

August 27, 2012

[Start of recorded material 00:02:31]

Mayor Cooper: Councillor Lloyd?

Cllr. Lloyd: Thank you Your Worship. Yeah, I'd just like to say wow, what a crowd, and thank you for coming out tonight. I think it's going to be a lively discussion and a great deal of information exchanged. Thank you for coming out, it's appreciated.

[End of Section 00:02:45]

[Start of Section 00:43:29]

Mayor Cooper: At this point in time we'll move on to deputations, and the first is Central Park Multiuse Recreation Facility, Ameresco. And I think there's a change from our presenter, so if you could come forward please and introduce yourself, Frank.

Frank Miceli: Your Worship, Deputy Mayor and Councillors, Anthony Da Silva, our Vice President Chief Operating Officer sends his regrets. I'm Frank Miceli, Director of Construction with Ameresco Canada, and thank you for allowing our team the opportunity to make this presentation. We've been working on solutions for this project for just over a year, and we truly hope that what we present to you gives you something to consider and to look at.

Mayor Cooper: Thank you. If I can just offer, if there are vacant seats, please find one and sit down. You're more than welcome to. Sorry.

Frank Miceli: Okay. Our presentation is broken down into three sections; brief introductions, discussion about obstacles to proceeding and our proposed solution. In a way of introduction for Ameresco Canada, we've been in business since 1973, about 150 employees across Canada. We offer a full range of energy services. We look after construction projects. We do asset management, project financing and, in addition to that, we actually operate and maintain facilities on behalf of our clients.

Introduction for Greenland Group, our major partner in this, a locally respected engineering and technology enterprise, in business since 1994, award winner in 2012 for low-impact development projects and technology development partnerships. They are an integrated civil engineering and landscape architecture firm. Their business model respects the natural environment and combines best available science with proven technologies. And they provide innovative solutions with a conservationist ethic.

How we see the obstacles to proceeding for this project; first is the uncertainty of the scope of the project. Second is the uncertainty that's

been around about the delivery method, and lastly, the uncertainty about funding for the project. Dealing with the first one, the scope – and these are just a blast of the issues that have been around, and it's everything from the site location, to retain an outdoor rink, the single or double rink, the seating capacity in the arena, the swimming pool expansion, the size of the pool, splash pad/water play.

The other facilities that are on the Central Park site, the lawn bowling, the baseball diamonds, dog park, parking, whether the facilities that are being added to the site are being linked or kept separate, the whole issue surrounding Eddie Bush, whether it's replacing Eddie Bush Arena or whether the Eddie Bush Arena remains or it's repurposed. And then the discussions as well that I think have taken place in the past regarding the facility management itself and the town-wide management. And I'm certain that there are many others as well.

With respect to the delivery method, just a quick run through the options that are available, there's a traditional design-bid-build, design-build option, construction management as an agent, construction management at risk, and Private-Public Partnerships. So those five options are the main ones that we saw that you've considered in the past.

With respect to the Private-Public Partnerships, there's a whole litany of options that you have as well. And this is from Public-Private Partnerships Council. Everything from design-build is just on the outside of a P3 project, but you have every option within that spectrum, right up through to privatization, so everything from building it, designing it, financing it, maintaining it, operating it, running it as a concession and right through to privatization.

With respect to the delivery methods, these are sort of the thought processes in coming to terms with what method you're going to use. The essence of any agreement is the transference of risk. So, risk can represent a variety of elements including capital cost, performance of the facility, the success of the business. And Public-Private Partnerships shift the risk from the public party in the agreement to the private team. And again, the more risk you shift the cost model changes as well.

With respect to funding, some of the discussions that have happened in the past, budgeted money being used, funding the project through added taxes, borrowing the money, selling public assets to fund the project, Private-Public Partnership which includes financing, revenue-generating options, and then many, many more I'm certain.

So, our proposed solution: To address the current uncertainties, a contract format should be established to provide the Town of Collingwood the greatest flexibility in all aspects of the project. So this is specifically dealing with the delivery method, addressing the

delivery method solutions. So you should, because there are so many uncertainties, pick a method that gives you the greatest flexibility.

The most advantageous relationship is one where a firm is retained that could take the lead in delivering the project while offering sound input on all aspects of the project, so everything from design, site development, contracting, green technology, financing, revenue generation. All those questions that will invariably come up through the life of a project can be handled with an integrated manner through one single point of contact. So, in essence, you're choosing a partner rather than a contractor.

And all services purchased outside of the core services, what we're proposing is that we provide the core services. Anything that we purchase outside of the core services will be done on an open and transparent basis, with all the results and decisions being made collectively with the Town of Collingwood in whatever manner is decided upon, whether it be sole source, competitive bid, proposal calls. All those options are available.

I'm now going to hand over the presentation. Mark Palmer from Greenland is here as well, and he'll take over a description of the scope of our solution.

Mark Palmer:

Good evening Your Worship, Deputy Mayor and members of Council. My purpose tonight is just to give an overview of the site plan that we pre-engineered and have been working on for the last almost a year and a half now.

Essentially, the layout of all the buildings, we've looked at this from a pre-engineering perspective in terms of flood lines. As you know, this is within the Pretty River spill zone. So the orientation of all the parking areas, the building areas, have regard for the spill area. And there are issues there; this is documented in your official plan. So really, anything on the east side of the site would have constraints from a flood-proofing perspective.

The concept I'm showing here tonight does provide 400 parking spaces. It includes ingress and egress from actually two locations. What we tried to do was keep it on the Hume Street, build off the good work from the town on the Class EA for Hume Street, but also, then on Paterson Street, keeping it up into this quadrant. By doing so you're actually working with the information that you have now instead of regarding other local road improvements that may be needed. This also provides three main entrances for the curling rink, the YMCA through a common mezzanine or common area, and then an entrance to the twin pad arena.

We envision that this will require a Schedule B Class EA. When you're into new servicing through a public process regarding storm water management, the flood-proofing issue, servicing, you will have

to go through some sort of an EA process. And we built this into our schedule. We're looking at a two-year turnaround time to complete this project, and I'll talk about that further shortly.

The layout of the plan also has regard for the YMCA concept. I'm not sure tonight if she's with us but Marina Huissoon was the YMCA architect. So we consulted with the YMCA architect. This was the orientation that was actually designed by the group, looking at how the building could be serviced. There were issues with the mechanical systems, and that's the actual footprint of what the building should be. And as a result of that, that actually drives the parking situation and drop-off areas.

We are proposing to maintain two ball diamonds. We've heard this through the public process. There is an opportunity, actually because of this, we can actually re-orientate the one ball diamond at the southeast corner. That also provides an opportunity to install a geothermal field, an energy field, which again, is part of the opportunities here in clean energy, not only for that but there's actually solar harvesting that could be done here as well.

We are looking at relocating the lawn bowling facility to this area of the Central Park facility. Right now it is in this area so there'll be a relocation aspect there. We're also looking at restoring the heritage function, a feature of the storage unit or the barn unit back here to be part of our business plan.

And in terms of the ice pad, we've actually looked at a footprint here. We've looked at a footprint that would accommodate up to a 750-seat arena and also with a smaller arena, maybe perhaps for use for CMHA or the figure skating community. But again, that footprint is sufficient enough to look at other options in terms of two twin ice pads at 350 feet seating capacity is one option. But again, that would come out through the future process with a committee, the town, the public in terms of a design-build process, and an open and transparent process I want to add as well.

Also with this building, it creates a wonderful opportunity for rainwater harvesting, as I mentioned with solar energy as well. And because of that, there is going to be a need for storm water management. We've actually included a storm water block at this end. Once we get into the detail work and on-site issues with geotechnical and some of the soil issues, we would look at opportunities for low-impact development.

One of our latest building expansions included a permeable parking unit that we actually went through Site Plan Control with the town. So there is opportunities here for rainwater harvesting, overflow parking and for permeable parking that would actually reduce the size of the storm water block, but again, by reducing the size of the storm water

block, would create an opportunity perhaps for a dog park facility if that's the wish of the committee and the town and the public.

I want to also add, the design concept that we have includes over 10,000 square feet of commercial space that Ameresco would be willing to provide to the town for revenue generation purpose, for leasing right away. So that would actually create an immediate revenue source for the town. Actually, the mezzanine area as well would include extra space that could be used for leasing opportunities. So there is sufficient space here for restaurants, meeting rooms, commercial lease opportunities that the town would benefit from.

And finally, if a design-build construction process is initiated in January of this year, our proposed completion date is December 2014, two years. Site works would start immediately in January. That would include actually the ball diamond at the southeast corner, where you can actually install a geothermal field. We actually did this with one of the high schools in Angus where we actually did the geothermal construction during the winter. So there would be no time wasted. There will also be a need for the EA process in a number of these functions, so we'd run a concurrent schedule EA process that would actually jive with the design-build and consultation process. Frank?

That's just a back view of the concept, and we're going to run a video at the end of our presentation about this as well.

Frank Miceli:

Just moving on to the financing component of this, we estimate the cost of this concept to be about \$27 million, and it includes the YMCA expansion as well. With a design-build finance model, Ameresco has sourced financing, as much as \$20 million. And depending on the model, that number can vary. We can actually find funding to fund the full 27 million bucks; it just ends up being a more onerous burden. But preliminary discussions we've had with other partners, \$20 million is readily available for the project. The design-build finance model can be leveraged for future grant programs in order to construct other facilities on site as well.

And then, of course, the big question, why us? I've tried to show this Ameresco being in the centre and integrating all of the things that we've talked about. So, starting from the top left, so the design remains flexible to ensure that it meets Collingwood's needs. The financing remains flexible with respect to the amount and the term. The procurement will include local subcontractors, local trades and suppliers. The input is available from us on the green technologies and the alternate funding sources.

Our layout includes about 10,000 square feet of space for revenue generation, or even for local purposes, for your sports clubs that are looking for space. That could be assigned in that manner as well. Our completion date, as Mark mentioned as well, is estimated to be the end of 2014.

And this can be integrated with recent provincial requirements for asset planning/life cycle inventories by municipalities. This is a new initiative by the province that is being imposed on municipalities, and we're serving our clients in that manner as well. This can be incorporated into that. And in essence, we'll be a partner in an open and transparent agreement, and assume the role of the integrator of all of the project components.

We also have a detailed Request for Qualification draft that we had prepared about a year ago, which we can hand over to Council for your review to assist you if you do elect to go to a Request for Qualification process. And our team stands ready to respond to a Request for Qualification to ensure that the public process remains open and transparent.

And then it's open to questions, although we do have a little video, an animation of that.

[Video 00:58:14 to 00:59:19]

And that's it for our presentation. I'd like to hand that in.

Mayor Cooper: Thank you very much, Mr. Miceli. Council, any questions? Councillor West?

Cllr. West: Thank you very much, Mayor Cooper. Thank you very much, Frank. Some of us have seen some of your presentations before. As you're probably aware, because I know you guys have been following it closely, how amenable is your idea to a phase...? Sorry, I was asking how amenable his project is to a phased-in approach.

Frank Miceli: Through Your Worship to Councillor West. The advantage of a design-build solution is that you can start processes that don't require the intensive design activity as early as – far earlier in the project. So for example, the lawn bowling relocation needs to happen to start to clear out the footprint to create the space for the arenas. That can happen almost immediately, because the space it's going to is available and, as long as the timing for the use of the facility is available, we would just build the new one and then clear the space out from where the existing one is.

So, the idea of phasing the work is definitely available in a design-build format. And in fact, it's more so than in any of the other more rigid stipulated sum contracts where phasing just adds cost because it adds time and everything else. So, it's very suitable for that type of a delivery method.

Cllr. West: Okay, thank you.

Mayor Cooper: Councillor West?

Cllr. West: Well the only other one I'd have is, although you obviously based your plans on the steering committee report, the outdoor rink, I've heard a lot of feedback about keeping that. But you don't have one in your proposal either.

Frank Miceli: Yeah, through Your Worship to Councillor West. That's why that scope slide was with bubbles, because right now there's a whole bunch of items out there that were floating around. And some were contradictory; some were supported by some in a weak manner. So we didn't really – we chose a basket of goods that we thought solved the problems.

But you're absolutely right. The existing outdoor rink, we thought, based on our review of the material, that that was probably less favourable than the two indoor arenas. Again, it's not a solution that we're necessarily imposing. It was just our read on what we thought was the reports and studies that have been done to date.

Cllr. West: And I think my only other question, Mayor Cooper and maybe Mr. Palmer, or maybe Ed could talk about, you mentioned flood concerns from the Pretty River flood plain. And maybe we can talk about how that would effect, because obviously the east side is going to be discussed later.

Mayor Cooper: Mr. Palmer?

Mark Palmer: Thank you Your Worship, through you to Councillor West. Yes, in your official plan this is a designated are of the Pretty River for a regional storm event. This is a spill area. What the advantage is with the building layout that you have at hand with this concept, it has been pre-engineered. We have looked at issues in terms of velocity and the depth of water that is actually mandated through policy that you would have to have as part of a site plan for a building permit stage.

We know through our work, for example the Admiral Collingwood School, as you know the east half of that school was not developed. It's actually the soccer pitch and that is part of the spill area. So along the rail tracks, as the water would convey to the north, you want to keep away from that rail track area because there will be issues in terms of the conveyance. And putting a public structure there, you would have to look at that. You would have to look at any structure in that area.

So it should be done right away. We did this right away at the very beginning. We would never propose a concept like this unless we had regard for it. But any site plan of this magnitude you would have to have regard for the flood proofing and the flood risk aspects of it.

Mayor Cooper: And Mr. Houghton?

Ed Houghton: Thank you very much Your Worship, through you to Councillor West. Actually, Greenland was actually doing some work for us when we were looking at, both from a hydraulics perspective and a hydrology perspective, we were looking at that. We actually have monitors in the Pretty River as part of this. The NBCA is our partner.

What we're trying to do, we believe that that spill can be something significantly less than what it is today. But we've had regard for that in all of the developments. We had regard for that even through the shipyards development. So certainly, we're well aware of it and we would be taking that into consideration, and flood proofing a building if it happens to be into that area.

Mayor Cooper: Thank you.

Cllr. West: Okay, thank you.

Mayor Cooper: Okay, Councillor Edwards?

Cllr. Edwards: Yeah, thanks Your Worship. Thank you for the presentation. If we could go back, where are the double rinks located on this? Could you just go back? I maybe missed that when it was going around.

Frank Miceli: You want me to go back a slide or...

Cllr. Edwards: Just to where it's located here would be great actually.

Frank Miceli: I'm sorry.

Male: The white square Mike.

Frank Miceli: It is the white square. Oh, the arena.

Cllr. Edwards: Yeah, sorry.

Frank Miceli: I'm sorry.

Cllr. Edwards: The double rinks.

Frank Miceli: The double rink is there. Okay, I can run through this quickly. This is the swimming pool addition. There's some entrance reconfiguration that happens here. This is the existing curling facility. There is a link that gets created to integrate all of the buildings. It gets created through the centre here and down the front here. The ice pads, that's the reoriented baseball diamond. The lawn bowling facility is back here.

The existing stable which appears to be not in use, we think we can repurpose that and perhaps support either the outdoor sports activities, the baseball diamonds and even the lawn bowling facility. And this is the new parking structure where the existing lawn bowling facility is,

and there's some parking lot adjustments and entrances that get changed in the front here.

Cllr. Edwards: Okay, thank you. One more question if I may, with regard to the financing. When we talk about the 20 million that is available, what kind of interest rate is that? And what length of time would that be carried over? What would be the financial arrangements for something of that magnitude?

Frank Miceli: I don't want to hedge my response. I'm sorry, through Your Worship to Councillor Edwards.

Mayor Cooper: That's fine, Frank.

Frank Miceli: I'm trying to remember the rates. Anthony Da Silva, our Chief Operating Officer, is really our finance guy. But if I can be vague, if you permit me to be vague, it is not as attractive as the Town of Collingwood could borrow from Infrastructure Ontario. There isn't a client that's got a higher rating than any municipality.

This would be at a premium rate to what you could borrow provincially. It is – and I'm going to say at the other end – it is more competitive than you could borrow as a private lender. And that's about as vague as I can be and I apologize. If Tony was here he could give you the exact numbers. But if I told you 5.5%, I'd be making up the number.

Cllr. Edwards: Do you know the time period that that would need to be repaid over, or...?

Frank Miceli: That is totally flexible. I do know that we had discussed terms of as short as 10 to 15 years and as long as 25 years. So that is totally flexible. Our lending partners have all acknowledged that and have basically said that the term is flexible. So, it's whatever the tolerance would be from the Town of Collingwood, whether it's a quick turnaround with a higher annual payment or a lower annual payment with a longer turnaround.

Cllr. Edwards: And just one more if I may, Your Worship. When we look at the relocation of one of the baseball diamonds, what would be the timeframe involved in that? I'm just looking at the baseball season. Would that disrupt that? Or is...?

Frank Miceli: Well that would the challenge is phasing all of this. The relocation of the lawn bowling we think is fairly straightforward. Because that space there isn't being used right now, we could grab it and move it over there. I'm sorry, that's the existing baseball diamond. But we would relocate this fairly quickly.

The reorientation of this and other site work would also hinge upon whether we elected to go with a geothermal system to support this facility, a geothermal system that was more central-utility based

where it could serve other municipal facilities that are nearby. The example that we reviewed was the hospital which is down the road. Those are options that need to be looked at. And if that's attractive, then that would dictate how long those things would take.

If we were drilling in, you know, 400-foot deep holes throughout this whole area here in order to create a geothermal field that could support a larger facility, that takes time and it would have to be worked out to see how we accomplish that. It could be the elimination of one baseball diamond, restoring it, getting it operation, move over, do the other one. Those are all the things that need to be ironed out in a micro-schedule sort of way.

Cllr. Edwards: Okay, and if I may Your Worship, just – not that I'm a homerun hitter by any means, but...

Mayor Cooper: I've seen you play ball, Mike.

Cllr. Edwards: I have been known to reach the fence on occasion. But that car park is dangerously close to a lot of players that can hit it out of the park.

Frank Miceli: Currently you're saying? Because, we're not expanding the footprint of that baseball diamond. That's currently a gravel lot and we're basically just upgrading the lot. But you're saying it's going onto the parking lot now.

Cllr. Edwards: There's quite a few. Anyway, thank you very much.

Frank Miceli: Okay.

Mayor Cooper: Thank you. Councillor Chadwick?

Cllr. Chadwick: Yes, thank you. Councillor Edwards asked a couple of questions I was going to ask. Could you tell me, with the 20 – you're talking about a \$27 million project – does that include all of the green technology, all the hardware?

Frank Miceli: Through Your Worship to Councillor Chadwick. It does not. In the proposal that we prepared, all the green technology was left out of the number for a very good reason. One is obviously the scope was undefined, but in addition, the implementation of the green technology could follow an entirely different financing model. It becomes a revenue generator, and it would attract a different financing structure, a far more attractive financing structure. And there are incentives and grants that could go with that that would sweeten that deal as well. So, we deliberately left it out because we weren't certain of the scope and we weren't certain of the appetite for it.

Cllr. Chadwick: So if we decided that, if we went with this, that we wanted to use our partner PowerStream, for example, to provide the technology, we could do that?

Frank Miceli: I'm going to say.

Cllr. Chadwick: Is that contingent upon...?

Frank Miceli: Yes.

Cllr. Chadwick: Okay.

Frank Miceli: We work with local utilities on a regular basis on behalf of municipalities. And the options in the models are quite varied.

Cllr. Chadwick: Okay. I have another question for you too now. Of the \$27 million, you're saying that we'd have to 20 million. Are you saying that we'd have to come up with the \$7 million as well? Or is the Y paying that portion? Are they paying any portion of this at all?

Frank Miceli: I'm not going to speak on behalf of the Y. And that has changed even in the year plus that I've been involved with the project. At one point in time there was direct involvement, or there was a perception of direct involvement by the YMCA. But I'm going to suggest that at the moment, no. It is that the funding of the YMCA component is just part of the same funding for any other components of this solution. So there's no other outside money.

Cllr. Chadwick: Okay.

Frank Miceli: Yes.

Cllr. Chadwick: Thank you.

Mayor Cooper: Councillor Lloyd?

Cllr. Lloyd: Thank you Your Worship, through you, just to clarify, I'm a little confused. The 27 million is for the structures, and then you would be asking for additional money from the municipality for the thermal and the other members you have, or parts of this that you planned. Are you asking for another amount of money from us?

Frank Miceli: Yeah, through Your Worship to Councillor Lloyd, yes. If there was a desire to introduce solar panels on the roof to generate, like photovoltaic solar panels to generate power, if the desire was to create energy through a geothermal field to serve this facility to offset the operating costs or to serve this facility and other adjacent facilities, then yes, those would be at a premium, yes.

Cllr. Lloyd: What's your best guess at the estimate for that?

Frank Miceli: I'm going to give you a quick number here. A 35,000 square-foot multi-tenant facility, full geothermal heating and cooling was a \$200,000 effort. This facility is dramatically different than a multi-tenant facility in that this arena spits out energy. It actually spits out

heat. So, you can claim it, store it and use it elsewhere in the building. It's unique in that it's not like a...

So a residential facility, you are constantly grabbing energy, storing it in one season and taking it out in the next season. In this facility, during the winter you are generating heat. In order to keep that ice surface cold, you have to extract energy out of that water. You could take that extracted energy and put it back into the building. So, I can't really give you a number on that, or even a scope. That's as close a number as I can give you.

Cllr. Lloyd: Who actually owns the buildings?

Frank Miceli: We see this as the Town of Collingwood would continue to own the buildings. And it would end up really being like a mortgage, in essence a mortgage. There's great flexibility in that as well, but we think the logical way to do this, where the ownership remains with the Town of Collingwood and the financing ends up being nothing more than a financial instrument like a mortgage or a lease or whatever, you know. Actually, a lease wouldn't... But I think in its purest sense it would be a mortgage, yes.

Mayor Cooper: Councillor Lloyd?

Cllr. Lloyd: Thank you. Thank you very much, yeah, thank you.

Mayor Cooper: Anything further? Councillor Hull?

Cllr. Hull: Thank you Your Worship. Thank you, Mr. Miceli, for your presentation. I know it's been a long time coming that you have wanted to be here, and I thank you. And I thank Mr. Palmer and your team for being here.

Some of my colleagues have already asked questions specific to the financial model, and I think it would behoove us to actually have maybe a more thorough either presentation or to actually have a financial model drafted and presented to the Council, either through the Clerk's department that we could review. To simply just continue to ask question after question without having the information in front of us will continue to prolong the evening, and we've got a long way to go.

I am intrigued to maybe, though, explore a little bit further the green aspect of this. I know that the gentleman behind you, next to Mr. Palmer, Ken Hale, was instrumental in the Nottawasaga Pines High School project in Angus. And, if I'm not mistaken, that specific project has been recognized as an award winner for the environmental components, specifically some of the geothermal and the rooftop aspects. And so that is something that's very exciting. It's something that has come to the table in the last couple of weeks through our new partnership with PowerStream, but it certainly does provide an opportunity.

So, with that financial model, I very much would like to see not only the borrowing cost but also maybe the costs to an installation, what the long-term paybacks would be etcetera, etcetera, not only to the Town of Collingwood but potential partners, as you mentioned, other facilities in the adjacent area like the hospital.

And, if I may, I've taken a few minutes, you've got Ameresco.com, but I believe there's Ameresco.ca as well. And if the viewing public is interested, it would behove people to take a look at the corporate site, simply to get a better understanding of who you are, where you're coming from, and the other municipalities that you've worked with. So, thank you.

Mayor Cooper: Thank you. Deputy Mayor Lloyd?

DM Lloyd: Thank you. Thank you very much for your presentation. I had the luxury of seeing this in Toronto and also seeing it again up here in Collingwood just recently.

The management aspect of it, I seen that was part of the proposal, that perhaps you'd enter into a management agreement with the town or something. You've done this in the past I'm sure in other municipalities. I just wonder what kind of rates, or how do you come up with numbers? Something's got to give that you've got to make some money. And other than the interest on the money, how is it?

Frank Miceli: Through Your Worship to Councillor Lloyd. Is the question specifically with respect to the financing?

DM Lloyd: No, it's more about operation.

Frank Miceli: Or is it the whole scope?

DM Lloyd: Yeah, I'm more interested in knowing, if you were to run or operate a facility like this, what would you charge us? Have you looked at that?

Frank Miceli: I apologize. That really does vary. And I'm not trying to be evasive about this thing, but we manage everything from civil facilities like a cogeneration plant, a central utilities plant, wastewater treatment plants and facilities like this. The number would vary dramatically. So, similar to the question from Councillor Hull, I could prepare something based on assumptions and submit it formally; I'd be exercising creativity if I made up a number right now. My apologies.

DM Lloyd: Again, I'm quite impressed with the presentation. It's well done. I guess a question I have through to our treasurer, not to put her on the spot, but just talking about \$20 million, to finance that, what would it cost us per year payback on it and over the course of the term? Like, if the project, if we were putting \$20 million into it, in the end, does it cost us 35 million? And I don't mean to put you on the spot if you can't.

- Mayor Cooper: Ms. Leonard?
- Marjory Leonard: Through you Your Worship, today's rates, we could borrow \$20 million at 3.45% interest for a 20-year debenture, and it would require approximately almost probably \$1.4 million annually in a repayment or about \$145 per - \$105 per average household in the town.
- DM Lloyd: So, over the term of the loan, would that be – through you Your Worship - \$36 million we'd pay back?
- Marjory Leonard: I believe it would be somewhere between an additional 7 and 10 million.
- DM Lloyd: Yeah, that's great.
- Mayor Cooper: Council? Thank you very much for the presentation. It was very thorough, very green.
- Frank Miceli: Thank you very much Your Worship.
- Mayor Cooper: Thank you. Next, another deputation, Central Park Multiuse Recreation Facility, Paul Cadieux, Friends of Central Park Collingwood. Welcome Mr. Cadieux.
- Paul Cadieux: Thank you Your Worship. I'll apologize now for my voice. I'm just getting over a little cold. It's very positive to see the room so filled. I appreciate everybody being here.
- Mayor Cooper: Yes, thank you.
- Paul Cadieux: Your Worship, Deputy Mayor, members of Council, I'd like to thank you for providing me the opportunity to speak with you this evening about the future recreation needs of Collingwood. Sorry, do we have the presentation? Yeah, thank you.
- I'm here tonight speaking to you as a full-time resident of Collingwood, and also the spokesperson for a group called Friends of Collingwood Central Park. The group was formed as a reaction to an overwhelming number of residents who, quite frankly, are outraged by the lack of process and transparency with respect to Council on this matter. Slide number three please?
- The mission of the Friends of Collingwood Central Park is quite simple, and that's to see the wishes of the community served in building one community recreation centre to serve the residents for decades to come, not too far off of what we're looking at just a few moments ago. Our motto from the beginning has been very specific and that's do it once and do it right. Next slide please?
- The goals of our group are also simple, and that's to ensure that the future growth and needs are considered in the development of a recreation facility, not just meeting today's needs but looking at what

our future needs are. Keeping the residents fully informed of the development of recreational facilities in Collingwood; assist the public in providing a voice to ensure that the community needs are being met; - next slide please - contribute to the vibrancy of Collingwood through public engagement on a recreation facility development; support the efforts to attract residents and businesses, similar to the one we heard tonight, Collingwood; and work together with other like-minded groups and agencies. Next slide please?

A change in direction away from the Central Park plan has left the community confused as to what you're recommending. We heard it tonight. The bubbles indicate questions, more questions than answers. At the July 16th meeting, we heard for the very first time of an alternative plan to the Central Park project. Plans were described initially as temporary, and now they're permanent. And now, only six weeks later, with absolutely no input from the community, stakeholder groups, Parks, Recreation & Culture Advisory Committee, you're prepared to spend \$15 million. How is that even possible?

Senior staff was instructed at that meeting to review options identified, and they've had six weeks to do it. And I've heard from senior staff who I happen to have met, talking about the fact that they've had to put in extra time to get this done. And I'm just wondering if they've had the appropriate amount of time to create a fulsome report that Council is able to view, understand, communicate to the public, and have a vote on. The speed alone at which this had to be done should cause us to question the entire process. Are we okay with huge decisions, multimillion dollar decisions, being made under such time pressures?

The report prepared by senior staff, in my opinion, is completely incomplete and falls very short of public expectation. There are absolutely no indications of operating costs anywhere on the pool and ice. And I understand why. Council did not ask them to do it. However, the Central Park Redevelopment Project created by the steering committee includes projected operating costs of the pool connected to the Y. There are comparative analyses there. Where are the comparative analyses in this situation?

You know, now we're talking about operating in competition with the Y rather than in collaboration with the Y. I can only see these omissions as far as operating costs as intentional. A letter recently received from Rob Armstrong, Chief Operating Officer of the Y, has put in writing that the Y still views the partnership between the Y and Collingwood as possible.

They might not be able to put money into capital improvements, but they certainly can absorb much of the operating costs. This alone would save the town upwards of \$400,000 annually. The partnership would give residents a newly-constructed pool, a warm-water therapy

pool at Central Park. The therapy pool alone has been identified by the community as a need, but it's absolutely absent from staff's review.

Deputy Mayor Lloyd stated at the July 16th Council meeting that he didn't want Collingwood to be like other communities that have combined recreational operating budgets in excess of \$500,000 annually. Operating three facilities at three separate locations would easily exceed this, if not come close to doubling it.

Where are the reviews of alternative technologies? There's only one vendor talked about in the staff report. It indicates for the pool, for example, that the specification used was an insulated enclosure over the existing facility to be used on a year-round basis. It goes on to say that the staff have researched only one supplier, and are only aware of one supplier of this type of technology.

That may very well be the case if you're only researching membrane structures. You don't need access to a smart phone to go and Google the Granite Club, the Royal Glenora Club in Edmonton, a pool that I built when I was at the Toronto Cricket Club that would indicate easily that other technologies exist. Why were none of these vendors contacted? Why weren't they considered in staff's report?

I believe we deserve better than to be told that no other options exist when clearly this is not the case. The enclosure for the rink has been noted that other options do exist rather than a sole one. But staff only chose to identify two but dismissed one alternative with little disclosure as to why. To me, this is an absolute lack of due diligence, and to me again, an attempt to mislead the community into thinking that no other options exist, which is simply not the case.

After reviewing, there are many other questions that emerge. When you look at the pool cost, it looks to me like the only item that would remain, after you take down the building and you take down the mechanical room, would be the tank itself. Was any thought given to the cost of adding the tank into the budget, moving the entire project over to Central Park, which we all agree is a preferred location where you can piggyback on the partnership between the Y, rather than being in competition with them you're now in collaboration with them; they help to absorb your operating costs? No, because staff wasn't asked to review that.

There's no mention of any additional pool equipment that would be required to upgrade the existing mechanical system from a three-month pool to a year-round facility. I'm talking specifically of advanced water treatment systems, computer monitor systems that are commonplace in year-round pools. I'm a regular user of that pool. No less than three times this year have I been turned away from using the pool because the pool hasn't been useable because of chemical problems. That shouldn't happen in a first-class facility.

Has a pool consultant been retained to determine the impact of a 45-year-old pool operating in the winter? It's 45 years old. Will it last the winter? Has anyone actually gone to a location to look at one of these structures? You're talking about a membrane system over top of a pool, a membrane system over top of an ice rink. Has anyone stood in it? Does anyone know what it looks like from the inside? Or is it bought out of a catalogue? What are the costs to rebuild the ball diamond?

So you know, to me, we're just looking at a lack of disclosure on the full cost of the project. At what point are we finally going to know what the total project costs? We're talking 14 million, but there's elements missing in it. Unfortunately, the staff report shows costs that support your position. It doesn't show the true cost of the entire project.

Lack of process, transparency, public involvement in reviewing the alternative projects to me is troubling. Spending even a dollar without due process I have to consider a reckless use of taxpayer dollars. Next slide please?

Council's accountable for due diligence. If I'm in your place, I have to be demanding that a full comparison of both operating and capital costs are done before doing anything. We've got what's been approved in principle by Council, which is a \$35 million project which everyone has said is too expensive. We've got a \$14 million, upwards of \$15 million project as an alternative.

At what point are we going to sit down, look at each of them, determine what's in one, what needs to be in the other, compare them, and figure out what's best? We only want what's best. We don't want the most expensive. We want what's best. And we want the public to be involved in helping to make that decision.

We want an apples-for-apples comparison of the facility components. Everyone talks about \$35 million. Everyone talks about how much it costs. But no one's ever talked about what you got for the money versus what you get for 15. You have to review all the impacts of the taxpayers over the long term by operating multiple facilities in multiple locations. If the Deputy Mayor's correct in that he doesn't want to spend more than \$500,000 annually on operating costs, I can't see how that happens when even within the steering committee report they're talking about \$400,000 operating costs just for the pool alone.

Investigate funding scenarios for all options. Has Council abandoned the idea to try to generate private or public funding, or any kind of support through capital grants? Demand an open and competitive tendering process to determine the best vendor, not just the one that meets your narrow specifications.

Consideration for preferences of the community residents; that one's last. To me, that one ought to be first. Nobody has seen the staff report until Friday afternoon. And by Monday evening, we're ready to vote on \$15 million. Slide number 10 please.

So our message is clear, do not make a decision tonight. Stay the course on the Central Park project. There is still an opportunity to realize a community multiuse facility at one location. That shows what it could look like. The swimming pool is the only element that's not there. We've talked about the fact that only the tank is going to survive what you're planning on doing with tearing everything down. Why not rebuild that tank, move it to a location that everybody agrees makes sense, engage the community in putting a proper cover over top of it, and let's get it done.

You called for a Phase 2 steering committee. You didn't rescind it at the July 16th meeting when you had the opportunity to. Why not strike that committee, allow them the opportunity to review apples-for-apples operating costs, both capital and operational, and work with staff rather than working against staff to take into consideration the needs of the community. Do it once and do it right.

Establish an open and transparent process for soliciting feedback. I have to say this process has been anything but open and transparent. We've heard only what the newspaper has told us, and only what helps to support each other's case. That's not open. That's not transparent.

Nobody knows what the total cost of this project is. We hear 35 million from the steering committee. We've got 27 million over here. We've got 10 million on temporary fixes. We have 14 million or 15 million on permanent fixes. Nobody knows what the final project even looks like right now.

And finally, ensure that an open and competitive tendering process is used to determine any vendor. Do not single source. There's no need to single source in this kind of an environment. There are multiple vendors out there that do non-traditional, something other than bricks-and-mortar construction for swimming pools. There are tons of them, I guarantee that.

I'm reminded of what Councillor Chadwick said at the July 16th Council meeting on the subject of purchasing a new vehicle. He said, "Sometimes you have to pay a bit more to get a better product." Should the same logic not apply here? Are we really going to consider putting millions of taxpayer dollars into facilities that by all accounts have long outlived their useful lives?

Finally, we want to work with Council. We want to work with staff to come up with something that makes sense for the future interests of Collingwood. We all have the best interests of the community at hand.

We're not far away from a viable and workable solution for the long term. We just want to remind you to do it once, do it right. Thanks.

Mayor Cooper: Thank you very much. Please refrain, thank you very much. Okay, I'll ask who would have the consent agenda. Please, we have to continue on with our Council meeting if you wouldn't mind. Thank you very much.

[End of Section 01:34:24]

[Start of Section 01:42:46]

Mayor Cooper: And next we have staff reports. Who would Staff Report EMC 2012-01? Excuse me, who would Staff Report EMC 2012-01 Centennial Pool and Arena Pad Operations?

Cllr. Cunningham: Mayor Cooper, I would have that as a motion.

Mayor Cooper: Councillor Cunningham, thank you.

Cllr. Cunningham: Moved by me, second by Councillor – oh, I'm sorry. Moved by me, second by Councillor Chadwick, be it resolved that Council receive Staff Report EMC 2012-01. And further, that Council direct staff to proceed with the purchase and construction of an insulated architectural membrane facility for a year-round single-pad ice arena at Central Park, maintaining two ball diamonds, the outdoor ice rink, the lawn bowling facility, and additional green space, while keeping the option to twin the new arena at a future date.

And further, that council direct staff to proceed with the purchase and construction of an insulated architectural membrane structure over the existing outdoor pool, including the removal and reconstruction of the existing building in order to provide a year-round pool to meet the community's aquatic and competitive swimming needs.

Mayor Cooper: Thank you. Mr. Houghton, if you would like to begin. And through the process of the staff report, I will ask that you hold your questions until after the presentation. Clarification, Councillor Gardhouse?

Cllr. Gardhouse: Yeah, I just wonder, Your Worship, whether wouldn't it be appropriate to perhaps separate those two motions since they're not really linked and you are talking about building a rink with one and a swimming pool in the other, and probably a good idea to deal with both of them separately.

Mayor Cooper: Okay, Council, fine with that? Okay, so noted. Mr. Houghton, if you'd like to begin.

Ed Houghton: Your Worship, through you to Council, if I may ask Mr. Tom Lloyd from Sprung to come forward. He's going to give his presentation. And then I will then walk us through not only the staff report but all the other information that we've put together in our presentation, and

conclude that with the financial considerations, the operational costs as well as the procurement that we went through.

Mayor Cooper: Okay, thank you. I'd like to just – I have been referenced by one of the deputations – recognize the time that senior staff have been involved in the community recreation facility in moving forward. And that has been quite a commitment and so thank you for that, all those involved.

Ed Houghton: Thank you.

Mayor Cooper: You're welcome, sir.

Tom Lloyd: Good evening Your Worship, Deputy Mayor, members of Council and members of the public, thank you so much for allowing us from Sprung, our team, to come up and just talk a little bit about our building systems and what it is that we actually do.

Well, Sprung, just for those of you who aren't familiar with us, what we thought we'd do tonight, quickly, is give you a bit of our history and background, the types of buildings we erect. We are a global company that started 125 years ago in Calgary, Alberta. We are still a 100% Canadian company. At the very top left is our head office. In 1887 we were in the canvas tent and mattress game for the Canadian Railways, and we eventually graduated into the architectural stressed membrane business in about 1970. We invented the technology. It's completely patented and nobody else can do it in the way that Sprung can.

The lower picture is our head office just south of Calgary, Alberta where we manufacture all the product, we do all our membrane. The middle piece is head office staff. There's about 125 people that work in that facility. We have a gymnasium, a dining hall, fitness room, full manufacturing facility. And, while that picture doesn't do it justice, the building actually does a full 90-degree turn and it's three different sizes, the point being that Sprung's flexibility is incredible. So, the point made just a few minutes ago about should you need to add an arena, it's very simple to expand a Sprung, and I'll show you examples of companies that do it all the time without disrupting any of your existing day-to-day business.

A Sprung is a complete ClearSpan building, meaning there is no beams inside so it's very easy to build second-floor mezzanines. Businesses are changing all the time. We do a lot of airport business. We do casino businesses. And those types of businesses are always changing, so they love the ClearSpan so that they can make offices or event rooms larger and smaller and change it up. We're very large throughout almost every university in the U.S. for that exact reason. IT is hot today. Who knows what's going to be hot tomorrow, maybe woodworking. They can convert quickly.

We've done over 12,000 buildings. We're in 93 countries around the world. We started off primarily as a military company providing global military forces around the world. We then moved into general industry, and municipality sports and recreation most recently. That's Vail, Colorado, for those of you that are skiers.

You can do anything to the exterior of a Sprung. This is an example of a casino that put on a large dining facility to it. Again, the ClearSpan is great. This is three NBA courts that they may want to change up down the road.

In this picture, on the ceiling you'll notice we have a daylight. That's an option that most clients want because it provides a tremendous amount of light. We have a video on our website done by the owner of this building, where they'll tell you that many times they come into this building and tell the kids to please turn the lights on while they're playing basketball, and they'll say "We thought they were".

The acoustics are amazing which is why we're so popular with churches. We'd like to take credit for that but the reality is, our wind and snow load is our first and foremost concern. We design each building to the local wind and snow load. And it turns out that the pitch we came up with years ago makes tremendous acoustics when you insulate the building. We have churches in the U.S. that have congregations of over 5,000 people every Sunday, with household name pop bands playing in them.

We have unlimited amount of endorsements and recommendations. Collingwood's a big equestrian area. We do a lot of equestrian in our home province of Alberta. This particular owner has tried many different types of structures and said, you know, well, it says it all there, the quality of the Sprung is second to none.

This is a pool that was an outdoor 50-metre-long Olympic-size pool in Utah, Kearns, Utah, that we've recently enclosed – we're going to show you a video of this in a minute – complete with seating, what we call our roll-up sunshine doors so you can open it up in the summer to let air in and get more of an outdoor feel. We're doing now a lot of sports and rec like tennis, golf clubhouses, hockey of course. This is a school that we'll show a quick video of just outside of Calgary, Alberta that built two Sprung arenas and a Sprung gymnasium. And, as the owner and founder said, "With Sprung we hit a homerun."

Hockey Canada has come to our rinks and we are the first product or building of any type that they've ever actually endorsed. We have a letter from Bob Nicholson, who's the President and CEO of Hockey Canada, and his counterpart Tom Bitove of the Hockey Canada Foundation. Their goal is to grow arenas, and they've now endorsed the Sprung Performance Arena as the arena of choice for communities across Canada.

This slide just quickly speaks to expansion. This company has added structure after structure, attached them, put corridors between them, done them all. And they say “What a great way for a business to grow using Sprungs.” Built for today, and as you, not worrying about what your long-term plans are, if you start meeting those plans, you can quickly expand and grow.

I mentioned the acoustics and that we’re in airports around the world. And even Her Majesty the Queen cut the ribbon at a Sprung. In fact, she flies out of this actual hangar on a regular basis.

As I said, over 150,000 casinos; the only difference with casinos is they want the black liner. They don’t want you to know what time of day it is. We do hospitality all over the globe. In Cape Canaveral, they couldn’t believe how great the structure was. It’s survived hurricanes, so they’ve now added more instead of using it as a temporary facility.

This slide is here because of great Canadian technology. When September 11th happened, the first company to get a call was Sprung. They know that we have by far the best airtight seal of any pre-engineered structure, which is why our buildings are so energy-efficient and green.

What most people didn’t realize were the Twin Towers were full of all sorts of bad materials, so they needed a building that they could divide into three sections. And when the employees came out from underground they took off their hazardous material suits and had to be hosed down, and then from there went into the Sprung dining hall on the far end. The lights, by the way, are also a company from Calgary, so.

Again, this is a classic example of a school that was all actually a woodworking shop. Woodworking started to slow down and they made the other half of it a lab just by popping up one of our interior partition walls. This is in Ottawa. LA Dodgers Retail, dining facilities.

So, while our product is very complex and, as I mentioned, it is patented, when it comes on site it comes in three major components, an aluminum beam; and we use aluminum because it is the strongest material in the world, withstanding extreme high winds, high snow loads, and it also has a remarkable resistance to earthquakes. The architectural membrane we use is of the highest quality through Siemens in Wooster, Ohio, and they will only manufacture it for us. No other membrane manufacturer has that quality. And our insulation package, which in the arena is a true R30.

Pre-engineered steel will tell you what they are. I would ask them for an independent energy report, which we have provided to the Town of Collingwood to show that, on average, we are about half the cost to operate, from an energy standpoint, as the conventional construction, and we’re about a third the cost to operate as pre-engineered steel. So

you will save money with a Sprung structure, ongoing maintenance and operating costs.

I've left for you folks, apples-to-apples was the past group, we're oranges-to-oranges. We like to be unique. Just comparing the Sprung Performance Arena to a pre-engineered metal building and a conventional construction, everything from lighting to maintenance, air tightness, which is a huge component to energy efficiency by the way.

We are a 60-year plus building. We are not a temporary structure. There are advantages to a Sprung because it can be so easily adapted, moved, added onto by so many different means. So we are a very flexible product.

Our licence partnering company we work with here in southern Ontario does a lot of sports and entertainment work, and it's been recently named the Partner of the Year by the Maple Leaf Sports and Entertainment Group. Those of you who go downtown may know of a bar called the Real Sports, right beside the Air Canada Centre, which was recently named by ESPN as North America's greatest sports bar.

Larry, can we do the pool?

[Videos 01:58:22 to 02:08:12]

- Mayor Cooper: Thank you.
- Tom Lloyd: So yes, thank you. I guess we'll open it up to questions and answers, answers and questions.
- Mayor Cooper: Thank you very much. I'll just ask Mr. Houghton to finish up here with the presentation.
- Ed Houghton: Thank you very much, Your Worship. What I'm going to do is, as per your instructions, you wanted me to go back through some of the things within the Central Park Redevelopment Project Report, and bring those forth to show that what we've been trying to do is be respectful of that report, to try to keep the intent of that report.

So the purpose which is identified within the report is that the steering committee examine the feasibility of redeveloping Central Park. It also talked about exploring opportunities to address the primary needs, which was the arena and pool uses. And then they wanted Council to develop recommendations regarding a design concept, look at the capital cost estimates and then the projected operating budget.

During the process, they went out and they spoke to the public and they talked to different stakeholders. And some of the things that were indicated to them was that there was support for a multiuse concept. Whatever they were doing, they wanted to make sure that it was in a central location adjacent to the downtown. They obviously wanted to

have various modes of transportation, whether it be mass transit, bicycles, pedestrians and/or cars. They were hoping to have the possibility of integrating intergenerational uses. And one of the primary uses was, again, a new pool and a twin-pad arena.

Again, through that consultative process, they identified four specific areas of either priority or concern. And what those were was that the funding for the construction of the project should not be solely derived from taxes; that the existing recreation uses should not be permanently impacted; and that the significance and the importance of the Eddie Bush Arena must be strongly considered; and finally, that partnerships required should support the public uses.

In the report, the recommended facility components should include a twin-pad arena, a new six-lane 25-metre pool with deck space for viewing and competitions. It looked at the adaptation of the existing pool at the YMCA that would be turned into a warm-water therapeutic use and teaching pool. There is a need for having a common space for a community centre for town hall type meetings for recreational type uses.

And they also had a vision that the park would be family-oriented and they would have things such as a playground and the continuation of the dog park. They wanted to be able to have integration of a lawn bowling green. They looked at the redevelopment of ball diamonds in a different location. And they also looked at the park and site improvements to support the entire complex.

The recommendations from that report, that came to us again on March 5th of 2012, was that Council endorse the recommended scenario and invest the necessary resources to complete the design; that Council develop a funding formula to support that plan along with the associated timelines; and that Council explore Public-Private Partnerships – it's funny how we say public-private because we're looking at public and our friends were saying private-public from their perspective – opportunities to track investment.

But what they were looking at is the potential of leveraging existing municipal assets such as the Collingwood Harbour, the grain elevator, potentially the Eddie Bush, and look at Public-Private Partnerships or privatization of those to be able to help pay for the asset at the Central Park. Also, that Council and the YMCA develop and launch a capital fundraising campaign. They threw it back to staff to develop a plan for the relocation of the existing ball diamonds. And also that council consider the options for repurposing the Eddie Bush Arena if it was no longer to be used as an arena.

And what happened was, from March the 5th when Council received this, there were significant discussions about this. There was obviously differences of opinion. We were receiving emails back and forth that were in favour and some were against. I think Council had

many discussions amongst themselves. What we felt that we needed to do was we needed to have a strategic planning session where we allowed respectful discussion amongst Council, to be able to bring forth their thoughts, their wants, their needs, their desires from both their opinions and the opinions of their families and friends and their colleagues.

What I've done is I've taken those common comments, the common themes that we heard on June the 11th, and what we heard very clearly was there was a priority for ice and water. There was a priority for an ice pad. There was a priority for some sort of an aquatics centre that would have a six-lane 25-metre pool.

A common theme that we heard was that there was a significant concern with a \$35 million cost. There was a request that consideration be given to phase the project. Another common theme, which is similar to the first, was that we needed to satisfy the immediate needs. So they were showing there was urgency within that.

There was a thought that we should refurbish the Eddie Bush and retain it as an ice pad. There was a concern with the location of ball diamonds, because within the report it had a cost for relocation but didn't have a cost for the property. There was the thought there were three locations, two that were not in the town of Collingwood and one that was, but also, that property was owned by developers. And also, they said we need to start soon. Again, I think that that was a common theme amongst some, that talked about the fact that we need a new ice pad and we need it now. So those are the common themes that we heard on June the 11th.

On July the 16th, through again significant discussions, staff trying to capture all the different needs, wants and desires and the different opinions and those kinds of things, we thought that we needed to provide you with a menu of options so that you could come back and say, 'Here's what we believe that you should be looking at'.

So we provided Council with a whole menu of options. One was to construct a single ice pad. One was to construct a double ice pad that potentially could be phased. Construct a 25-metre six-lane pool at Central Park at the YMCA. Construct a new therapeutic warm-water pool at the Central Park YMCA. Enclose the outdoor rink with a fabric type building. Cover the outdoor rink with just a roof structure. Enclose the outdoor pool with a fabric type building. Examine a completely new site for a phased multiuse facility, which was suggested. Or, as we always do in most EA type things, no new recreation facilities.

What was resolved by Council that evening, and this is the resolution that Council direct staff to pursue the following recommended options: develop a project timeline and detailed estimates and bring

the report back to Council not later than August 27, 2012. That was supported. It was significantly supported especially from a date perspective. Staff pushed back because they believed that there was an urgency to move forward. The two portions of this was to enclose the outdoor pool with a fabric type building, and then to construct a single-pad arena that could be phased into a double pad.

Staff took that information and started to work on looking at all of the different options. We did look at a whole bunch of different options. We looked at several different options. We looked at a number of different fabric buildings, we looked at bricks-and-mortar buildings and we looked at steel fabrications buildings. We talked to our consultant, our architectural consultants. We got prices on those kinds of things.

We were working as a team. And I should have mentioned that right at the beginning, Your Worship, and I apologize for that. That was my intent. I should have said this is very much a team effort. Poor Marta, the day after our July 16th, said "I'm going to be on holidays. What am I going to do?"

So we supported Marta, and she's been part of feeding in the information. Marjory's been very much involved, our treasurer. Ms. Almas has been very much involved. Larry Irwin's been very much involved. Dave McNulty's been very much involved. And it has been very much a team effort to put this together, as well as the consultants getting the information. So I should have mentioned that at the beginning. I apologize for that.

What we did was, we needed to do an assessment of those options from the stakeholders' perspective, going right back to the report that was given to us by the steering committee. One of the things that Council needs to is, what we need to do is we need to balance between the demonstrated needs. And I'm saying it's not needs, wants or desires; it's a demonstrated need. We heard a common theme that we need to have a pool, and we heard a common theme that we need to have an ice pad. So, staff is taking that as if it is a demonstrated need. And so what we were looking at and trying to help provide information to Council was looking at that need and trying to balance and manage the financial resources. And that's very difficult and that's what we have to do.

Earlier today, we quickly looked at the fact that we have \$100 million that's going to be required in a whole bunch of different things. In fact, I think Marjory, over a longer period of time, was showing us there's \$151 million, which includes a \$65 million wastewater treatment facility, \$10 million, 9 to \$10 million to do Hume Street reconstruction, \$4 million to complete High Street, \$1 million to complete Highway 26 West, and the list kind of goes on and on; 8 to \$10 million for the expansion of the water treatment facility in the future. So those things go on and on and Council needs to look at those

things. And that's what we tried to do is balance the financial resources.

The primary aspect of the resolution is still in keeping with the Central Park plan, i.e. the multiuse concept. What we're proposing with the new ice pad is in keeping with the steering committee's report. It is at Central Park. It can easily be twinned. It will have a number of facilities and amenities within that. We also have had discussions with a company that would like to do an expansion to that, which would also bring an opportunity from a sports excellence perspective.

The proposed resolution continues to provide easy access. Obviously, it's centrally located because we're in the same location. The proposed resolution considers both primary uses. However, at this point in time, we were talking about a single ice pad but that can be twinned.

The funding for the construction of the project, as we've proposed, will not be solely derived from taxes. In fact, if allowed, if the public says this is the correct thing, we could show you where there will be no tax dollars going into this.

The existing recreation uses will not be impacted. The plan that we've put together at this point in time protects the two ball diamonds, ball diamond number one and three, and as well the outdoor rink.

Council has already identified the significant importance of Eddie Bush Arena. You have voted that it be our priority for a SIF funding, which is potentially \$3.1 million, so that has gone in. We recognize that, irrespective of what happens with Eddie Bush, we're going to have to replace the roof. We're going to have to make it more accessible. And if we move forward with this, there is less of a burning desire and need to be able to, or to have to spend the other dollars at this point in time to get it beyond the 10-year life which we were talking about.

What we also wanted to do was we wanted to look at the resolution that Council made in consideration of the facility components. The proposal, again, provides a single pad with the option for a twin pad, which meets the components. The proposal will see a newly-renovated six-lane 25-metre pool with deck space for viewing and competitions that will accommodate upwards of 250 people.

At this point in time, we are unable to provide an adapted existing pool for therapeutic use and teaching at this time. We will have a common space. That common space will be in the single ice pad for community centre, community uses. And we are going to be able to provide areas for the dog park and potentially for playground.

The lawn bowling green will remain as is. Again, there is no need for the redevelopment of the ball diamonds since ball diamonds one and three will remain in operation. And we've also proposed to add as

much as \$700,000 for park and site improvements to support the entire complex and to be able to keep in respect, which my friend Mark was talking about, from this flood that goes through that I think we've all had fun with.

The consideration of the Centennial Pool option: now we're going to try to narrow down to look at the specifics. And this was a moving target, and certainly I was looking at it from completely different eyes, had not been involved at all with any of this. But I did receive a letter from the YMCA's position, and it stated "In the spring of 2012 the YMCA received word that its \$3 million application from Accessibility Ontario was denied. Without the accessibility funding, the YMCA cannot proceed with an additional pool at its current facilities."

Now they went on to say that the YMCA did however offer to help raise and/or, if the town built the pool, operate the facility, to offset (*sic*) the losses that would occur with an expanded facility. And the proposed expansion of the YMCA pool option with observation deck, design and contingency was \$7 million 745. The letter sort of talked about 5.5 million but, going through the detailed budget, it shows that there's \$5.5 million for the pool, \$400,000 for the observation deck, 590,000 for the design, and 1.298 for the contingency. And if you remove the 20% contingency, because that's just if you think that you need more money, it still is in the order of \$6.5 million.

Further consideration of the Centennial Pool option was that no other Heritage Park amenities would be displaced. The insulated architectural membrane construction would facilitate the demolition of the existing pool change house, which is the 40-year plus facility at this point, and mechanical room. And the new enclosure would house modern facilities and a recently-renewed pool asset over top of a recently-renewed pool asset. Construction would be approximately 16 weeks.

The new enclosure would include an expansive viewing area, it provides for year round, and as well, the ability to open very large exterior doors – they were calling them sunshine doors in the video – for the outdoor pool experience during favourable weather. So basically, we can bring the outdoors indoors for our pool and provide somewhat of the best of both worlds.

Improvements around the facility would include a new asphalt surface parking lot to accommodate upwards to 70 vehicles, because we estimated that that would be required through some of the swim meets that take place at that location.

Some of the design components – it got a little bit small, but I wanted to try to put it on at least one slide – that enclosure would be 120 by 140 feet. We would have the daylighting roof panels that you saw. We would have of those operable insulated doors, and interior spectator

seating up to 250 people, a new mechanical room with additional space and upgraded servicing, chemical room storage with direct exterior access and containment.

We would have both male, female and family change rooms with accessible washrooms and lockers. The pool entry facility, showers etcetera, we would take away that one step that we have currently to make it fully accessible to the pool for persons with disabilities. We would also include a portable lift.

There would be a lobby and customer service area. We have a separate staff locker room/lunchroom. We will have a manager's office, a swim team office. There'll be janitorial closets, pool equipment, etcetera, etcetera. It'll be a sanitary design with room finishes, HVAC system throughout, energy-efficient lighting, electrical fixtures, occupancy control switches, and efficient non-touch plumbing fixtures. So what we were asking for in the specifications was we wanted to put our best foot forward with this building.

You saw this a few moments ago. This is the one pool that was a, I believe it's a 10-laned 50-metre pool. Ours is a six-lane 25-metre pool. But it represents a similar thing. If you were looking at this, on the left hand side, that would be the east side of the building, that's where we were proposing to put the bleachers for the observation deck.

On the west side, which would be opening up to the new fire station, we will have six of those sunshine doors allowing, again, the outside to come inside. On the south side would be the locker rooms. And this would be basically the north side which we would have two of those large sunshine doors. And you can see the continuous skylight.

This is basically just a quick drawing showing you what we'd be doing from a hard-surface perspective for the parking.

A look at the single-pad arena option, there were – again, we looked at several different ones – we felt that only two kind of met with what we were looking at from a cost perspective. We looked at a pre-engineered steel building and we looked at the insulated architectural membrane building. Either building has the potential of being twin. There's no difference there. Either building can be LEED Silver standard certified. However, the architectural membrane building has the LEED requirements already built in. If we were to do that with the pre-engineered steel building, what we would have to do is increase the amenities within that to get to that LEED Silver standard.

The significant advantage that staff saw, apart from the lower cost, was the time to construct. We're able to construct the ice pad in 22 weeks versus the typical construction which is 64 to 72 weeks. Now in that 22 weeks we would also have to have about eight weeks of design time, so it would be about 30 weeks. We would be able to have people skating by end of April/May. Next one Larry?

Design components is we have an NHL size ice surface, 85 by 200. We're going to have glass with 5.5 feet with an aluminum rail. We've included a dropdown scoreboard in the centre, which is an enhanced type scoreboard because we were looking at this being a wonderful arena. There will be six player dressing rooms which include all of the amenities that a dressing room requires. There'll be two referee rooms capable of eight referees at any point in time and all the amenities. There will be a first aid room complete with a shower, washroom and the amenities.

There's going to be at least a minimum of 250 seats with overhead radiant heating. And what we're looking at is putting in the radiant heating potentially for coin operated. So, if somebody's there watching their child play hockey or at figure skating, they can put a loonie in, or a toonie or whatever it happens to be, and that money could either go to the minor hockey or it can go to the skating club.

There's an ice resurfacers room and mechanical and electrical rooms suitable for the Olympia style ice resurfacers. We actually have a, we got a price in a Zamboni, both electric and propane. We have large service doors with direct access to the ice surface. There's going to be in this dual-purpose meeting, party, music, media room with an ice view. There's a digital entry notice board – some of these things I'm not even really sure what they are – ice level warm area and lobby, resilient flooring throughout. There'll be a manager's office. There'll be staff a locker/lunchroom to accommodate up to six staff members, which we probably would have potentially four. Next Larry?

There's separate offices for both minor hockey and figure skating. On the first floor we will have a vending area. There'll be a pro shop to get your skates sharpened, buy your hockey sticks. There's main floor accessible washrooms. There'll be janitorial closets. There's a complete sound system, telephone system, communications systems throughout the facility.

Our fire chief was asking about making sure that it was all fire alarmed and building sprinklered; it's that. We wanted to make sure that we had a HVAC system for the entire facility, and it's also capable for the second floor mezzanine. There'll be energy-efficient lighting and electrical equipment, including occupancy control switching, so every room that you go into, whether it be the washrooms, the referees' rooms or those kinds of things, the lights will come on and the moment you leave the lights will go out; efficient non-touch plumbing fixtures and components.

We will have a second floor mezzanine. There'll be an elevator for accessibility to that second floor. It will have a lounge area and there'll be a second-floor kitchen and complete bar service room, and capable of 200 seating occupancy in that area, again to be able to provide the opportunity for additional types of events that we could have there. We could have a puck-and-ball tournament.

This is just a drawing that shows the single pad. On the left hand side would be the entrance. On the right hand side would be where the Zamboni, some of the offices and those things would go.

This is really difficult to see, but this was also shown in the Sprung. I think what I wanted to highlight right at the very bottom is these are not temporary facilities. They are 60 plus years. The other thing, from a lighting perspective, they're more energy efficient. Because of that white interior you're able to reduce the amount of light fixtures that are required.

And again, from the maintenance, the aluminum frames are virtually maintenance free. But the exterior and interior are self-cleaning, very easy to keep clean, very resilient to graffiti and those kinds of things. If you get graffiti, you spray it off. It's virtually vandal-proof in a lot of ways.

One of the things that we're showing here is just the single ice pad. And we have relocated it so that we can be respectful for the existing amenities, so that we're not paying the cost to relocate. And again, we have to be cognizant of the Pretty River spill. And then potentially – and this is the next slide shows you that, and all we've done is just saying we can do that. We may lose part of the dog park or we may choose not to do it, or we may have an issue with parking, because I think you're going to have issues with parking in any event once you get to the full plan.

But this is just one location. You could move that wherever you wish to do that. In fact, that circle is the same size, or that oval is the same size as the other one. It would probably be a flat end on both ends, because there's no need for the foyer and there's no need for the ice house because we'd be sharing that facility between the two.

One of the things that we heard was that people felt that we were departing from the original intent of the report. And that was the furthest thing from what we were trying to do as staff. What we were trying to do from a staff perspective was to be respectful of that, to look at how can we take the excellent work that they did and try to make it work, but also recognize the financial constraints that we have as a municipality, as any municipality.

And so, we would suggest that the enclosure of the Centennial Pool is a departure. It certainly is. It's a departure in the sense that we felt that we could give to those people who need that, if there is a demonstrated need, and we could do that in a fairly quick order and fairly inexpensively. And there is the opportunity to still partner with the YMCA from an opportunity from an operational perspective. And that was always the intent of trying to do that.

Quite frankly, when we've reviewed it, from a staff perspective and from our perspective when we were doing basically through a

development committee, it's going to be difficult to be able to instal a six-lane 25-metre pool complete with the observation deck and then have consideration for 70 additional spaces for those kinds of events. It's going to be difficult to do that, maybe not completely but it's going to be difficult. We've looked at it a whole bunch of different ways in trying to being respectful of that.

Again, the revitalization of this asset begins the rebuilding of Heritage Park along with a new fire station. So there's opportunities at both ends of our community.

The construction of the single ice pad is a departure from the ultimate plan. However, it was contemplated in the plan to be in a phased-in approach. The location of the ice pad has changed. There was contemplation, but only to preserve the significant assets, \$2 million, for the two baseball diamonds. There's 1.2 million to relocate, and we've estimated \$800,000 for the property, along with the loss of the outdoor rink which is estimated at 1.3 million. That actually wasn't in the report, but if we were to replace that – and we've heard that there is a desire to continue to have the outdoor rink, and in fact we've had discussions with Mr. [Seymour] and he's got some wonderful ideas of how we can enhance that operation, and so we can reduce the reflection of the sun so it doesn't melt the snow so much.

The Central Park multiuse design contemplated that all the buildings, including the YMCA and the curling club, would be connected by a one-storey gallery. In doing so however, we do displace the ball diamonds and we do lose the outdoor rink. So that is a departure. But that doesn't mean that what we're doing trumps any of this. It doesn't mean that, what we're doing doesn't mean that things can't happen in the future. But we are going to be answering the need.

We have brought these together, being respectful of the suggestion earlier of separating, what we did was we talked to both – when we were looking at all the different pricing and from a procurement perspective, and I'm going to as Marjory to come up and speak to this - but we brought it together. From a cost perspective we felt we could get the biggest bang for our buck. So I needed to at least mention that. And if I could have our wonderful treasurer provide you with these numbers.

Mayor Cooper: Absolutely. Ms. Leonard?

Marjory Leonard: Thank you Your Worship. The total cost estimate for the two buildings is \$10.6 million. That would be 3.2 for the pool enclosure and 7.4 for the arena. We have some accessory costs that would mainly be for the arena itself at 316, and site servicing costs for both buildings, 200 for the pool and 500 for the arena, for a total cost of \$11,633,000.

When we looked at the funds that we did have available, we do have \$1.5 million in reserve that was put there in the very beginning when we first started discussions with the YMCA and the pool reconstruction there. Last week at AMO our Mayor and acting CAO were able to convince the county that they should purchase Poplar Sideroad, so we will be getting \$1.3 million for that.

Mayor Cooper: It was the Deputy Mayor. He was doing a little arm twisting too on that one.

Marjory Leonard: Okay. We do have approximately, well right now we do have \$8 million in Collus funds. However, Council did promise or pledge to the public that there would be discussions before we would use those funds for any capital items. I also do believe that we will be able to get about \$88,000 worth of development charges for the Heritage Park parking, landscaping and a few of the other items that we're going to do there. And I also believe there is about \$821,000 in potential development charges available for the arena enclosure at Central Park. So with all those funds together we would have approximately \$11,700,000 to apply to these two projects that we're looking at tonight.

When we consider the operational costs for the Centennial Pool, it is understood that if a year-round, six-lane 25-metre pool is required, then operational costs would be increased. From discussions with the Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture, it is intended that a staff member from Town Hall – actually that's The Annex now – would be relocated to the new year-round pool to operate, manage and make sure that there was at least somebody in the building at all times. We would then make sure that that staff member's wages and benefits would be divided appropriately between the different cost centres, whether it's facilities, programs, special events or wherever.

And taking into consideration the yearly fixed and variable costs along with the revenues, it is forecasted that there may be an additional \$250,000 in annual net operating costs for the pool 12 months of the year. And if we really considered it, those are the comparable costs that we were experiencing when we did have the Contact Centre, or fitness centre open at the time.

The single pad estimated operating costs for the arena, again, it should also be understood that if a new single-pad is required then the operating costs there would be increased. Energy costs, however, with an insulated architectural membrane building will be less than a prefabricated steel building. Again, our Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture has anticipated that it may require between one, one and a half, maybe two full-time-equivalent employees to operate, essentially, four facilities. It will be the Eddie Bush, the curling club, the outdoor rink and the new ice pad.

The intention there is to optimize the use of the current staff that we have at both the Eddie Bush and the outdoor rink. Taking into consideration the yearly fixed and variable costs along with the revenues, it would be forecast that there may be an additional 90 to \$100,000 in annual net operating costs.

In terms of our procurement policy, this will be a supply and construction as a direct purchase from the supplier. Our procurement policy was developed to ensure the effective use of funds allocated by Council for the purchase of goods and services by achieving the optimum quality, expertise, quantity, price and other material terms and conditions as may be applicable in the circumstances, for the best value of the town and its taxpayers. The policy does recognize that there are times when single or sole-source purchasing may be the recommended method for procurement.

We do believe that due diligence was maintained throughout the process. During our research of the varying forms of construction, each of the comparators knew we were looking at cost for pre-engineered steel building and fabric or architectural membrane construction, since we already did have the cost for bricks-and-mortar estimated in the steering committee's report. So in that vein, it did interject an element of competition into that process.

Through the research and investigation phase it was determined that the architectural membrane building would provide the most cost-effective and beneficial solution for the taxpayers, both capital and operation wise. And again through our research, it was determined that there was only one supplier of this leading-edge technology that had a proven track record, that would provide what we needed at this time.

Back to you, Ed.

Mayor Cooper: Thank you, Marjory, for that. Ed?

Ed Houghton: Thank you, Marjory. So basically – and I'm trying to conclude – again, it was staff's intent, through Council's direction, that the Central Park Redevelopment Project must be respected throughout the process. And we've done that. We believe that we've done that. We tried to do that. And it's unfortunate that people think that we haven't done it, but in fairness, we've worked very hard, and at every turn we looked at every option and what is going to be the impact if we do this or do that.

The proposal fulfills the very clear requirement that we need a new ice pad and that we need a competition pool. Again, the new pool can be in operation sometime in February, the new ice pad in April or May. And this is important because, if we are successful at our SIF funding, we will need to take the Eddie Bush out of operation to be

able to do the required renovations to that. And again, we will be able to have, at that point, a new ice pad in operation.

Both proposals are turnkey, basically, everything from lockers to benches and those kinds of things. Really, all we need to do is add swimmers and skaters to both of these. And if the community approves the use of the funds as described – and I think I just need to mention that Marjory talked about the 8 million and we don't to make any confusions that those funds is just north of 14 million; a portion of that is the promissory note, 1.71 million as well as the 4 plus million that we also gave you, wired transferred to you folks, to us, and the 8 million that came from the PowerStream partnership as well – if the Collingwood residents allow us to do that, there is no tax implications to the Collingwood residents. And we can satisfy the needs of those people who need a new ice pad and those people who need a new aquatic centre.

Your Worship, again, I think we've taken ourselves a little bit out of our normal realm of comfort, but with a team approach and with Ms. Proctor's guidance, and Mr. Seymour and Mr. McNulty, we've been able to put this together. And we're actually, quite frankly, we're proud of what we're presenting to you.

Mayor Cooper: Thank you very much, Ed. Thank you to the executive management team and to Marta and staff. Also to the Central Park Steering Committee for the information that they have provided as well, because again, you had demonstrated that that was used in the presentation this evening. Okay, thank you. Questions Council? Yes, Councillor Lloyd?

Cllr. Lloyd: Through you Your Worship, if the population says no to using the 8 million for this, what is the cost of the 8 million if it's debentured?

Mayor Cooper: Ms. Leonard, can you answer that one perhaps?

Marjory Leonard: Through you Your Worship, could I just have a moment?

Ed Houghton: Your Worship, we anticipated the question. She just has to check her little notes there.

Mayor Cooper: Okay. Yes Councillor Chadwick, and we'll come back to that question.

Cllr. Chadwick: Thank you. Excellent presentation, Ed, and I really hope that everybody in the audience and Council gets the appreciation of how well thought out this is, and that this is not a temporary or, as we read in some of the concerns, a subpar type of building. This is really remarkable. I'm quite impressed by it.

My big concern, speaking for the BIA, is the Eddie Bush Arena. And of course, this has been talked about in a lot of things and I know we're looking for funding to get the refit done. But we really haven't had

any lengthy discussion about repurposing it. And the BIA of course is very concerned about that and would like to be part of that planning. The BIA board, by the way, has said that they do support this proposal that you presented tonight.

I'd like really have that discussion, because I think that's very important to the community as to what we might be able to do with it. And there were some ideas have been bandied about of indoor soccer, indoor lacrosse, something that can be used in the summertime, especially the spring and summertime, as an indoor sports. Those are two particular ones that are growing in a lot of communities, so thought about that. But, when we're doing the refit, if we're doing the refit, if we do get the funding for it, will that be able to take into account some of those future uses?

Ed Houghton: Your Worship, through you to Councillor Chadwick. That's exactly what the intent would be. We've had a discussion that if in fact we move forward with the new arena, that arena would be the 365-days-a-year arena. The Eddie Bush would most likely be an arena that would be the winter only. And what we would be looking at is opportunities to repurpose that.

If we do get the SIF funding and we're allowed to do the changes that are required, I think being able to do the things that you're suggesting, like lacrosse and others, is probably going to be easier on a concrete floor and etcetera, those kinds of things. I think that it would behoove us to have Council direct us to look at opportunities for repurposing it, and to look at those kinds of things. And I believe that that was also a common theme with the June 11th meeting with Council on the strategic perspective.

Mayor Cooper: Councillor Chadwick?

Cllr: Chadwick: If I can just add another comment about that. Now, the ice pad in Central Park is obviously a phased-in approach to the beginning of a larger project. Let's say in a couple of years we decide, okay, we want now to move ahead and put a swimming pool in there, on that site. Can we take the building that's over Centennial Pool, assuming we decide to decommission at that point, and move it and then reuse it as well, so we've actually saved ourselves some money in the long run?

Ed Houghton: Your Worship, through you to Councillor Chadwick. If in fact somewhere down the road – and somewhere through the presentation I should have mentioned that, when we were at the AMO Conference, generally speaking, the Minister of Finance or the Premier uses that as basically a launch basin or launching ramp for talking about new funding opportunities. There was nothing. We didn't hear any of that, as you well know.

But if in fact in the not-too-distant future there's an opportunity to do that, the Sprung building is easily removable. What we'd be leaving

behind, obviously, would be the footings and foundations and those things. But it can be picked up and rebuilt in other locations.

Cllr. Chadwick: Okay, thank you. That's it for now, thank you.

Mayor Cooper: Okay. Yes, Ms. Leonard?

Marjory Leonard: Through you Your Worship to Councillor Lloyd. To debenture the \$8 million over a 20-year period, it would be roughly 557,000, 560,000 a year in annual principal and interest repayments. And I believe that that works out close to about \$75 for the average homeowner.

Cllr. Lloyd: Thank you very much, Marjory.

Mayor Cooper: Anything further? Councillor Hull?

Cllr. Hull: Thank you Your Worship. I've got a couple of questions that are specific to the structure, and then I've got questions that pertain more to process and any associated costs. I don't want to in any way defame Sprung. What they have presented this evening I think is a quality product. I'm not questioning that. And in fact, when I start to look at this particular product as an option, whether it be Sprung or an alternative, it does appear that this is perhaps an opportunity for the future.

As many know, I work in a different profession, and that profession sees changes in building construction all the time. So I'm not opposed to the concept of going forward with some type of structure as the one that has been proposed. And in fact, when you actually Google the words – and they'll come to me in a second – it does pull up a number of companies, and it pulls up an association. And when you pull up the association it brings up hundreds of companies from around the world that are manufacturing this type of product. And again, I don't want to speak specifically about Sprung, because they've been invited to attend this evening and they've given an excellent presentation and, from what I can see, they've got an excellent product.

The two questions that I maybe would like to ask directly to the gentleman that is here would be, one, the facility that was built out west, I think it's the one that Mr. Nicholson endorsed, it would appear that it is a facility that is not only sort of a typical or more traditional building structure and then it's been added to with what appears to be about three arenas. Would that be correct?

Tom Lloyd: Yeah, the athletic facilities all Sprung, two arenas and one gymnasium, and the rest of the facility is standard conventional construction.

Cllr. Hull: The second then would be specific to the pool. You know the numbers in terms of where you've been around the world, the number of products that you've sold and set up, extremely impressive. But just a

single question would be have you ever actually enclosed a pool of this age in this climate?

Tom Lloyd: Of this age, I don't know how old the current pool was, certainly not in this far north a climate I can say no.

Cllr. Hull: Okay.

Tom Lloyd: I think, as I mentioned, we got into the recreational properties very recently. We have enclosed pools for the military, but nothing as far north as this.

Cllr. Hull: Okay. So, a question then perhaps back to staff that I don't think can be answered tonight so I'm not sure how we can vote to support this tonight, would be that there has to be an explanation through engineering that in fact one of these structures could in fact actually be purchased, put over top of the existing Centennial Pool, and that we would have some guarantee as taxpayers that next winter the existing concrete pool doesn't crack because there hasn't been adjustment made for the differences in temperatures etcetera as a result of a facility that has sat empty during the winter and is now exposed to a warm climate during the winter. I'm not an engineer, but that seems somewhat logical. So that would be a question I'd like to have addressed or answered.

Mayor Cooper: Mr. Houghton?

Ed Houghton: Your Worship, through you to Councillor Hull. Obviously I'm not going to – I can't answer it in the way the question's framed. I know that certainly, when we talked to Sprung, they felt confident that they could do that. We spent I understand \$1.2 million in the refurbishing of basically the tub and the appurtenances to that. For all intents and purposes, the building is what's the older building. That's about all I can answer from that perspective. I'm certainly not going to talk about – I mean, I do have an architectural background – but I'm not going to talk about the fact that to enclose it, whether it would cause an issue with that.

Mayor Cooper: Councillor Hull?

Cllr. Hull: I fully appreciate that. In the past two weeks we've received correspondence from a number of people throughout the community who have a vested interest in what's happening, and that's very exciting. Whether they are in favour of Central Park, whether they're in favour of this type of model, whether they're opposed to it completely because they would like to see their tax dollars spent elsewhere.

But, a couple of the emails that stood out, one was from a lady I believe over in Cranberry – and she's quite right – she said none of us on Council have an MBA. We don't have a CA background. And I

certainly don't have a public engineering background. So, if it's okay, I'm going to ask some of these questions, and I am going to ask that maybe they are answered in a report that comes back to Council before I spend \$11 million of these people's money.

With regards to the process, I fully agree with the presentation that was given tonight by Mr. Cadieux. And I would like to offer an apology to the taxpayers of Collingwood twofold. One is that, in looking at the process, if I could go back – and with the exception perhaps of Councillor Gardhouse – and I could do one thing different, the difference would be that I would give broader parameters. We gave such specific parameters that the steering committee look at Central Park alone, look at water and look at ice. And I think Councillor Gardhouse, you time and time again have suggested that maybe we should have been looking at alternatives all along. And now, here we are tonight looking at alternatives.

And so, in fairness to the taxpayers, in fairness to the steering committee, in fairness to staff, if I as a councillor could change one thing it would be going back in time and I would have made that recommendation. And that would have broadened the mandate so that we could have maybe a more fulsome discussion about options as opposed to one versus the other.

The other is that, with regards to our last meeting, July the 16th, I along with everyone at the table unanimously supported the motion that was put forward by the Deputy Mayor and Councillor Lloyd, and that was to bring forward the report that we have this evening. And yes it is a case of you get what you ask for, because we have been presented with exactly what we asked for.

I am somewhat concerned, though, that there was, again, in addition to that motion through Councillor Gardhouse that staff be given the opportunity to spend additional resources in terms of financial dollars to go out of house to hire expertise to bring back this report if required. So, I am concerned – and I apologize – that, if you feel that you didn't have the time, if you felt that you pushed back and we didn't listen, then I wasn't listening or I didn't hear that and I apologize for that. Because certainly, when I read the report that's been presented tonight, and the time in which it's been prepared, I am concerned that we've rushed to a conclusion and there are numerous questions still to be answered.

We as a Council deferred the \$40,000 commitment to hire consultants. And in fact, I'm not sure we've actually deferred that, sorry, brought it back. We deferred it but we never actually brought it back to the table for a vote.

The part that I am struggling with the most is that I am being beaten up, rightfully so, for the price tag of \$35 million. And it's like an issue down south in the United States that won't seem to go away in terms

of your perception, whether you're republican or democratic, pertaining to a specific President. No one at this Council has ever said that the taxpayer of Collingwood is on the hook for \$35 million. In fact, we as a council have never determined what we as a council feel comfortable in terms of spending, whether it's 2 million, 5 million, 10 million. I mean we haven't even established that parameter yet.

So here we are this evening considering a proposal to spend X million of dollars of the taxpayer, that basically will drain all of our resources in terms of maybe doing other things, and yet we haven't asked the very question of ourselves, what is it as a council we're comfortable spending. Is it 8 million? Is it 10 million? Or is it the full shot? And then it goes back to the very question that I think the steering committee last asked of us, and that was take the time to go out and do, if you're not going to do the market sounding, at least kick at the tires and see what additional funds are out there.

Tonight, we learn – and just so people know, a lot of the information that's been presented here is the first time that I have read this information, or had a chance to review it. So to Mr. Cadieux's point, to be asked to make a decision tonight on something that's being presented tonight is just not, it just can't happen.

But in terms of the funding, we just learned 10 minutes ago that, through the efforts of the Deputy Mayor, \$1.3 million is coming from the county. Well, if we've asked the county for \$1.3 million for selling them Poplar Sideroad, what else can we maybe ask of the county? What else can we ask of the province? What else can we ask of the federal government? Until the minister responsible at the provincial level or the federal level actually hands a letter to Her Worship that says no, why haven't we at least asked the question? And again, I take responsibility for that. I'm going to push that forward, that we need to start and ask the questions.

I have a whole other series of questions related to the procurement policy and how we've arrived at sole sourcing of one company. Again, in a matter of five minutes I was able to Google structure and I was able to bring up comparable companies all over the world, including others here in Canada. Now again, I'm not an engineer. I'm not an architect. I'm not a CA and I don't have an MBA, which doesn't say a lot does it? But it does behove us, I think, that we should be presented with a report that says 'Here is the company that we are recommending. Here are the four other companies that do similar work in this country. And here are the reasons why we are presenting you with option A.'

No different than a month ago – well, it's going back six weeks now – when we had an engaged discussion about the purchase of a \$23,000 vehicle in which there were questions raised about the policy, whether or not we were purchasing the correct vehicle at the right amount for the needs in the municipality. We sent it back to staff. Staff brought it

back two weeks later and we had a vote. And I do think, again, that it behoves us as councillors to ask that a report comes forward that says 'Here is the due diligence that we've done. Here are the companies that we've taken a look at. And this is the reason, X, Y and Z, why we are recommending this particular product.'

Again, I don't have an issue with the product. In fact, I think it may be a very exciting viable option. But when we talk about meeting our ice needs and our aquatic needs, again, I'm not convinced. And I'd like to see a more thorough report that actually compares the operating costs of what was proposed at Central Park versus the standalone structure on a year-round basis at Centennial Pool. We will have a 25-metre pool at Centennial. They Y will still have a 20-metre pool. We will have no therapeutic pool in the town of Collingwood; residents will continue to go to Wasaga Beach.

And something that's never been discussed but I know is certainly on the minds of many, and that is that, when we talk about aquatics, you know, something that's extremely popular, not as costly as some of these other options but may be more valuable and more bank for the buck, is some type of kids' splash park, splash area. And in fact, the Town of Alliston has a great little park, Rotary Park, that has a first-class facility.

But I am concerned, cost aside, we are dividing the community. We cut in our budget last year dollars from the Centennial Pool. We actually closed the hours and reduced the staffing for our residents. So we cut, and now we're going to expand, and yet, I don't think that we are meeting the needs.

The needs to me are a lane pool for competitive swimming. But when I look at the demographics that were provided in the steering committee report, when I look at the demographics that have been provided in Nancy's staff reports, Nancy Farrer's reports through Mark Bryan, I mean we all know where the demographics are heading. And yet, we're prepared to invest in a 25-metre pool that's going to compete with a 20-metre pool, and yet the demographics would suggest that a therapy pool is maybe where we need to be investing our money. That too is a question we need to ask.

I very much would like to see the operating costs side by side; here's option A, here's option B, here are the costs. I honestly can't go through this PowerPoint presentation and try and line up the dots as to where they're comparing one versus the other. And so I would greatly appreciate that, if it could come back to the table.

Mayor Cooper: Thank you for your thoughts, Councillor Hull. Councillor, any other comments, questions from Councillor – Councillor Lloyd?

Cllr. Lloyd: Thank you Your Worship. I have a correction on that cost for the homeowner. I think it's \$43 a year rather than \$75 a year. [Unintelligible 00:09:58]

Mayor Cooper: Thank you. Councillor Cunningham?

Cllr. Cunningham: Yes, thank you Mayor Cooper, just a couple comments, and I'll be very brief –

Mayor Cooper: Thank you.

Cllr. Cunningham: - but I'll be right to the point, that I started, I was employed with the Town of Collingwood May 1, 1980 and stopped my employment in August 31, 2008. And in that time I've worked through I believe seven mayors; you'll be the eighth, and from the day that I was hired, that this has been on the table every five years. And it all comes back to arena and pool every time.

And we go through the process and we almost get to the point, and then all of a sudden we stall or we don't have this information, we don't have that information. And then all of a sudden it goes dead and it just gets shelved, and I've seen this shelved more times than enough. And I'm to the point now, I have done all my homework, I've done all my research, and staff have done theirs, and especially Marjory, our treasurer. And as far as I'm concerned, in fact I know I do not support a motion, I don't put forward a motion and I don't second it unless I've done my homework and I know that this is the right thing to do.

And as far as I'm concerned that this is the right thing to do, and I just hope that this doesn't get stalled and in five years from now we're, whatever council of the day is discussing the same thing again because we don't have this report or we don't have that report. Probably you could paper the walls with reports of this whole council chamber on all the reports and consultant fees and all this other stuff. And as I said on July 16th, we just keep going around and around and around. And I'm jumping off the bus here and saying, I support that motion because I made it. Thank you.

Mayor Cooper: Thank you, Councillor Cunningham. Anything further, Councillor Hull, to be brief.

Cllr. Hull: Sorry, I wasn't finished the last time, but I will be brief.

Mayor Cooper: Thank you.

Cllr. Hull: Having Council direct staff to go out to the market with a January 1, 2013 deadline of kicking the tires to see if there's funding is not going to delay this project. Taking a second sober thought at whether we should actually be putting a standalone arena at Central Park versus maybe some other areas within the community, based on discussions that we as a council have had recently about other additional lands in the community, would be worth consideration.

Determining exactly what it is that we are going to be willing to spend of the taxpayers' money is something that we should ask and determine first. I don't think that those are unreasonable requests moving forward. I am as passionate as anyone else about achieving the recreational needs of this community, and I want to see it go forward.

But the reality is, and in fact, if the timelines can be met from this particular company, which is phenomenal, which is great, this does give us the opportunity for second sober thought, to make sure that we are making the right decision. We can still have a phenomenal opportunity for recreational product, whether it be at Central Park as a whole unit or whether we start to split up the assets.

But let's make sure that, before we spend this kind of dollar, that we ask the types of questions that I've asked this evening, and that we have them come back in the form of a staff report. And if it means that the executive management team and, under the direction of our Parks, Rec and Culture Director, Marg Proctor, if it means that they need additional time, I'm willing to give them the time. This is too much money and too big a decision. And if it takes four, five, six additional months to make the right decision, I'm quite comfortable with that.

Mayor Cooper: Deputy Mayor Lloyd, you had your hand raised. You haven't spoken yet.

DM Lloyd: No, thank you Your Worship. Isn't it wonderful that we're all debating whether we want to spend 10 million, 15, 20, \$30 million; that we're all debating that we really want to get going forward on a project? I think it's unique because we're not battling not to do it. We're all saying yes we need to do it. And we recognize that there is inefficiencies in the community.

And looking at, in the next 10 years, the possibility, from our treasurer, that we will be committed to spending up \$153 million, out of that at least 48 to 55 million of it will be debentured. That's with things that we have a judicial responsibility to, things like roads and sewage plants and water filtration plants and all that.

And my whole method here isn't against the Y or for anything, it's for the youth of our community, to try and get something done, try to get going, get a project going. And hopefully it will be with the Y. Hopefully we can get something going with a partnership that they can operate it.

But it's been a long time. We've been battling this, as my colleague down the table has said, since the mid '80s when I was first elected. We've had opportunities. And you know, I erred back then by voting against some of those opportunities we had, government money available. That's gone now. Now we're looking at opportunities that maybe we can move forward.

I support this proposal. I support going ahead with the Sprung. I think, you know, is it perfect in every way? You can study it to death and you can get two people on the street that may disagree, but I'm telling you that I think that it's a wonderful opportunity. I really feel the compassion from Mr. Cadieux. I think it was wonderful that you come up here, because I don't necessarily disagree. I think our staff have done their due diligence and done it really well. I just, quite frankly, look at how far we are in this term and we're still scrambling to try and come up with a solution. We have it.

I think that it would be wonderful to think this time next year we won't worry about ice time because the youth of this community will have lots. We won't be worrying about people being able to have competitive swim teams playing or swimming in our new refurbished pool. I think it's a win for everybody. I think it's a win for the community.

And looking at what the community has said, all those public meetings weren't in vain. They really did bring out some really good issues that we're listening to. We understand don't have enough aquatics. We understand we don't have enough ice time. How we get there, we're driving the bus a little bit differently but we're going to get there. We're going to have the opportunity to have two and a half ice surfaces that'll be fully operational in the winter months. We'll have a 25-metre pool. Like I said, I hope that we can enter into some operating arrangement with the Y.

I think, you know, I really feel need... I want to move forward. I'm convinced that the timing is right, and quite frankly, I'm not prepared to stall it and keep stalling. And, like I can get more reports and try to find more partners and find – see if we can get more government grants, which it's not there. We were just at AMO and every minister we met with was basically saying the province aren't prepared to be paying any new grants, especially recreationally, right now.

I really believe that we're at a crossroads, that Council should make a decision. We're elected to make decisions. Sometimes those decisions aren't always popular with everyone. I think that what's been presented tonight, by everyone, is wonderful. This is a solution. We can get our feet on the ground and get going, stop us from still planning in the future to make the facilities even better. It just is a perfect opportunity to move forward. Thank you Your Worship.

Mayor Cooper: Thank you. Councillor West?

Cllr. West: Thank you Mayor Cooper. I do have a couple questions before I make some comments. When you talked about the operating cost of the pool, was that 250,000 more than what we already pay? Or is that 250,000 counting what we're already using to operate the outdoor pool?

- Ed Houghton: On a going forward basis, we're estimating that it would be 250,000 net operating costs for the year.
- Cllr. West: So it's 120,000 more than what we're already paying? Or is it...?
- Mayor Cooper: Ms. Leonard?
- Marjory Leonard: Through you Your Worship, it would be about 200 more.
- Cllr. West: That includes the cost of the facility itself, like with electricity and all that. Okay. Again looking at the pool, the panels on the outdoor, you stated a certain number. Is there the option of putting more in to make it more of an outdoor pool in the summer, so you almost have no walls existing in the summer?
- Ed Houghton: Your Worship, through you to Councillor West. We landed on eight because it's based on the spacing of the structure. And we felt that six was optimal on the west side and two on the north side.
- Cllr. West: The question was already answered about what happens if the community doesn't want to spend the \$8 million from the Collus PowerStream transaction. The 8 million doesn't have to go in one place. Like, it could be maybe 4 million to this or whatever?
- Mayor Cooper: Ms. Leonard?
- Marjory Leonard: Through you Your Worship, yes it could be in any way that the public and Council decided to disburse those funds.
- Cllr. West: And we still plan on having that meeting soon, right?
- Marjory Leonard: Absolutely.
- Cllr. West: I still like – I mean I've seen the Ameresco proposal before. I mean, a couple of others have seen it before. And I still like that and I still see, you know, in the future, as we continue to develop the vision that maybe is something there, and maybe there is an opportunity already sitting there for the next step down the road.
- I have said out loud many times that I'm comfortable with anywhere between 10 and \$12 million. I've said that before. And with all due respect to holding another discussion on it, I'm still comfortable with spending 10 to \$12 million. And I was spending that thinking that a good chunk of it was a tax increase. So, I'm comfortable with that.
- I have probably been listening to these as long as Councillor Cunningham has, if not longer. I've been a part of many of them. I don't feel that we've betrayed anybody's input. I don't feel we've betrayed the report. I believe that – and I said this in some emails that I sent out over the weekend – the Central Park Steering Committee Report is always going to be the impetus of whatever happens over

the next few years, because there was so much conversation done with the public and because we have all that information.

I agree it's not the bus route that some people thought, but I also have talked to people in the past couple of weeks, just going out and saying, 'You've heard about this, you've heard about that'. So I mean, obviously, they didn't have a report to do, but they said to me that, when they took part in the Central Park Steering Committee Report, they weren't looking specifically for a certain picture at the end. They were looking for a certain presentation; that we are going to do something about the facilities that we need to deal with.

I mean, I'd love to build something like that tomorrow. But I have the feeling I'm the only one right now that's going to say that. But I do know that when I wake up tomorrow morning that I'm confident I made the right decision by saying yes to this idea to build the rink and to build a pool, and to keep working towards all of that. So I mean, I've been here, I've read the reports, I've reported on the reports, I've reported on the committees, I've done all that over the past 20 years. This isn't an overnight decision for me. This is 20 some years in the making, and I am ready to vote.

Mayor Cooper: Thank you. Councillor Edwards, Councillor Gardhouse.

Cllr. Edwards: Yeah, thank you Your Worship. I'd first like to say that I have faith in the staff report. I don't think we ask our staff to do something and report something unless they've done their due diligence. And if so, they shouldn't be here. And so I appreciate the report and the information that's come forward.

I've had sufficient time to digest it, and I think I've had sufficient time over the years to determine what the needs of the community are. They've been reported many times. We've had many studies over my terms of council, but also prior to that during my term on minor hockey, and nothing has moved ahead. It truly hasn't, mainly because I don't think there were any concrete proposals.

This is the first one with our Central Park Steering Committee that came forward with recommendations. And those recommendations are perhaps not etched in stone, but the needs were there. And I think we need to address those needs now, or it's going to go back on the shelf and it's not going to come down again until another council comes in and dusts it off and we go back to doing it again.

My concern is can we do it cost-effectively, and can we keep Central Park the basis for our recreational facilities. And I've always been a supporter of that. Am I friend of Central Park? Well I am. I've been a big proponent of that since I got elected on Council the first time. It's unfortunate that the Y can't be a financial partner in this, because it would be a good place to put a six-lane competitive pool. But they

haven't come to the table and, truthfully, it doesn't look like they're going to come to it in the future.

And is that fair to put that load on the taxpayers when we have a public pool that we could enclose and make that a competitive pool? And we see where all the competitions are during the summer. If you go down there, there's many, many spectators. So I think it gives us a lot of options.

Is it cost effective? I think we look at that from a tax point of view. And I think the proposal that we saw tonight is. When it doesn't come out of the taxpayers' pocket or on their tax bill, I think it truly is. But it doesn't take away from the fact that we can still improve the facilities that we have, and expand on them, at Central Park in the future. And I think that's important. And as I say, if we don't get going now, personally, I don't think we are going to make that move.

I have confidence in staff and I'm sure, if they come across something that is not to specification or do not think that this is going to function, they will come back with that report and we will adjust it accordingly. But I think if we don't move forward at this time, I'm afraid that we will again, as I mentioned before, put it up on the shelf and it will stay there.

So with that, basically, I think it meets our immediate recreational needs. We're not going to have a lot of our young people going out of town to rent ice time, or our older people for that to go out right now. We will keep basically those dollars in our town. And, if you've been a parent and you've had to take your child out of town to get extra ice time or to play a game when you should be playing in your own arena, and you're a taxpayer and you have the opportunity to do something as we're trying to do, I think that is what we're really looking at here.

And anyway, with that I will pass to Councillor Gardhouse.

Mayor Cooper: Thank you, Councillor Edwards. Councillor Gardhouse?

Cllr. Gardhouse: Thank you Your Worship. I will be very succinct and quick. I personally am prepared to move forward on the arena as presented. However, I think it's fair to say that the pool proposal needs more work. I'm not saying vote it down. I'm saying perhaps defer it for say 90 days until we have a professional pool consultant come up with a business plan and/or a structural report, just a basic overall thing.

I think it is fair to say that the Town of Collingwood has a history of not exactly running year-round pool things successfully, i.e. the Contact Centre. And I think that is worth a second look and there is no rush in that. It's all there. I don't think this is has to be a package to vote on.

So I would vote for the arena. That's the reason I wanted to separate them. I would vote for the arena tonight, and let's just a little bit further study. And I'm not saying we turn it down, I'm saying defer it for a specific time period, say 90 days, whatever's appropriate, pending a report to answer some of the questions we have tonight. The arena's pretty simple. We know that. But it's fair to say the town doesn't know much about running a pool year round, so let's check it out.

Mayor Cooper: Okay, I'll come back to that and a seconder there, Councillor Gardhouse. Deputy Mayor Lloyd, you had your...

Cllr. Lloyd: Can I go first?

Mayor Cooper: Oh sorry, Councillor Lloyd.

Cllr. Lloyd: Thank you Your Worship. Now, this has been debated and been studied and been talked about for over 15 years and I don't know how many councils. We've had ongoing public consultations for all those years, including the latest Central Park Redevelopment Steering Committee Report. It has reconfirmed and prioritized what our needs are and what needs have been requested by the citizens of this town, and it's ice and water. Too many efforts have failed in the past, and that's for numerous reasons. Tonight we have the opportunity to make the people's expressed needs a reality, and do it in a viable, fiscally-responsible way, with the best interest of every citizen of this town at heart.

I believe, like Councillor Edwards, that staff has worked tirelessly and done their due diligence. The reality is, at some point we as Council have to make a decision. Staff's recommendation is not a temporary, short-sighted Band-Aid solution. Quite the contrary, it is an affordable, high-quality, sound, long-term investment in our community. And importantly, it will retain public ownership of the assets and maintain public control over their operation, minimizing future risk. I thank everybody for the work they've done, but I am in favour of this and I will support it.

Mayor Cooper: Thank you, Councillor Lloyd. I think at this point in time we've had a lot of discussion, and I will ask to call the vote. And we've got separated out so thank you very much, Ed and staff. Yes, Councillor Lloyd?

Cllr. Lloyd: Thank you, Your Worship. Could we have a recorded note on this please?

Mayor Cooper: Okay. If I can just – I've sat and chaired and listened to everyone, and we all have a passion for recreation in the community. And I've been here a number of years and it's something that should have happened a long time ago. The needs of the community are long overdue, and due diligence has been explored, has referenced to the staff report and all the work that staff have put into this. I have faith in them. We've

got a CA sitting, or an MBA sitting in, yes, in our council chambers to garner information from her to make sure that we are doing the right thing.

I don't think waiting for upper-tier grants or funding; it's not possible. In looking at just attending the AMO Conference, listening to both Premier McGuinty and also listening to Mr. Hudak, his opposition, there were no exciting announcements for funding. We could wait and maybe five years from now there might be something.

Also, I've just been informed today that my – everyone knows I'm usually in the arena with my grandson for hockey and for Collingwood Minor Hockey Association – we're going to be travelling to Stayner to watch his hockey games. His home rink will be Stayner. You know, those are the needs that I see that are required facing.

We look at Etobicoke; they have the former Lions Arena or the Mastercard Centre, a \$43 million facility. They can't meet their loan payments according to Toronto Life magazine just recently came out. I don't want to put us as taxpayers in that type of a situation.

And I'm excited about all the information that I've received from the taskforce. They've provided me with a wealth of knowledge that some that I knew and some that I didn't know going forward. So, I thank the taskforce for all they've provided to us, and their time and dedication. We appreciate that. And I'm prepared to vote now, and I'll look to the clerk to call the question for the first part.

Clerk Almas: Thank you. At the request of Councillor Gardhouse, the motion has been divided into two motions. The first one being voted on this evening is to direct staff to proceed with the purchase and construction of an insulated architectural membrane facility for year-round single-pad ice arena at Central Park. All those in favour of the motion, please rise. Thank you, you may be seated. Those opposed, please rise. Thank you, motion is carried.

Mayor Cooper: So, just if I can, we've got a motion to defer if you have a seconder, Councillor Gardhouse.

Cllr. Gardhouse: Yes, I'd like a motion to defer for a period of 90 days the motion regarding the pool pending a report from a professional pool consultant, a business plan and structural audit.

Mayor Cooper: We can look for a seconder to that. And there's no chance for discussion at a deferral. Councillor Edwards?

Cllr. Edwards: Your Worship, I just have a question regarding the 90 days, if we could ask staff if it could be done earlier than that, sooner than that? We're looking three months there.

Mayor Cooper: Mr. Houghton?

- Ed Houghton: I can say up to, if you want that.
- Mayor Cooper: Up to 90 days for deferral on the pool. So, do we have a seconder on that deferral?
- Cllr. Lloyd: I will second it to put it on the table for Councillor Gardhouse.
- Mayor Cooper: Okay, and was there a request for a recorded vote for the deferral?
- Clerk Almas: Calling the vote for deferral of up to 90 days for a professional review and audit of the plan for the recovering over Centennial Pool and a structural audit. All those in favour, please rise. Thank you, you may be seated.
- Cllr. Gardhouse: I'll sit down now.
- Clerk Almas: All those opposed, please rise. Thank you, you may be seated. The deferral is defeated.
- Clerk Almas: So back to the second portion of this motion to direct staff to proceed with the purchase and construction of an insulated architectural membrane structure over the existing outdoor pool, including the removal and reconstruction of the existing building. All those in favour, please rise. Thank you, you may be seated. All those opposed, please rise. Thank you, you may be seated. Motion is carried.
- Mayor Cooper: Thank you Clerk Almas.

[End of recorded material 03:38:00]