

July 16, 2012

[Start of recorded material 00:04:31]

Sandra Cooper: Next up we have deputations, Central Park Community Recreation Centre. We have with us Brian Saunderson, Claire Tucker-Reid, and Penny Skelton. And I would ask Penny to come forward first. Total you have 10 minutes. I'm sure the clerk's department have reminded you of that. And Penny, I know that you're representing Parks Rec and Culture today as chair.

Penny Skelton: Yes I am, your Worship. Thank you. Ooh, a little bit of kickback. And Sara's going to be happy because I'm way under 10 minutes because I actually wrote my – didn't want to miss any points, so.

Good afternoon Mayor Cooper and members of council.

As previously said, I'm Penny Skelton and I've asked to speak with you regarding support for the Central Park Redevelopment Project – don't spit in the mic, Penny.

Today I stand before you representing the collective voice of the Parks, Recreation and Culture Committee. As chair of this committee I've had the opportunity to both listen to the PRCAC support and concerns regarding this project, as well as representing PRCAC on the steering committee Phase 1 of Central Park which have completed their task.

It's been a fascinating learning curve regarding the development of a major recreational facility for our community.

First and foremost I must state that the – I've got a real echo here. Don't know about there.

First and foremost I must state the PRC Advisory Committee has been fully engaged in the process undertaken in investigating establishing water and ice at the Central Park location. I'll go try going that way.

One of the main reasons that I stand here today is that as an advisory committee, we discuss and truly understand the importance and value of the planning process for both small and large projects. Whether we're discussing what needs to be done to facilitate a new sports group establishing themselves in the community, such as recently our new tennis club, or the new potential development of the ever-talked-about multiuse facility.

I'm just having trouble with mics today.

The PRC committee have discussed the need to develop the roadmap for recreational facilities and amenities. We've now

become involved in the process, which the department has undertaken to update the recreation master plan.

Involvement in this process has established in our collective minds the need to refresh and expand the facility inventory to include the ongoing maintenance requirements, lifespan of facilities relating to capital costs, as well as the operational efficiencies.

In other words, upgrades versus replacement values.

I can relate to this process as a business owner because any good business must have a strong business plan. Traditionally within our business we create a five-year plan, which once established is renewed annually. When year one's completed we review the priorities and the goals. And then year two becomes year one and we add another one on the end.

In our case we work on a five-year projection. We should always have a concept of our direction for a minimum of five years. Recreation planning may require a longer forecast than five years, but the principles are the same.

We are acutely aware of the need for a second ice surface within the community. When council began this process it charged the committee with investigating establishing water and ice facilities at Central Park. The report came forward in March of 2012, presented a vision for the redevelopment of the park. This report was received and adopted by council.

Over 18 months' investment of time and talent was applied to the creation of the plan. One major element of the process was community input. We held meetings, asked questions, listened to both the positive and negative feedback. The community as a whole had the opportunity to speak through these public meetings, online surveys, as well as interviews with the major stakeholders and user groups.

The PRC committee support the department's initiative in both the planning and consultation process. We believe that the department must manage and maintain current facilities as well as establish future direction of facility development.

Our major concern is as follows.

Since the adoption of the report, many different options for these particular facilities and their development have been discussed. Individual elements such as an arena or pool are bandied about as viable alternatives to the project as a whole.

As a committee our major concern is many of the new alternatives being discussed are being done so without any operational costs attached. For instance, we now operate an outdoor pool for three

months of the year. If council is considering covering the outdoor pool, we'd now be operating a 12-month facility.

The department budget would have to increase, Mr. Lloyd.

The department budget really would have to increase. Also many users of the outdoor ice rink at Central Park have contacted committee members to state that covering the outdoor ice rink won't extend the length of time they can skate. But it would cost a significant amount of money to cover, and then the users will no longer be able to enjoy the fun of skating outdoors.

I have heard that from so many people.

Also, the future of the Eddie Bush has come up for a great deal of discussion. Stay or not, that is the question.

We believe council need to set a clear direction for our recreation future in Collingwood. Remember, it isn't just build it and they will come. It's build it, be able to afford to staff it, and operate the facilities efficiently.

Often at our PRCAC meetings I wrap up the discussion by indicating that our collective voices are included in our minutes, which go forward to council. But all action is at the will of council. As council's advisory committee we believe in maintenance, upgrading and development of all our community facilities.

But please in your wisdom and planning consider the implications for operational or budget allocations. Today's decisions will have implications for many future generations.

The end.

Do you have any questions?

Sandra Cooper: Questions of clarity? No? I'll ask then Brian and Claire if they'd like to come forward as co-chairs from the former task force committee.

Welcome Brian.

Brian Saunderson: Thank you. Good afternoon, mayor, deputy mayor and council. Hope you're all surviving the heat and enjoying it. I was talking to a client the other day. He told me this kind of weather costs you \$2,000 in February because you've got to go south to get it. So we shouldn't be complaining.

I'm here today approximately a year from the time that my co-chair and I, Claire Tucker-Reid, first spoke to this council about the Central Park Steering Committee Phase 1. And we're here today to do a brief presentation too. We have a PowerPoint presentation.

Terry, I don't know if you have it up. Are you the AV guy today or who am I working with?

Sandra Cooper: I'm sure Larry with his expertise in IT can pull that together.

Brian Saunderson: While Larry's bringing that up – oh, thank you Larry. You can – if I do that we'll switch on the second one.

So the presentation overview today is we have a deputation context. Collingwood Now and Into the Future, the project history, of which most of you are well aware. The key issues as the steering committee sees them are our key messages for you today. Our suggested next steps, and the concluding statements.

I will be opening the presentation today with the deputation context, and then I will be handing over to Claire Tucker-Reid, who has a vast experience with the City of Toronto in this type of project and as a consultant in this area. And she will take you through the history, key messages, key issues and suggested next steps, and I will have a brief word in concluding statements.

This deputation is largely in response to the strategic planning session that this council held in the library approximately one month ago, at which we heard from all of you about your views of the Central Park proposal, possible options and next steps.

And we're here today, Claire and I, as the co-chairs of the steering committee to support the work of the Phase 1 committee, which represented a significant amount of community input on the community recreation centre as you know. There were two online surveys, there was a blogpost that received a number – many, many hundreds of hits. There were two open planning sessions, and the report that came to you at the beginning of March was a consolidation of all that input and I thought a well-thought out and put-together document that really summarized what we saw as the needs of this community, not only today, but as we move forward for many generations to come over the next 60 years.

And this program, really, is a one-off chance for this town to build a recreation facility as it will have a lifespan of 60 years and it will service hundreds, possibly thousands of Collingwood residents on an ongoing basis as we move into the future.

So we are at a watershed moment here. This is a point in time when we are looking at establishing a legacy as opposed to a compromise.

We're also here today to offer advice as to what is considered the most responsible and responsive approach to developing a community recreation centre, and that has to look in terms of capital costs for today, and for ongoing maintenance as well as

operating costs and operating models as we carry this facility forward into the future to service our residents.

That I'm going to pass over to Claire.

Claire Tucker-Reid: Members of the council -

Sandra Cooper: Welcome Claire.

Claire Tucker-Reid: Thank you. And members of the public.

We also want to state that we're not here to defend to the Nth degree the Central Park Recreational Community Centre as the only option. We think that we went through a tremendous amount of due diligence and I think you've recognized that and are appreciative of that.

But we want to make sure that any future options that are on the table follow the same due diligence, and as Brian said, for every single option we need to know what the conceptual drawing is, what the capital costs are, what the operating costs are, what the impacts on the community are, and as you know, that will require an investment of funding as well.

It was clear that our mandate was to only look at Central Park and we followed that mandate. But we are not here to defend it to the Nth degree, although we are here to defend a community recreation centre that has one-stop shopping. That can welcome all generations of the community, that there's that social interaction. And frankly we've heard that loud and clear throughout the consultations as you did.

So just a bit of history. Collingwood now and to the future, there are components of the community that we have to consider regardless of where and when. And as an aside, frankly we're thrilled that you're spending the time looking at recreation facilities in Collingwood. You care, you know the impacts of recreation on a community, and that means a lot to us and the community. But thank you for continuing to have this on your agenda to find the right solution for Collingwood.

But the town is a growth node, as we know. It will continue to grow. So the weight of this community centre rests on your shoulders. You have not only to consider what's economically feasible today, but what social – what social impacts will have on your community for generations to come.

So as this town grows, that becomes – that exemplifies and I don't envy your position whatsoever.

The older population will continue to grow, as you know, and we have to consider that some communities, the older population is 26

percent of the community already. This is growing and will show itself in many, many ways in Collingwood through employment opportunities, through continued volunteerism, through meeting the needs of the new senior. And the new senior isn't somebody that sits back and goes and plays cards and bridge. I'm there's definitely a component of that. But the new senior, A, doesn't want to be accounted as, or counted as a senior. We're young adults and we will be older adults, but never a senior. We don't want to join that club. We advocate for what we want and these are proven out in research and studies.

So we want to be active and we don't want to be necessarily in a seniors' class. We want to be in with adults. So this is a whole different notion of what older adults will bring to communities. And you need to consider that.

We know that well-planned recreation infrastructure attracts business, attracts residents, attracts other social components, and infrastructure. So we need to be cognizant of that.

We know that the current infrastructure – recreation infrastructure doesn't meet the needs in Collingwood and something needs to happen, although the urgency, I think we can discuss in a bit.

If we could have the next slide. Great.

Central Park history is very much aligned with council's strategic plan, that your direction and was to develop the implementation strategy to build a multipurpose recreation facility. We can't forget that.

Our work has always been aligned with that. The thinking to put one facility here and another there needs significant consideration, not only from an operating impact standpoint, but from what the community has called for.

So at the very least we need to develop these concepts and get back to the community for their further input to weigh those two options.

As you know, our process was professional, it was completed by a significant number of very intelligent folks in the community. And we did come and follow suit with our deliverables in terms of the conceptual plan, capital operating impacts and staffing.

Brian iterated that – oh next slide please. Thank you – that council unanimously endorsed the Central Park Recreational Community Centre in principle, and there were provisos, absolutely. The funding needed to be dealt with and still needs to be dealt with. The relocation of the ball diamonds as well as dealing with Eddie Bush. So these things still need to be in the mix of any other options.

And as you can see, we're pretty married to the one-stop shopping concept. We know that the community wanted that. We heard that from many generations wanting the social space, promoting activity within the centre. So that will be one thing that I think you'll hear loud and clear from the deputation this evening.

We also went to many other communities as part of our due diligence. And we saw that the impact that one community centre had on the strength, the cohesion and the pride of communities. So I think that guiding principle still needs to be apparent somehow or addressed somehow in any other scenario.

Moving on to key issues. Thank you.

The public's spoken through surveys, as Brian said. The blog site, we understand from planning staff that it received the most comments from the community. So while we hope that our recommendations to you were representative, I think that they were more significant than most projects because we received so much and went to great lengths to include people's – their thoughts.

But the strongest wish was for one-stop shopping through a community hub of activity, centred with social spaces to animate the community and bring that pride and cohesion.

Key issues.

There is currently, and we fully understood this all along, inadequate funding in the reserve to build the community recreation centre. That's a given. Our next phase, your next phase, regardless of how it's done, needs to look at that funding strategy. And whether it's now or later, I think that would need public input as well.

My strong sense is that the public would rather see one community centre, one community hub of activity that is well-planned for and saved for and prepared for, versus a facility here and there throughout the community.

Moving on to key messages.

As you know, the public has indicated a strong preference for one centre with all components. There are 455 or 52 municipalities in Ontario. Most are moving – if they haven't moved already in that direction, are moving in that direction. They're multipurpose facilities. I do master plans which include 25-year projections how the public will grow, the demographics, the socioeconomics, and they're all centred on these community hubs. In larger community hubs, often they're smaller and community – they service neighbourhoods, but in smaller communities there's a central hub that's very visible and highly used.

And we only have to look to very close communities to see that community centre concept in evidence and has been very well received.

The other point I want to raise with council is the efficiencies of having one location.

If you have an arena in one location and another arena in another, you have two operating crews. So instead of six staff that can handle ice clearing, maintenance of change rooms, maintenance of the lobby area etcetera, you can't switch them back and forth. They can't be driving back and forth. So you will actually have double the staff.

The pool in a separate location, as you know if it was centred in Central Park the Y would handle those – the net deficit operating costs on an annual basis. And that's in the range of \$350,000. I'm not sure if the Y would operate but I think there would be a fee involved.

So frankly, I strongly recommend one location because your operating costs will add up over time: \$350,000 for a swimming pool, \$250,000 net deficit for another arena, additional staff, you're projecting two additional, now it would be six. You need a staff person on each shift.

Where in an arena you can double up, and with a separate pool you need, for safety reasons, often enough if someone's – due to the Health Act someone needs to be there while an operator is vacuuming the pool.

So I know this, I've run facilities, I'm offering you my very best advice for future consideration.

So our key messages again, you've got a well-documented and professional plan before you. I'm contracted to do this very same thing for four other communities right now. I'm not taking the plan in its entirety, but I'm saying take the due diligence that has gone into that plan and apply the same principles to any other option.

I would really wish, or we'd really wish, that council would consider the urgency of moving forward. Our thinking is that when a community has a concept and goes forward with working drawings and has a reserve fund for one-third of the project, often enough an infrastructure program comes along from the province – we've had three in the last 10 years – from the province and the federal government to match that two-third funding.

Our key message to you is the most responsible approach is to be ready. To have a plan for this community. To test the urgency of this centre. And to do it once and do it right.

Brian?

Sandra Cooper: We're just about wrapping up Brian -

Brian Saunderson: About done? Okay.

Sandra Cooper: For 10 minutes total.

Brian Saunderson: Well, let's go beyond suggested next steps then, please, Larry. Go to the concluding statement.

What I think Claire has iterated very well on behalf of the steering committee is that we stay the course, or this council stay the course and pursue the funding alternatives and options for a Central Park development or other possible developments going through the proper due diligence to identify the capital costs and operating costs to carry those forward. So that when the community is afforded an opportunity for input they're comparing apples to apples. They know the differences, they know what they're comparing.

We believe this council has shown great leadership in the past, and will do the right thing to preserve this exciting vision for the committee of recreation, our recreation in Collingwood.

And as we sit on the eve of the Olympics, I'm reminded of a statement made by Adam van Koeverden, triple gold medals to the Olympics. He carried the flag out of the Olympics two Olympics ago after winning a gold and silver – gold and bronze, I think, and the last time he carried the flag in when he won a bronze. And he's going again this time.

And they asked him if this was going to be his final Olympics and what he said to them is, on my life I operate my drive for pursuit of excellence on the basis of what pulls me as opposed to what pushes me.

Now what the distinction is there, he says I will leave when I am ready, I will leave on my own terms, and I will leave because I have a vision that pulls me onto something else. I will not be pushed.

And what we're suggesting to this council today is that you pursue this vision. You push forward for the pursuit of excellence for recreation in Collingwood, and you use a vision and you pursue that vision so that it pulls the community together to work together to make this vision a reality.

And that you not be pushed into something else that is substandard for other motivations.

That's our message today.

Thank you.

Sandra Cooper: Thank you very much.

Council, any questions? Clarification/

Thank you very much.

[End of recorded material 00:28:31]

[Start of recorded material 00:40:46]

Sandra Cooper: Next we have A5, Councillor Chadwick.

Ian Chadwick: Thank you Your Worship. It's the same kind of thing, this is a request for a delegation for June 25th meeting, and I would like it if we could – and I know that was done on short notice, but again if we could have some heads-up on these things, I would have liked to have heard what they had to say. And I know this is your prerogative as to who has a request for delegation, but perhaps we could have asked them for other information.

Sandra Cooper: I'll just pass – and my understanding is the clerk's office had invited them to make a deputation. I'm looking at Mr. Houghton as well.

Ed Houghton: And Your Worship, in this letter it came from them, addressed to you, but also CC'd to all of council. I also was CC'd – I spoke to Ms. Almas and discussed it. We felt that it needed to go on the consent agenda again. But it did say that all of you were CC'd. If you didn't get it, then they didn't do it, but at the back of the letter it shows CC'd to council.

So we made the incorrect assumption that they followed through with what they were saying they would do. So our apologies for not checking with them. But that was our thought.

Tonight what we felt was that we didn't believe that it would be appropriate for them to come and provide you with an explanation of what they think they could do for us in the future. We thought that it was only appropriate to hear from Parks, Recreation and Culture and the committee that was involved with this, and with council.

So that was the decision that Her Worship and I made thinking that it wasn't probably appropriate to do it at this point in time.

But the letter was supposed to have been CC'd to all of you folks.

[End of recorded material 00:42:41]

[Start of recorded material 1:48:40]

Sandra Cooper: And next up we have under old or deferred business, and I think we'll get right to the first on the list, which is Central Park redevelopment discussion slash, direction. And I will ask Mr. Houghton if he'd like to begin.

Ed Houghton: Thank you very much your worship.

I just wanted to remind council and the viewing audience that on June the 11th we held a council meeting that was over in committee rooms B and C at the Collingwood Public Library. The meeting at that time was primarily to discuss the Central Park Community Recreational facility and we started the meeting, and I'd mentioned that the costs of such a facility are significantly less than if you were to be building a waste water treatment plant that has significant regulation and those kinds of things around it. But because of its very nature, the decision to build a recreation facility that is also expensive is significantly more difficult to make. It's more difficult because there's passion, there's more difficulty because people use it and they see it and they feel it and they're out enjoying it.

And one of the things we also said was we wanted to get this right. We wanted to get it right for council, and we wanted to get it right for the citizens.

At the meeting we had a wonderful opportunity to hear all the views and opinions of council, and throughout that we noticed that there were a number of common themes.

At the conclusion of the meeting it was decided that staff would review all of the existing approved resolutions and supply council with a series of those resolutions as well as any new resolutions that would allow us to continue to move forward. And again, along with pertinent background and options, and that's what you have in front of you.

What we would like to do is review those options, review the current ones and the existing ones, and provide you with a little bit of background on the salient points. We're not going to go word by word.

We acknowledge that this is somewhat complicated. It could even seem somewhat convoluted when we're going through it. But we would ask for your indulgence and not to get too frustrated with us. We will work our way through it.

I would offer, through you, Your Worship, that if there are questions please utilize the experiences of Ms. Almas when it comes to process and those kinds of things. Please utilize Ms. Proctor because she has lived and breathed this project for quite

some time. And if there's something that they can't answer, which I doubt, you could ask me as well.

Before we move forward, Your Worship, I think I have to tell you that Ms. Proctor and her passion for this project cannot and should not go unnoticed. She's put a lot of effort and time into this, and I think that she should be commended.

The executive management's team's biggest difficulty with Marta is to harness that passion and to try to put it down on paper. And it's been a significant project. But I think that council should acknowledge her efforts.

I would also like to point out the efforts of the executive management team that have been working alongside Marta in an attempt to try to move this project forward in a way that the people of Collingwood wish to see.

Our goal this evening is to again provide you with more information, the additional information, repackage it, let you see it from a different perspective possibly, so that council can provide staff with clear direction that will allow us to continue to move forward in a positive and productive manner.

I would, through you, Your Worship, ask if Ms. Almas, I think she's the carrier of all the different resolutions, and she will sort of provide those to you to move forward. And again I think that Ms. Proctor has a presentation of the resolutions and some of the salient points of the background and the options that you may choose to discuss this evening.

Sandra Cooper: Thank you very much, Ed.

So at this point in time I'd like to welcome Marta Proctor. Ms. Proctor, if you'd come to the podium please. And certainly well said by Mr. Houghton that you have spent a lot of resource on this particular item. And council recognizes that along with the task force and we appreciate that. Thank you.

Marta Proctor: Thank you very much, Your Worship, and through you to members of council and the public I would like to walk through the package that was provided to council. As Ed Houghton has highlighted, at the council workshop on June 11th there was a lot of discussion about this project and a lot of very valuable input, and then staff were asked to take that information and somehow synthesize it into resolutions and providing some background and options for consideration this evening.

So in preparing this package I've organized the information in sort of two directions. Direction A provides council with options to continue supporting the Central Park redevelopment

recommendation as it was presented by the steering committee, however capturing some opportunities to adjust that scenario based on the discussion that occurred.

And then there's also a Direction B which would allow council to consider some alternate options that were also discussed and brought forward in that workshop.

So I thought it might be best to walk through all the resolutions and recommendations under Direction A, and then review Direction B, and then council can give their feedback and input on it all. Or ask questions.

So first of all, under Direction A, the first resolution that was approved by council was that council endorses in principle the recommended scenario for the redevelopment of Central Park. And again, I believe we heard very clearly that overall there was a lot of support for the work that's happened and the information that had been compiled to date.

However, the price tag was an issue and council was looking for alternatives that could help address some of the priorities that the community had identified. And therefore there was another motion put forward here that asks council to consider directing staff to obtain architectural and engineering and site plan drawings that would include phasing options for consideration. And there was also clearly emphasis on dealing with the ice shortages.

So this recommendation prioritizes ice surfaces.

In looking at all the resolutions we felt that if there isn't continued support for this resolution, alternatively council could look at removing all previously supported resolutions with respect to the redevelopment of Central Park and then move forward with Direction B.

So there's background and options that were highlighted, just recapturing information that was previously provided, as well as information that was discussed that day, and that's all included in full in the report.

The second motion that was previously approved by council was that council approved the development of a funding strategy with recommendations to be presented within six months. And in that funding strategy we looked at several components, one of which was exploring public/private partnerships. It also looked at a capital fund campaign, internal funding resources and potentially exploring federal and provincial grants.

During our discussions at the session on June 11th there was considerable discussion related to the market sounding of

public/private partnerships. And therefore at this point we are recommending that we continue with moving forward with the funding strategy, however, should council choose, they can choose to not proceed with the detailed market sounding at this time, and instead direct staff to continue exploring other potential funding opportunities and those can be presented in the 2013 budget deliberations.

The third resolution that was approved was that council authorize the establishment of a Phase 2 Central Park Community Recreation Centre steering committee. And again, with the questions being raised about which direction we're going to proceed moving forward with, and exactly which skill set or what configuration would best assist with that process, we have provided an alternative and that is that council herein proceed with a Phase 2 steering committee that perhaps could include council representatives as well as staff, and then any other volunteers that they would deem appropriate. Or that council choose to rescind the previous decision on establishing a Phase 2 steering committee.

And then the fourth resolution that was approved was that council authorize staff to develop actions and timelines for all of the recommendations as outlined in the steering committee report to be presented within six months. And given that we are reconsidering or considering the direction we're moving forward, we are putting forward a recommendation that council consider deferring this resolution until all other aspects of this project have been defined.

So those are the recommendations that have been approved to date with options for consideration for council. As I said at the beginning, if the first resolution that endorses in principle the recommended scenario is rescinded, we would then move to Option B. And under Option B we've tried to capture all the various other ideas, and there could be potentially other ideas that could be added or prioritized, and that would give council the opportunity to put forward new resolutions today to explore any of these that they deem appropriate.

So the ones that have been highlighted with some high level benefits and challenges include:

Constructing a single pad arena and retaining Eddie Bush.
Constructing a double pad arena that could be phased.

Constructing a 25-metre, six-lane pool at the Central Park YMCA.
So just focusing on the pool.

The same could be put forward regarding a new therapeutic leisure pool.

There was discussion about a theatre performing arts centre being added to the proposed multiuse centre.

There has been some discussion about enclosing the outdoor rink with a fabric building.

About covering the outdoor rink with a permanent roof structure.

About covering the outdoor pool with a fabric building.

And then there was also some discussion about examining a new site for a phased purpose multiuse facility.

And staff have also put forward a recommendation that no new facilities be pursued at this time. Very cautiously.

So these are the assimilation of all the proposed ideas that were discussed at some point. And again, we would recommend that if we are adding any new or different components that further research and analysis on costing and implications would need to be done as well as some form of feedback from the community on these.

And the resolutions are outlined on the final page.

Sandra Cooper: Thank you very much, Marta. And certainly we'll take questions, and just to clarify things, so before procedurally with recommendation Direction A, recommendations the alternative rescinding any previous resolutions, could you explain that, Clerk Almas.

Sara Almas: Certainly, through Your Worship to members of council.

Basically staff have discussed the process on rescinding the individual resolutions and felt that since this would really be a matter of reconsideration that it would be simpler just to lump it into one motion, and that motion would require a two-thirds majority vote to pass.

If it doesn't pass by two-thirds then we'd have to look at alternative resolutions suggested.

Sandra Cooper: Thank you very much.

Okay, if council have questions of Ms. Proctor or Mr. Houghton.

Ed Houghton: Your Worship – sorry, through you to council, and again what we're trying to provide you is a menu of options that you can think about. And there's an opportunity for you to sort of mix and match these. There's an opportunity to be creative and do others. This was just some that we've had. As an example Councillor Lloyd had

contacted us with an additional one. We've had conversations with Councillor West today. So there's a whole opportunity for others.

We just left it with these 10 and wanted to invite creativity and some thoughts and comments on all of them. So it is kind of a menu of options for you to choose from.

Marta Proctor: And as well, the clerk actually has the options that we'll send out when it's appropriate to members of council.

Sandra Cooper: Councillor Edwards.

Mike Edwards: Yes, thank you Your Worship. Just a question regarding the resolutions, to start off with – and I'll speak later if I may. But I just want to clarify something. If we're saying that alternately the council herein rescinds all previous resolutions, all of those four would be gone. And the one that I would question, I guess, is the reason why they all have to go because there is one about the establishment of a Phase Two steering committee, or committee. Which – does that need to be brought back then as a resolution? Obviously you can see, I still think there should be a committee somewhere, or – and I don't – I wouldn't like to see that resolution gone. I don't have any problems with the others at this point, but if that's the way we're going to go, do we have to go that route or do we need to go that route and then bring it back as a separate resolution after the discussion is over, or the direction that council has.

Sara Almas: Through Your Worship to members of council, and it may be supplemented by our director of Parks Rec and Culture, however, if council would like to continue on with this steering committee, right now the approved establishment actually defined the structure. So the alternative motion that's in this package tonight would be approving a different structure.

So if you ultimately would prefer to go with this structure that we're – simply – or I guess we're currently pursuing, then we wouldn't want to rescind that resolution. We can go through them individually to rescind if that's the preference.

Mike Edwards: Well that's just what I wondered, Sara, actually, is if we go with rescinding all of them as a package then – I'd rather see them individually perhaps at this point.

Sandra Cooper: Yes, it's okay. We can do that.

Mike Edwards: Well it's up to council if -

Sandra Cooper: We can propose that. I'll change my wording. We can propose that.
Councillor West.

- Dale West: Thank you Mayor Cooper -
- Sandra Cooper: Were you finished Councillor Edwards at this point?
- Mike Edwards: At this point, yes, Your Worship.
- Sandra Cooper: Okay.
- Mike Edwards: Thank you. It was just to clarify that.
- Sandra Cooper: Sure.
- Dale West: Thank you Mayor Cooper. Actually I was just going to make a point to Councillor Edwards' comment because if, for some reason, we did do that, rescind everything there could be no Phase 2 committee because we just wiped out the existence of Phase 1 anyway. Said it didn't exist by wiping it out. So we would have to wipe out everything and start with options on B and how we did all that.
- So – just my feeling on that one. I've got more for later, but we'll see where we're going here.
- Sandra Cooper: Okay. Thank you. Any other questions, council? Deputy Mayor Lloyd.
- Rick Lloyd: Worship, are you suggesting recommendations at this point or just questions?
- Sandra Cooper: Well I'm – I'd like if – open it up to questions and comments, and then I do have the resolutions to bring forward through the discussion.
- Councillor Hull?
- Keith Hull: Thank you Your Worship. Through you to my colleagues and to members of the community.
- Like everyone I too have been invested in this project since day one. And I appreciate the comments of the former chair, co-chair, Brian Saunderson this evening in closing when he talked about push and pull. And I would like to subscribe to the pull theory and continue to pull the community together in moving this project forward.
- Since our meeting over at the library a month ago, it's been brought to my understanding that other opportunities may be in the offing. And this is of concern to me. Only in the sense that as the other co-chair, Claire Tucker-Reid mentioned, if we are to start to look at other opportunities, that it be vetted in a similar process, that it highly engages the community, that we ensure that we are actually looking at the facts, and that we are comparing apples to apples to

ensure that we are making the best decision for not only today, but for tomorrow.

When we put our community together, I was pleased that in one form or another I felt that we had a real cross-section of the community. You had people who were highly engaged in a volunteer capacity with legal profession, engineering profession, medical community, past political, education, and the list goes on.

And to have a committee like this come together and spend the hours that they have working on behalf of the community, and to put a document together like the one that they have, in my opinion it behoves us to continue the process to see the process to a conclusion. And the conclusion would be that we continue to look at the Central Park opportunity as a master plan and to ask the questions.

We have yet to ask the questions. The questions being is the money available?

This past Sunday or Monday in the Owen Sound paper there was an article online that talked about the new \$39 million community facility that was just opened. A facility that has, among other things, a double ice surface, both NHL size, and a pool complex.

And similar to Central Park, it's a facility that's not only a partnership between the municipal, but it's a partnership with the YMCA of Grey County, I believe, or Owen Sound. And it also talked about the funding in terms of where some of the dollars came from, and it talked about how there were federal, provincial, county and private dollars available.

I truly believe that this community, and the generosity that has been expressed in a number of other ways, if given the opportunity would rise to the occasion, and would A, support this project in its current concept, and 2, would prove to us that they are willing to financially support a portion.

No one around this table has ever suggested that the \$34 million bill be funded entirely by the taxpayer. So if the question is a portion has to come to other – or from others, why have we not allowed ourselves the opportunity to ask that question?

And to Councillor Edwards point, I think you're bang on, that as part of that second committee, one of the key elements is that we have to have a funding strategy put in place that would allow us to go out to see if the dollars are there.

I will be the first to contend that if the money isn't there, then we have to start looking at other alternatives. The other alternatives being whether we phase in a Central Park project, whether we

phase in a project elsewhere, or whether we look at completely different scenarios that we're not looking at today.

When I read there the 10-page report that Director Proctor put together, which I greatly appreciate, thank you. And you and I have spoken so many times about this. I went back to some of the previous documents that were put together by previous councils. And if I may, I just want to take a minute to go through two in particular.

This one I think is absolute – this is critical to a discussion. The differences in capital and operating costs for centralized and decentralized facilities, there's no question that multiuse complexes are most cost effective. Capital costs are reduced when space is shared. Operating costs are lowered due to more efficient allocation of staff, and in some cases energy savings from shared physical plants.

No municipality would develop a single-pad arena if a twin pad was possible because of the operating cost savings. The possible cost saving must be quantified and measured against other considerations to determine if Collingwood is prepared to pay a premium for decentralized facilities.

This is from our own Leisure Services Master Plan of 2007.

In an absolute related question, or ... this one kind of hits home, to be quite honest.

For the first time since I took office, back in 2010 I guess it was, I had somebody point blank say to me, you don't understand because you're not from here. And they were referring to the Eddie Bush arena. I ended the conversation because I felt that if I continued the conversation I'd probably say something I would regret.

Last year my son, Aiden, played hockey for the first time. And although I was a goalie, against my better judgement I allowed him to play goal. And in his first game as a goalie he allowed 11 goals.

I fully anticipated that I was going to go in the dressing room and find a young boy in tears. And yet what I found was a young boy who could speak only of the best save that he made. In fact it probably was the only save that he made. And many of you know that that young boy, Aiden, idolizes Carey Price of the Montreal Canadiens, and has convinced me that someday he will be drafted by the Canadiens. And I've told him quite frankly if he's drafted he can play for anyone.

But I go back to the same Leisure Services plan with regards to Eddie Bush, because this seems to now have become a lightning rod within the community. I would never impose my opinion with

regards to the Eddie Bush on anyone else. What I would impose, or what I would like to discuss, are the facts.

Impact on the downtown of relocating the Eddie Bush arena. We understand that relocating the arena was strongly opposed in the past by some segments of the community at least in part because of an anticipated negative impact on downtown business.

The issue needs to be addressed and decisions made on the results of a study that would explore among other questions, 1, the extent to which use of downtown businesses by residents using the arena or visitors, people in town for a tournament as an example, is dependant upon the arena location in the downtown, and 2, whether alternative uses for the arena or the arena site could potentially draw more people into the downtown and have a more positive impact on local business.

If a convincing case can be made that the arena has a positive and irreplaceable economic impact on the downtown, the facility should be retained until such time as capital conservation costs are prohibitive.

However, in anticipation that the arena may be relocated at some time in the future, the multiuse complex should be sited and designed in a manner that would allow – to accommodate this ice surface in the future.

And again, this is from our very own Leisure Services master plan in June of 2007.

I think it's unfortunate that something that was drafted in 2007 has yet to be answered in 2012. I fully understand the memories and emotional attachment to a facility. I too grew up playing in a memorial arena. However, I think that we need to know full well what the operating costs of such a building would be going forward, and what the costs would be to maintain such a structure as compared to the economic costs savings that are potential in twinning such a facility in the future, whether it be at the same time or in a phase capacity.

The other reason that there's been discussion about the possibility of enclosing or simply utilizing the current outdoor facility that's at Central Park, and the one issue or question I have specific to that would be that there seems to be the opinion that we can simply just enclose the current outdoor facility and we have a second outdoor hockey rink.

If we go back to the plan that was developed – and this is dated July the 15th, 2010, for the Collingwood ice surface roof, this diagram – and I apologize that it's not visible – clearly outlines that if we were to enclose a rink, that we would still be in a position

where we would be relocating current facilities including the lawn bowling club, and secondly one of the two diamonds – and I defer to Councillor West who is a diamond expert through his umpiring – one of our two better diamonds, would in fact actually have to be minimized in terms of size and actually relocated. And this was already documented.

So we're still in a position where if we look at doing some type of interim solution, that we would be looking at having to relocate or allocate other amenities that are currently on site, either within the site or elsewhere.

And so therefore I go back to the original plan that was put together by the steering committee, and I would simply just suggest that we continue the fine work that the committee put together. We asked the question, and the question is, is the money available from other sources outside of the community? If it is, we have a tremendous opportunity to build a legacy not only for today and tomorrow.

If we don't, then we come back and we start to look at option B, option C and the list goes on and on.

The last thing that I would like to say is that when we started this process, we started a process that engaged the community as stakeholders, but we also engaged the YMCA as a partner. And it would appear that we're going in different directions that perhaps may still include the YMCA or may not.

But I think that they play a viable part and a viable option in terms of not only providing the physical space off of their current facility, but they provide a tremendous opportunity for the municipality in terms of operating costs, not only in terms of the costs day-to-day, but also the staffing, the complement of services that they also provide, to all of our members within the community, and I can't think that that – I stress that that can't be undervalued at this point.

And finally, and perhaps maybe the only comment that's very specific to the resolutions that were set forth is that I didn't see anything specific to the cost, and I believe it was outlined at about 400,000, for the restoration work to the curling club. And if we were to go in a different direction I think that that's something that still needs to be looked at to ensure that that facility is maintained at its current level, if not exceeding its current level.

I feel that I've been consistent in my comments over the last, I don't know, number of months. I would encourage my colleagues to, for the short run, continue to move forward with the plan as presented, ask the question, can we get the money. Put together the committee to go out – and I'm actually stepping back. I'm willing to forget the market sounding. Go to the – put the people together. We've got such bright, talented, connected people in this community. I'm sure

if we give them the opportunity, they can find the resources, financial, and the expertise to actually put this together to make it a reality for today and tomorrow.

Thank you.

Sandra Cooper: Other members of council. Councillor Gardhouse.

Joe Gardhouse: Your Worship. I congratulate all [unintelligible 02:22:57] presentation. The only thing I can add to that is that – something that became very relevant tonight on another piece of business we had, that is that our town planner pointed out that we will have a population of 33,000 people in 2031. So the decisions we make today, or the direction we take today is not really for now, and it's not some little patchwork here and there. It has to be for those 33,000 people plus in 2031. We just can't ...

So we do have to do our due diligence. We do have to continue on the path because it's the only way you're ever going to succeed in the end. And I'll be voting to continue the process, although I still have my problems with – I would still rather continue the process.

Thank you.

Sandra Cooper: Deputy Mayor Lloyd.

Rick Lloyd: Thank you Your Worship.

I really want to show my support for the efforts of the committee. I think the committee has done an incredible job. And with their vision from the community of Central Park and the facility.

With that, they brought forth new ideas, and a lot more demands in the urgency of moving forward. I think even part of this evening was the urgency of moving forward.

I want to thank Marta for being pulled and pushed every direction imaginable.

You know, as chair of the budget, my concern with this project is initial cost and our ability to service the debt and the debenture debt. And then the ongoing maintenance costs that we'll be faced with in the future. I don't disagree that we need it. I don't disagree that we needed it 10 years ago in fact. But \$35 million plus is a lot of money, whether it's phased in or not.

I don't want to go down a path such as the Town of St. Mary's which is now grappling with the issue of \$500,000 annually for operating and maintenance costs for their multiuse facility, or the issues of Midland that see their taxpayers taking on the major burden of a facility that became a regional facility, but they're not getting the funding regionally.

I really thought long and hard, and I've had many discussions with our residents. And I believe that ultimately we can have a multiuse facility. But not today. In the future and with a phased-in approach is what I really believe.

However, I also realize that the people want, and in fact deserve a new ice pad, and they want and deserve an indoor six-lane 25-metre pool. And I'm prepared to support the additional operating costs of those facilities.

I actually would encourage and would like to request council support to have staff prepare a report for our next council meeting that looks at a structure over top for Centennial Pool, which has been looked at, that would allow bleachers and so on. A structure that's approximately 100 by 143 feet in size.

I know some discussions of this kind of facility is less than \$3 million. And it would be something that could be done immediately to meet these needs. But it wouldn't hamper us with our future concerns.

And as well, I would like the staff to give us – to include in the report a new ice pad, also at Central Park. And I would like to see us move forward as quickly as possible with the funding, again looking at the needs of today.

I think when I've listened to the committee and seen some of the recommendations it's come loud and clear to me that we need to move forward as quickly as possible. And I have, through some discussions looked at different companies that give us alternatives. Very viable alternatives for now. Not Band-Aid alternatives. Something that have a life expectancy of 60 years or more. Something that can be done immediately. Something that perhaps as soon as the pool closes in September could be fully functional, operational within six to eight weeks after. So that the people do get today what they have been wanting for a long time.

That can work, hopefully, something with the Y or through you, Marta, whoever may give us an operating proposal through partnerships or through us alone.

The structure could either be an architectural membrane, or fabric building, that can be repurposed in the future. Repurposed as such that if we found that there is a demand, as we said, in 2035 or 2030 that we could have a large multiuse facility that we have the funding for. That this facility or this building could be repurposed.

As chair of finance I really would like to work with staff and our CAO to come up with an alternative. I would like to see a report back for our next council meeting which is July 30th. Again, to

look at covering our Centennial pool and a new ice pad at Central Park.

Your Worship.

Sandra Cooper: Thank you councillor – or, sorry, Deputy Mayor. The county right now I guess.

Joe Gardhouse: Can I ask a question.

Sandra Cooper: Councillor Gardhouse.

Joe Gardhouse: You're saying a new ice pad, you mean covering the existing one?

Rick Lloyd: No, brand new ice pad that could be a fabric cover or membrane covered facility, which there's all kinds of examples throughout North America and Europe.

Joe Gardhouse: No, I just – I didn't know whether you – I thought you wanted to put a top on the old one.

Rick Lloyd: No, keep -

Joe Gardhouse: Where would the other pad go?

Rick Lloyd: It would be something that would have to work with staff to deliver location -

Joe Gardhouse: I'm sorry. I thought – I didn't mean to -

Rick Lloyd: In Central Park. But something that's viable. There's been prices that come through in the neighbourhood of \$5 million for a complete facility that's turnkey. But I'd want staff to investigate it further.

Sandra Cooper: Thank you Deputy Mayor.

Rick Lloyd: Thank you, Your Worship.

Sandra Cooper: Councillor Chadwick.

Ian Chadwick: Thank you Your Worship.

In a similar vein, I think we all agree we need something. And we all agree we need expanded and enhanced facilities. I don't think there's anybody who's going to disagree with that. We also all agree that \$35 million is just too big a pill to swallow at this point. So the question is, what can we do now? What can we do in the small scale that also positions with the idea of going forward?

I like the idea of putting together the Phase 2 group, having them look at that and try to figure out what would work, what can we do now that also leads into the future? And also take a look at what's

available in terms of funding. Because we're not going to go ahead with the full project, what can we do that meets demand – we know there's a demand for ice time, and we know there's a demand for the pool.

And I like the idea of looking at some alternatives, but alternatives that mesh with the future plan that we've already put in place. We've already got this – I think we all generally like – there might be some details here and there – but we generally like the idea. How can we hone that, refine that and do something that can be done reasonably soon at a reasonable expense, and that will later on, perhaps, be able to work together with a larger scope plan in that site?

So I would support – I think Councillor Edwards mentioned that having the – the Phase 2 committee go ahead and start looking at some alternatives. But I also support Deputy Mayor's request to have a staff report so we can look at some alternatives. So maybe we can actually have something in the very near future.

Sandra Cooper: Thank you. Councillor West. Mr. Hockey.

Dale West: Thank you Mayor Cooper.

Try and to this before the end of today.

First of all, when I first read the report about just A and B I didn't want us to sit here and just say, okay, we've got to go A or go B. I thought you could mix the two together. It seems everybody realizes that so we don't need to talk about that.

We aren't talking about ice that people want. We're talking about ice that people need, from that standpoint. I can't speak firsthand to the swimming. I don't know where it falls in there, but I mean they've been talking about a pool for a while. So we're not talking about wants, because wants are a different thing when you don't have any money. We're talking about needs for our community.

First and foremost, the Central Park idea and all that work, all the work we've had done – I think I've said this before – in a long, long time, and I still support the idea of that.

I was probably the one all along who's talked about we don't want to talk about phasing, we don't want to talk about phasing. Then somebody has to, you know, bring up reality and we have \$35 million. So the reality is we're going to phase it. At least that appears to be what the reality has become, is that we will phase it.

But we have this report and we have this plan for Central Park that allows it to be reviewed and set up in a phasing proportion and still give the community everything it needs, and still meets the multiuse thing. We've got that time.

But we do have some urgencies right now. We do have the urgency and again, I'll speak from what I know. Because, you know, I've sat there and I dealt with the ice issue. Four hours a week at a minimum being bought out of town. Other groups within minor hockey are buying their extra time. That's four hours minimum. That's eight trips a week, back and forth to Feversham. And if you've ever tried to drive to Feversham when it's snowing, it doesn't matter which way you go that it feels like you've spent the whole winter in one hour.

So that's dangerous.

There's another 56 hours at a minimum that's being rented out of town for tournaments every year. And on top of that, while those tournaments are going on there are kids that are being displaced and are missing their own hockey for two and three weeks out of the winter. So it's really – there's a need for even more there to figure that out.

So we're not talking about wants for ice, and we aren't talking about something that isn't urgent. It is. We've got to do something about that. That's the whole thing when I sat down and got this started, wanted to deal with the ice and water needs. And out of it we came up with our Central Park redevelopment plan, which I still support. And if it's going to take us a little bit longer to get there, then let's get started.

I mentioned at our last meeting, somebody knocking at the door, Dave decided, well let's see if we can push the door open a bit. We'll write a letter so everybody else has to see it, and I don't know if everybody else knows it, but it's sitting on the front page of the Enterprise Bulletin's website right now about what Ameresco wants to do with the town.

So as part of what Deputy Mayor says, let's direct staff to go out and contact them. The company that you want to deal with them, let's – as all part of that report. Let's go find out what they want. Or what they have to offer and what's there for the community. And we do that.

We can set out a plan right now to deal with what we need to do, and at the same time commit to making sure that it meshes – a great term that Councillor Chadwick used – with getting the Central Park redevelopment done at the same time. We start saving some money for it, and we build what we can.

I see the pool idea as well, if we're going to phase it, we still want to deal with the water issue, well at the very least we've got that. And by the sounds of things, it's not a very least. It's not a Band-Aid. It's given us something to deal with what we need to deal

with, and it's also giving us the time to sit down and get the money together and make the Central Park project a reality.

Still going to have to find a jumpstart to the ball diamond question, but hopefully we do that.

But there is urgency in the ice. We've got a plan that is great, that if it's going to take phasing, let's make sure what we're doing supports that plan. And we start putting money away together for it. Something – I mean how many times has this fallen apart? And the one little thing that would have made this council's job a lot easier is that when it had fallen apart in the past, if people had put the money away, started putting it away then.

But that's where we are now. We've got some people knocking on the door that obviously say, hey these guys want to do something, let's go talk to them. We've got a plan that shows great vision for the future for Central Park that people like. And we've got a way to get it done and deal with what we need to do and deal with what we deserve.

Sandra Cooper: Thank you Councillor West. Councillor Edwards?

Mike Edwards: Yeah, thank you, Worship. I have to admit that when we look at all of these options it's somewhat confusing. But I think if we really look at – break it down perhaps to the basics where we want to go, I think I hear a lot of people saying the same things.

I personally feel that Central Park or Exhibition Park as we used to call it is an excellent location. And I also like the plan of putting the types of facilities that we talk about there. Yeah, maybe there will be some changes. The plan won't be exactly as it is right now. But nothing is etched in stone.

But if we don't start somewhere, then we won't realize what we need to. And I've been on this trail now for nine years, I think it is, and it's about time we got the ball rolling in the right direction and pulling together. And what I hear from around the council table is I think the same thing.

There's nothing wrong in looking at other options. I think that's good because there are immediate needs. Councillor West outlined the ice surface and I think that's the most glaring, because of all the years that I was on minor hockey, and that goes back a little bit before Councillor West, not very much, but a little bit, people were still going out of town. And I don't think that's right. We've – this is 20 years later. And they're still going out of town.

And we have other groups wanting to come in for ice time. We have our ladies that want to play ice in town instead of having to go out.

But getting back to the basics, otherwise I'll start rambling. I think there's a lot of hurdles to overcome. Without funding from the Y, and we've all received that letter. That's certainly a disappointment. But that may change. The government funding isn't there either but it may be. And if we're not ready with a plan then we won't be able to get that at all.

So I really see the value in continuing. I like – established in that committee and that's why I brought that question up at the start, just to clarify that. I don't see anything wrong in that. I don't think we should do the market sounding at this point. I think we should hold onto that \$40,000 whatever it is going to cost at this point. But I think we owe it to put in a Phase 2, if we want to call it a Phase 2 committee, to further explore those options. What is there out there within the community?

So like I said, I'll stick to the basics here.

But I also like pursuing the other ... perhaps alternatives that are out there, so that we can get something down. What those costs will be we won't know until we actually hear.

So I don't think there's anything wrong in that as long as it complements what our overall goal is. Because we do need to provide the citizens of Collingwood – I mean people at my age that have kids come up have been paying taxes forever. So why shouldn't we be giving them something back that has an immediate need.

So I don't see anything wrong in that.

So I will definitely be supporting the establishment of a committee. I'm not quite sure who needs to be on that committee because I think we need to pursue those options. Especially the funding, the ball diamonds. They're pretty big obstacles but I'm sure they can be overcome.

And also to look at other alternatives that perhaps can help us out short term.

So I don't want to really go and pick and choose, but if I really have to say one, I'd like to see the costs of them before I start putting my X against any of those things. But I think an ice surface is definitely a major priority.

Thank you Worship.

Sandra Cooper: And we'll get you some new skates, too, Councillor Edwards.

Mike Edwards: Your Worship, I just may take up skating. I was banned from the adult skating club one time because -

Sandra Cooper: I saw your picture somewhere.

Dale West: Have to do it in Feversham.

Sandra Cooper: Councillor Cunningham.

Sandy Cunningham: Thank you Mayor Cooper. I'll make my comments brief. And I'll just get to the quick of it.

I've been coming to council since 1997. Used to sit here and I've listened to this and listened to it and listened to it. And every council's had a vision. They've had committees, they've had studies, for the last close to 15 years. And the short answer, it always comes down to the money. And let's call a spade a spade, we're in the ditch \$50 million. And this vision is going to cost us \$35 million.

I would rather doubt that we can afford \$35 million.

Now, I coached rep hockey here years and years ago. And I was one of the ones that had to go out of town to play hockey with a group of guys because – and that's back in '79. So ice time has always been a – we've always needed more ice time. And I'm to the point that I'm not going to tap dance. I mean in a heartbeat I would go to option B, and I'd do it right now. But I'm not going to make that motion.

What I am saying is I have great respect for the committee, they've done a great job. I guess the – if there was a perfect municipality and we live in almost a perfect municipality, one big community centre would be the ultimate. Can we afford it? No. We're 20,000 people and we keep talking about building for 30,000 or 35,000 people in 2031. Does that meet – so we just keep going around and around?

And I guess my point is that we need an ice surface, and there has been a need for the water side as well. I'm familiar with this company that Mr. Lloyd is talking about. I have seen their structures. I have been to Calgary. They have them there and Calgary is a city of hundreds of thousands of people.

And can't afford \$35 million we can meet our needs very quickly with the type of units that Mr. Lloyd is talking about. And we could do it practically immediately.

And even at \$35 million, if we were going the other route, our share would be ... do that part of it, would be more than what it would cost us to do what – buy these buildings that Mr. Lloyd is talking about and giving us instant access to a new arena at the Exhibition Park, as I call it. Leave the outside rink there. And enclose the pool and you'll – it's a done deal.

Those are my comments. Thank you very much.

Sandra Cooper: Thank you Councillor Cunningham. Any further comments? Yes, Councillor Lloyd.

Kevin Lloyd: Thank you Your Worship.

I'm not much on regurgitation and rehashing and going around in circles. It's time we got on with this. We've had a great committee identify what the needs are. The committee has identified that Central Park is a tremendous location.

We know that we need another ice surface. We know that we need some facility for swimming. Let's get the alternatives costed and looked at. Make a decision and move forward. I am – I'm not going to sit around for the next year, year and a half discussing this over this table, time and time again. My position is clear. And my position is we phase it. We keep the outdoor ice rink. We put up another ice surface at Central Park. That will allow us to have ball diamonds there. The lawn bowling there. The YMCA is there. The curling rink is there. And that to me is a community centre. Or a darned good start of a community centre.

The pool is another issue that we have to discuss and we have to have some alternative solutions to as well, since the – what has happened with the Y.

So let's get on with it please. I agree with Deputy Mayor Lloyd. Let's get some alternative costings done. Let's make some decisions and let's make this happen.

Sandra Cooper: Councillor West.

Dale West: I just wanted to add, Mayor Cooper, we have to realize that if we choose to do this that we are saying that we understand there are more costs involved with operating separate facilities and that we're going to have to deal with that as well. Those little things in there. Because that is something that people have been talking about is the efficiency and all that. And I'd hate to see in a year and a half down the road that all of a sudden we're yelling at somebody saying, why are you spending this money? And if we do this we're telling people to do that.

Sandra Cooper: Have it be -

Dale West: And I didn't get to tell my 11 goal either but DJ had one too.

Sandra Cooper: That'll be our fact finding for sure. Exploratory.

Dale West: So we're looking at -

Sandra Cooper: We have -

Dale West: - option A1 by the looks of things?

Sandra Cooper: It appears that option 1, or direction A, I believe, will remain in place. Okay. So I'll pass this over to you.

[Unintelligible 02:48:48] according to the presentation that was made. Council endorsed in principle the recommended scenario for the redevelopment of Central Park and further that council direct staff to obtain architectural slash engineering and site plan drawings that would include phasing options for consideration with priority given to developing an additional ice surface.

Councillor Hull, you had your hand raised.

Keith Hull: Just – I need to make a couple of comments. One is I think it's very unfair that we keep referring to this \$35 million as if we, the Town of Collingwood, the taxpayers are the ones that are paying the \$35 million. Again, no one has suggested that. We have talked about simply putting forward a portion, and in fact I would suggest – and I could stand to be corrected – when we started this process, the proceeds of a potential sale of our interest in Collus was not even a part of the discussion.

So circumstances have changed. I mean now we potentially have a new source of revenue coming to the municipality that may or may not be available for this type of project if we choose to go that direction.

The point being, if we don't ask the questions, we won't know.

We have a project that I think if we were to go to the next step of spending the money for the drawings, the engineering plans, then we would be in a position should the federal government, should the province, should the county, or should private enterprise come along with the opportunity to partner, we as a municipality would finally be in that position. And we would be able to act on it immediately. As opposed to I wish we were in that position to do it, like others.

The idea that we are a 20,000 person community from a numeric standpoint is correct. But I think if we spoke to the membership of the YMCA that they would suggest that they have numerous people who come to this community who are members of Ys elsewhere who are using the facilities who are not counted as part of the permanent population, but do have property within the town of Collingwood whether they be weekend residents, whether they be seasonal residents, who are also contributing to the tax base of the municipality.

When I look at the ball diamonds, when I look at the hockey rink, when I look at the various facilities I am continually amazed by the

people who are there who are coming from our neighbouring communities, from the west, from the south and from the east. We talk about the number of times that our families and children need to drive to Feversham, but I'm continually amazed that my kids are coached by people from Nottawa, from Wasaga Beach, from the Town of Blue Mountains.

This is a regional hub and it should be considered as such.

Numerically, yes. We are a community of 20,000. I would suggest that this has a recreational reach far greater.

I think it's also easy to go out and to start identifying communities that have had successes and failures. We were in a meeting with Ameresco and I specifically spoke of a community, Dale – God forbid I mention the community name – that had a devastating failure. And if it wasn't for the boys at Research In Motion bailing them out to the tune of millions, they'd be still in the debt.

But they've also had three or four amazing projects come forward to fruition. And within the county of Simcoe, I think we've got some great examples of projects that are partnered projects with the YMCA, and we can do that here in Collingwood as well.

And lastly, I'm not sure what's happened that all of a sudden we've had a change in tack, or a change in course of direction, but six months ago we were ready to go out to the market with an RFP. In fact we had an RFP drafted. We even had it circulated for everyone's review. We had invited – or we were invited, I'm not sure which, it doesn't matter – to have a discussion with this particular company and I firmly believe whether that company is the right opportunity, wrong opportunity it doesn't matter. What it demonstrates is that there are people out there who would like to participate in this kind of opportunity.

Let's give them that chance.

Male: [unintelligible 02:53:36]

Keith Hull: So – well, I'm sorry, Kevin but –

Kevin: Well nobody's saying that – may I -

Sandra Cooper: Okay, we'll have some order. But -

Keith Hull: Sorry, just for clarification I mean just two weeks ago or on the 11th, or whenever it was, added into the mix we now have a theatre. Tonight now we're talking about adding to an outdoor rink one rink, but keeping the ball diamonds. But that's not reality. We know that's not reality.

Male: Why is that not reality -

Sandra Cooper: Just -

Male: The ball diamonds exist. They are there. To reinvent the wheel, to me -

Sandra Cooper: I think we all -

Male: - doesn't make sense. I'm sorry.

Sandra Cooper: Thank you -

Male: Nobody is saying we don't go after funding. We can go after funding at any time, any place, anywhere.

Keith Hull: Let's do it.

Sandra Cooper: And I believe that's likely – would be the – one of the motions as well. I believe that's correct that – I don't believe we were saying we weren't going for funding, that it would only be taxpayers dollars, just for clarity on that. We would certainly pursue those opportunities. I know that I had just forward -

Keith Hull: Conversations -

Sandra Cooper: If I may Councillor Hull, I've just emailed last week to Ms. Proctor that in fact there possibly funding opportunities, I don't know how large or anything at all, still waiting to hear on that.

Keith Hull: But if I may, Your Worship, you are correct. But every conversation starts with, we can't afford this. But if I look around the county and the province, we didn't make this number up. This is what a facility like this will cost, whether we pay the \$35 million or whether the federal government or Santa Clause pays for it. That's what it's going to cost.

So let's create that funding committee, if that's what it takes. Let's do it. Let's ask the questions. Let's determine what we can put into it and go from there.

But to start all of a sudden dividing it up without asking the basic question doesn't make sense in my opinion.

Sandra Cooper: I think to clarify no one has said that – I think the information or the comments were that the taxpayers cannot afford \$34, \$35 million. I believe that's the context of it. It's not saying that \$34 million, \$35 could not come up, the taxpayers of Collingwood not to pay the 34 –

Councillor Lloyd then I've got to the other side.

Kevin Lloyd: If the first phase is \$10, \$12 million it doesn't mean that we're not going to go and look for a certain amount of that from the outside.

We absolutely are. And that's what the second committee is, I think, believed to be charged to do.

So let's look at this realistically, let's say we all have a vision, we want to achieve, how do we do it best? How do we get the funding in place in a reasonable manner in a reasonable time, but satisfy the immediate needs, as you have identified, as each of us have identified, in the best possible way that we can now.

I don't want to be sitting another 10 years from now listening to a successive council debating on this issue and going on and the town doesn't have, and the people of this town don't have what they've deserved for the last 20 years, as far as I'm concerned.

Sandra Cooper: Thank you. Next I have Councillor Edwards.

Mike Edwards: You know what? I don't have anything further Your Worship, before I get talked out of anything here. I know what I'm voting for and I'd like to see that resolution put on the floor because I think we're just -

Sandra Cooper: I'll just let – it's a very important topic and we've had a lot of resource over the past year, so – I'd encourage all of input to be included.

Mike Edwards: Absolutely.

Sandra Cooper: Councillor Chadwick.

Ian Chadwick: Thank you.

Well I agree with Councillor Hull it's going to be a regional source, I think it's too bad that none of our regional partners are going to be participating, are going to be willing to contribute any of the money because this is going to come at our costs, our infrastructure and our operating expenses.

I understand that and we're going to have people from the region come in here, and that's eventually going to be good for our economy because they're going to be sharing other things in the community. Going to shop here etcetera.

But it'll take a while for that to kind of trickle down and really affect the rest of us. So.

With this first motion, the section that says we direct staff to obtain architectural, engineering and site plan drawings, I personally think that's premature before we do the first part, which is the alternative one about look at the funding. Try to find funding because I think that coming up with architectural drawings at this point when we might have some other alternatives on the floor is premature. And only spend money on something that a year from now could be

changed and we may have to go out and spend it again. If we're going to spend it, let's do it once. Let's look at these alternatives. Deputy Mayor has some ideas he'd like to have brought forward. Let's look at those before we decide to spend the money on plans.

But I don't mind going ahead, creating the committee and looking at funding opportunities and see what's out there.

Sandra Cooper: Mr. Houghton.

Ed Houghton: Your Worship, I just wanted to mention through to you to council that at our meeting on June the 11th, we did talk about financial numbers. The treasurer mentioned that internally there is potentially \$13.5 million. Now I reluctantly say this because at the June 11th we did receive negative comments back about even mentioning it without having the opportunity to go to the public and making sure that this is the direction they would like to go.

But there is the opportunity with the Collus partnership, there was \$8 million. There was also through debentures and development charges, so Ms. Leonard noted all of that and broke that down and then what she did is she looked at what \$10 million in debentures would cost over a 25-year period of time. So we did bring that up at the last meeting.

I was a little reluctant because of the pushback to mention it this evening however.

Sandra Cooper: Thank you Mr. Houghton. Councillor Gardhouse? Question I thought I'd seen your hand up.

Joe Gardhouse: I was just going to ask a question of Councillor Lloyd. Just for clarification, the rink that you were going to put in there, you wanted to keep the plan – just for – you wanted to keep the plan they did, but just build that first rink and that's it? Is that what you were saying?

Kevin Lloyd: No.

Sandra Cooper: Are you asking the Deputy Mayor or Councillor -

Joe Gardhouse: No, Councillor Lloyd. I just wasn't sure -

Sandra Cooper: Lloyd. Okay.

Joe Gardhouse: That you -

Kevin Lloyd: No, if you want my honest answer, I don't like the concept that was originally presented.

Joe Gardhouse: I didn't – I wasn't going – I thought you wanted to keep the concept

–

Kevin Lloyd: No, I like the concept of Central Park as the community central place, I have a lot of support for. I will support that ongoing. I'm not fussy – I hate to tell you, but my honest opinion is I'm not fussy on the original design or concept. And the more I looked at it and the more discussion was had on it, the less I liked it.

So what I'm suggesting is what we're suggesting, I think as a group, is to look at alternatives and they may include a single ice pad, retain the outdoor arena, a single ice pad, refurbish Eddie Bush and resolve the swimming issue. That's where I stand.

Joe Gardhouse: I wasn't sure about the other thing.

Sandra Cooper: Okay. Ms. Proctor.

Marta Proctor: Thank you Your Worship. Through you to members of council I very much appreciate the discussion and the ideas that are being brought forward. One consideration or caution I would like to bring forward for consideration before the resolutions are voted on is that if we are going to move forward with this project or any adjusted project, especially from understanding the feasibility and the implications of it, we need to be clear what the concept is, what it's going to cost, and what implications it has to site development and to the infrastructure that exists there.

So moving forward with confirming what those components are and having that actual work completed is critical.

It is also critical for us to have that commitment and that vision to secure funding. It is very difficult if not impossible to have a fund-raising campaign when you don't have a commitment to a project. And I think we know from other infrastructure projects that it is very difficult to get other orders of government to invest in projects when you have no plans or confirmed process in place to support what you're investing in.

Sandra Cooper: Thank you.

Okay, just to wrap up, Councillor Edwards.

Mike Edwards: I'd just like to say to Marta's comments that that is surely going to be a role of the committee. Because when you don't have a plan and that plan will also be the relocation of the ball diamonds, I'm sure and also other areas that need to be located. So. That's where I think the committee would be of value.

Sandra Cooper: Okay. Yes, Councillor Gardhouse.

Joe Gardhouse: I'm just wondering one thing. We could bounce this around on different scenarios and everything. I wonder if council would be comfortable with setting the dollar number that we'd be

comfortable with and then give it to the pros and see what they come up with.

I'm just – like I think we all realize that we have to come up with the – we have to do our due diligence, we have to follow the process. We've got to find out all the ramifications of whatever little – whatever plan we come up with. And it's going to be very difficult to do at this table.

And we've got a committee here that knows what they're doing and they've – they know the way to do it. I'm just wondering whether maybe we shouldn't be floundering around here like this and maybe we should just say okay. Come up with a plan that costs not more than 20 mill. I'm just wondering – maybe that's the right way to approach it rather than doing the piecemeal or you know, do this, do that, do this and everything.

And then maybe we're comfortable with the dollar – the dollar figure.

I hate to throw a monkey in the wrench – a wrench in the monkey – what's the saying? But maybe that's an intelligent way to approach it. Because I'm not that thrilled about the way we're going at it now. We're – you know, we'll never get this done if we – we've still got to go at it in a professional way.

Food for thought.

Sandra Cooper: Absolutely. Very professional keeping that in mind as it is in the past. I do have a motion on the floor from Deputy Mayor, if we can just proceed with this. We've had a lot of discussion.

Male: What motion's that?

Sandra Cooper: According to the package we've received.

Male: We have a motion?

Sandra Cooper: No, it's coming to the floor. I'm just asking Deputy Mayor for – so what I'll do is introduce a mover of a motion and a person can read out the motion and council can vote on it. Okay?

Deputy Mayor you have a motion on the floor regarding this.

Rick Lloyd: Motion moved by myself, seconded by Councillor Lloyd. We resolve the council to direct staff to pursue the following recommended options and develop a project timeline and detailed estimates and bring the report back to council no later than August 27, 2012.

Number one, construct a single pad arena that could be phased into a double pad as well enclose the outdoor pool with a fabric building.

Sandra Cooper: Thank you.

So moved by Deputy Mayor Lloyd and seconded by Councillor Lloyd. Bring back a report not later than August 27th to construct a single pad arena that could be phased into a double pad. Also enclose the outdoor pool with a fabric building. And this would include – we would want to know ... the options – recommended options from that.

Councillor West.

Dale West: Thank you Mayor Cooper. Because it doesn't mention the Central Park – redevelopment of Central Park scenario, that would mean the motion that we passed before, supporting it in principle is still in effect, and this is just – so -

Sandra Cooper: That's correct.

Dale West: This is what I was saying before. We have this. We're starting to work towards it, while meeting needs right now.

Male: It's crafted that way.

Sandra Cooper: Councillor Edwards?

Mike Edwards: Would that include operating costs as well?

Rick Lloyd: Estimates on everything.

Sandra Cooper: Detailed estimates.

Mike Edwards: Thank you.

Sandra Cooper: Councillor West.

Dale West: You say it like – no, I'm just – it was just the way she said my name, that's all.

When I mentioned that I would like to talk to – you mentioned without mentioning Ameresco because they sent us a letter, does that get covered in this?

Sandra Cooper: On the recommended options, develop a project timeline. Detailed estimates and bring back the report to the council.

Rick Lloyd: Worship, that can all be part of what we're doing here?

Sandra Cooper: I would think it would be all-encompassing. At -

- Dale West: Just trying to make sure we're heading -
- Sandra Cooper: Absolutely. Ms. Proctor.
- Marta Proctor: Once again, through you, Your Worship to members of council, as much as we would be very happy to explore these options, I am concerned a little about the timeline and the obligations we have as staff with the events and summer schedules. I think that to make a good decision we need to have all the information and unless we have somebody externally, which really is a feasibility study in costing to help us determine the site – site implications because we can come back with some estimates of the buildings – okay. I'm not sure if they have operational costs in there and everything.
- I guess if somebody's got all that information to present us, that's great.
- Sandra Cooper: Okay.
- Well we've had a lot of discussion and look forward to bringing back a lot of the information including the cost. And also we've kept our resolution of Central Park in this. And also the task force would be given a new task force would be given an opportunity to assist.
- Okay. Councillor Edwards, but down the road.
- Mike Edwards: Not to that one, Your Worship, but does that involve the committee? The formation of a committee?
- Sandra Cooper: Not at this time. Not right now.
- Mike Edwards: Okay, I would like to make a resolution then, or a motion also.
- Sandra Cooper: Yeah.
- Mike Edwards: Sorry. Ms. Almas.
- Sara Almas: Through Your Worship to Councillor Edwards. Right now we currently would have that resolution still intact to establish a steering committee. So basically those resolutions that have been previously improved that are in the Option A would be on hold until this report comes back. So they would still remain in place. And then once we hear the information, once it comes back, by the end of August, those decisions can, in my opinion, might be appropriate for discussion at that time.
- Mike Edwards: I would – that's a fair time to wait. And I don't know whether we should not go ahead with the formation of the committee in the meantime.
- Male: The committee's already been approved.

- Mike Edwards: Ms. Almas had mentioned, it would be on hold until such time as this report came back. And what I'm recommending is that that move ahead at this point. I don't know why that would put that on hold.
- Sandra Cooper: Okay, well we can have that mover and a seconder -
- Rick Lloyd: Vote on this and then we can have a separate motion.
- Sandra Cooper: Okay. With a recommendation.
- Okay, then we've had a lot of discussion here and I think that Ms. Proctor if you have nothing more further to add at this point in time, I will call the question then. All in favour ... oh. Councillor Hull.
- Keith Hull: I'll be nice. Just a question of clarification. Just so we're clear – and actually in fairness to director Proctor so that when it comes back it's exactly what we're looking for.
- So Deputy Mayor Lloyd – through you to Deputy Mayor Lloyd, you're looking at the addition of a single pad adjacent to the current outdoor pad that would be covered in some way.
- Sandra Cooper: Deputy Mayor to Councillor Hull.
- Rick Lloyd: I'm looking for a single ice pad at Central Park that will be covered with the option to twin it.
- Keith Hull: So the question of clarification is just when you refer to the single are you referring to – I mean something beside or using the existing facility that's there?
- Sandra Cooper: Deputy Mayor.
- Rick Lloyd: The outdoor rink would remain as it is.
- Keith Hull: Okay. So in fact there would be two – hypothetically two ice surfaces either side by side or adjacent to one another.
- Rick Lloyd: That's correct.
- Keith Hull: So, just so when the report comes back to council, I would just like to add, if I may, that we should include in that then, the cost of relocation because anything that's come before council in terms of ice side by side, something has to go. One, two, all three ball diamonds. Something has to give. It can't – everything that's there can't stay plus two ice surfaces. That's all. And we may as well have the true cost. It's no good to come back and say, well it's going to cost X number of dollars to build an arena and then find out, well it's really X number of dollars plus because we've got to move X, Y and Z. That's all.

And then the second part is the facility that you're looking for at the outdoor facility, I know exactly what you're referring to in terms of these fabricated facilities, are you – you're simply asking that we would enclose – so we're not adding anything to the facility in terms of amenities etcetera, it's just simply we're putting a roof on top of that facility.

Sandra Cooper: Deputy Mayor.

Rick Lloyd: Going to Central Park, the configuration of a new rink at Central Park would be part of the proposal coming back from the staff. There is one ball diamond that has been deemed rather difficult to use up there, I believe I'll pass that on to Councillor West -

Dale West: Nice way of putting it.

Rick Lloyd: That's right. So – let the staff bring back the option of how we're going to do the configuration there.

The outdoor pool as we see it today would be covered approximately 100 by 143 feet. In that building that is there now would be within the structure, tore down, new dressing rooms, new washrooms would be included in the price. Turnkey. And what it would be is just a building within three feet of the building all around is what the proposals have been in the past for this kind of thing.

Keith Hull: Okay. And then to Councillor Edwards point there would be operating costs would be built into that as well.

Rick Lloyd: The proposals that would be coming forth would include the operating costs of both facilities. There's all kinds of examples throughout North America that can be used for costing as well as estimates.

Keith Hull: It's unfortunate, I mean it's no one's fault, but the diamond that's in question is the most awkward. I mean it's in the southeast corner of Central Park. And when we built the outdoor ice surface that's there, I mean unfortunately to go east, west of that existing facility you knock out a prime – like we can't pick up the existing ice surface and move it over to the – ball diamond 2 I think it is.

Sandra Cooper: Thank you -

Keith Hull: It's unfortunate, that's all.

Sandra Cooper: Definitely. Thank you Councillor Hull. Very good questions.

Mike Edwards: Your Worship it's interesting because the master plan for Central Park does show a twin ice surface working on there.

Sandra Cooper: Councillor Gardhouse.

Joe Gardhouse: Could you read back the motion, what date did we have again for reporting back?

Sandra Cooper: We have the date of August 27th.

Joe Gardhouse: Could I make an amendment to that motion that in the event Marta needs some outside help or has to hire somebody to get it on that date that she be given the okay to do so to get that report back to us? I'm just – like she'd be given the authority to get some outside help to get those numbers to us.

Sandra Cooper: Okay. Does not – that council directs staff to pursue the following recommendations. So I think with Mr. Houghton, if you're able to assist ...

Ed Houghton: Your Worship, through you to council. I think that what we'll do is staff will caucus, we'll have a discussion about it, I think what we'll do is we need to be able to prop up and support Marta in a whole bunch of different directions and ways. Recognizing, I think, she has some personal time that she needs.

I think that there'll be an opportunity for the executive management team to again discuss that. I appreciate what Councillor Gardhouse is saying and we'll take that under advisement. And if there's somebody that we can bring in to assist us, we'll certainly do that. By an email or a memo to council we'll let you know if we're doing that and what the costs happen to be.

Joe Gardhouse: Yeah, all I'm trying to get across is we need appropriate funds to complete the task, do it. That's all I wanted to get across.

Ed Houghton: I always just use a hundred words to say thank you.

Sandra Cooper: Thank you Councillor Gardhouse.

Anything further?

Okay, I'll call the question. All those in favour. Opposed.

So noted. That was carried.

Thank you Mr. Houghton. Thank you Ms. Proctor. Good Coles Notes presentation this evening. And Ms. Almas, also with the committee, the task force that had assisted with Central Park and all the information. Thank you very much, truly. Thank you very much for all your effort and time that you have committed to this project.

Councillor Edwards.

Mike Edwards: Yeah, thank you Worship. Do we need to put a motion in to continue with that resolution regarding the establishment of a Phase 2?

Sandra Cooper: [unintelligible 03:20:09] rescinded. It's not – it's still in place.

Mike Edwards: Thank you. Are all the other ones?

Sandra Cooper: All of ... Direction A, they're all – we haven't rescinded anything. All of them. ...

Any other old or deferred business, council? Councillor Edwards.

Mike Edwards: If I could go back to that same thing. Sorry to harp on it.

Sandra Cooper: Absolutely.

Mike Edwards: Resolution 2 was funding strategy and market sounding. And if all those resolutions are still alive, that involves market sounding.

Male: That could be approved though.

Mike Edwards: That's why I asked if we could go individually on each one, Your Worship, because I don't think we want to approve market sounding at this time if I -

Sandra Cooper: And I believe it's on hold. On hold. That one is not moving forward. It is on hold and we can bring that ...

Mike Edwards: That's – that's not – this is not ... that's okay.

Sandra Cooper: Clarification. Is the market sounding on hold? Ms. Almas?

Sara Almas: Through Your Worship to Councillor Edwards and council, based on the discussion tonight and the motion that's been passed, I think we will just – basically staff will keep those items in abeyance, still there until we have the discussion on August 27th or earlier, nothing will be pursued or proceeded on at this point.

Mike Edwards: Just anxious to see the committee continue, that's all.

Sandra Cooper: And that's something that if the executive team can look at in consideration now and pulling that together. Thank you.

[End of recorded material 3:22:12]