

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE RE: TWIN PAD ARENA PROJECT

Council Chambers, Paris
Tuesday, August 19, 2008
5:05 p.m.

- Present:** Mayor Eddy, Councillors Wheat, Schmitt, Simons (5:10 p.m.), Powell, Atfield, Hodge, Coleman and Gatward.
- Regrets:** Councillors Haggart and Chambers
- Others:** Architect D'Arcy Arthurs, Shore Tilbe Irwin & Partners
- Staff:** Fiebig, Glassford, Compeau, Underwood, Johnston, Bell, Wamsteeker and Carman.

Mayor Eddy in the Chair.

Moved by – Councillor Schmitt
Seconded by – Councillor Gatward

That the agenda for the Committee of the Whole regarding the Twin Pad Arena Project be approved as circulated.

. Carried

Moved by – Councillor Hodge
Seconded by – Councillor Wheat

That Council move into Committee of the Whole on the Twin Pad Arena Project with Councillor Coleman in the Chair.

. Carried

Councillor Coleman assumed the Chair and advised that the purpose of the meeting was to answer questions and address misconceptions on the preliminary design and costs for the Twin Pad Arena Project.

CONSTRUCTION COST COMPARISON

Members of Council discussed two staff reports comparing construction costs for twin pad arena facilities between the Brant project, Woolwich and Wilmot as follows:

- it is unfair to compare the costs for the Wilmot arena to Brant because it was built some time ago and prices have inflated
- the detailed site development costs were provided in the A. W. Hooker report dated May 26 – the Director advised she would ensure that all members of Council receive a copy of this report
- staff was requested to obtain information from Hamilton on a proposed twin pad arena for Flamborough
- it was noted that when comparing other projects, it is important to determine what costs are involved, e.g. construction costs, site preparation, consultants' fees, etc. so that a true comparison is done
- the Wilmot facility is of a lower quality than the Brant proposal

- Mayor Eddy requested that a comparison be completed that explains for the public the basic differences in costs between the three projects – it was noted that a detailed costing comparison between other projects is difficult at this time, due to the fact that the Brant project is a preliminary estimate only – it is estimated that it would cost approximately \$10,000 - \$15,000 to complete an accurate costing comparison between the Brant, Wilmot and Woolwich twin pad arena projects

FUNCTIONAL SPACES

The members of the Committee discussed the Twin Pad Arena Project in terms of the functional spaces proposed for this facility:

- many members of the Committee indicated that they did not want to lower the quality of the proposed building, noting that it is classified as a “moderate” facility – lowering the quality will result in increased operational and maintenance costs in the future
- in response to a question about eliminating expensive features of the project in order to cut costs, it was noted that a very sustainable design has been chosen for the project, including a good quality building with excellent mechanical and electrical systems, selection of materials, energy conservation features, etc.
- LEED energy conservation features planned for the project have a great payback and set an example for the community – the project does not include the costs associated with LEED certification
- one ice surface will be used year-round, while the other surface can be used for community events in the off season
- in order for the building to be fully functional, it may be necessary to increase the size of the two community rooms so that they can accommodate more people and events – it was suggested that some of the site preparation work can be delayed, and these funds utilized to increase the functionality of the building
- a question was raised about expensive features that are included in the project that can be eliminated in order to cut costs
- it is beneficial to use low maintenance materials in the project that will reduce operating costs
- although other options have been suggested for the facility, the mandate from Council at this time is for a twin pad arena only – this direction will not change until Council decides otherwise
- concern was expressed about the cost and increase in property taxes for this project if no funding is received from other levels of government – it was noted that a report prepared by the Treasurer some months ago provided various tax increase scenarios based on the cost of the project and funding from other sources
- in response to a question, it was noted that gifts-in-kind to the project are difficult to negotiate to maintain the quality of the work and administer these gifts within the public tendering process

D’Arcy Arthurs clarified that the Twin Pad Arena project is currently in the concept stage, and as such the cost estimate is based on a Class D estimate. The cost consultant has prepared this cost estimate based on facilities of similar size and projected the costs to 2009, taking into consideration that costs escalate approximately 0.75% per month. It is difficult to compare costs of buildings that have already been completed with the Brant project that is only in the preliminary stages. Mr. Arthurs noted that the Whitchurch-Stouffville project was recently tendered, and the low tender for the twin pad arena portion was only 1% over the cost estimate.

The Whitchurch-Stouffville twin pad arena project is about six months ahead of the Brant project, is very similar to the Brant proposal, and was costed by the same cost consultant. It was agreed that Mr. Arthurs would provide a costing comparison of the Whitchurch-Stouffville project to the Brant Twin Pad Arena project, as these two facilities are very similar in size.

Concern was expressed that if a community centre is not included at this site, it will be necessary to retain the Syl Apps Centre for this purpose. Including additional functional space for a community centre at the new twin pad arena will increase the costs, which may require cutting costs in other areas of the project. It was noted that the mandate of the Syl Apps Repositioning Committee is to determine the future uses of this facility. Mr. Arthurs pointed out that the large multi-use community rooms had been removed from the initial Twin Pad Arena proposal, at a savings of approximately \$2 million. If it is decided to put this space back into the project, a decision will need to be made quickly before the concept stage is completed.

Kathryn Underwood, Director of Community Services, pointed out that changes to the twin pad arena proposal need to be decided before the end of the concept period. Delaying the twin pad arena project until the Syl Apps Repositioning Committee has made a decision on the future uses of that building will add additional costs to the Twin Pad Arena project. There is opportunity for expansion in the future, noting that adding an indoor swimming pool on the west side of the building is estimated to cost approximately \$6,000,000. There is also the possibility of additional land being donated to the County if further expansions are required.

It was noted that a public meeting is planned to receive input and suggestions from the public and user groups on the Twin Pad Arena project before the concept stage is completed.

COMMUNICATION PROTOCOL

Councillor Coleman expressed his concern with statements that are being made in the public about the Twin Pad Arena project. He reminded Committee members that a Communications Protocol has been approved by Council for this project. All questions and concerns are to be directed to the Chair or Community Services Director for response. This ensures that the information on the project is accurate and consistent.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. In response to a question, the Director of Community Services advised that a preliminary draft of the presentation to Health Promotion Minister Margaret Best at the AMO Conference has been prepared. A final copy of the presentation will be forwarded to all members of Council attending the Conference.

Moved by – Councillor Hodge

Seconded by – Councillor Schmitt

That the Committee of the Whole rise and report, and that the meeting reconvene in Open Session.

. Carried

The meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

Secretary