days of operation per year; ice time and space booking
      assumptions
   d. Fees, rates to be charged
   e. Service responsiveness (complaint/issues management)
   f. Ongoing capital maintenance requirements (inclusive of life cycle costing)
   g. Capital funding sources and taxpayer impact
   h. Timing of capital funding
   i. Project phasing
   j. Roles and responsibilities of project partners (where applicable)

4. To recommend a viable long term financing strategy for the capital construction and
   operation of the preferred development option.

5. To make recommendations in first quarter of 2006 regarding the desirability,
   appropriateness, affordability and sequencing of decommissioning and/or repurposing Wally
Elmer, Harold Harvey and Cooks Brothers centres; this shall include developing a financial strategy to support the recommended plan of action.

6. To make recommendations regarding the continued appropriateness of proceeding with the addition of an NHL-sized ice pad and required ancillary facilities to Centre 70

7. To develop and recommend terms of reference for an Expression of Interest (EOI) to determine the degree of broad community interest in possible partnership/sponsorship arrangements with the City in connection with this project.

8. To assess submissions received in response to the EOI and make recommendations as to the appropriateness and desirability of pursuing a detailed Request for Proposals (RFP) process from among those groups responding to the EOI.

9. To develop a terms of reference for a detailed Request for Proposals (RFP), including preferred location criteria. It is understood that the Memorial Centre site may be considered as part of this analysis.

10. To assess submissions received in response to a Request for Proposals (RFP) and make recommendations as to the appropriateness and desirability of pursuing partnership opportunities that may be identified.

11. To ensure ongoing and inclusive community consultation and participation throughout the development and execution of the implementation strategy.

October 2004