



**MINUTES**  
**SPECIAL**  
**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**  
**Monday, June 13, 2016**  
**9:30 a.m.**  
**City Hall Council Chambers**

**Present:** Mayor D. Canfield  
Councillor M. Goss  
Councillor R. McMillan  
Councillor D. Reynard  
Councillor S. Smith

**Regrets:** Councillor L. Roussin  
Councillor C. Wasacase

**Staff:** Karen Brown, CAO  
Heather Kasprick, City Clerk  
Colleen Neil, Recreation Services Division Lead  
Lauren D'Argis, Corporate Services & Strategic Initiatives Manager  
Andrew Glassco, Manager of Community & Development Services

**Call Meeting to order**

**Public Notices**

Take Notice that as required under Notice By-law #144-2007, Council intends to adopt the following items at this Special Meeting of Council:

N/A

**Declaration of Pecuniary Interest & General Nature thereof**

- i) On Today's Agenda
- ii) From a Meeting at which a Member was not in Attendance

There were none declared.

**Deputations**

Approximately five (5) minutes per person/group.

**Items:**

- 1. Event Centre Development**

Council discussed the Event Centre development. It was questioned what the funding programs are that may be out there. Council will need to know this information before moving forward.

It was explained that Niverville, Manitoba, with a population of just 5,000 people which is located just west of us is also doing a similar project. The kick start to the Niverville project was \$5M and they knew they needed to leverage \$11M from there to move forward. They knew what they needed to do, had the amounts and the plan and could move forward from there.

There are funding models out there such as the Canada 150 fund. They continue to come out and change. Organizations like Trillium are out there but until we know what we are looking for and at what scope the project is, it is hard to start searching for funding.

Colleen Neil expressed what we do absolutely know is that we must have additional ice time in the community. She referenced Council back to the start of building this plan. If everyone remembered a few years back when we stood on the arena ice surface with the community there, and captured what the public felt is the gap in our community. Council asked the committee to ask the public what would it take for community to get behind this project as Council knew this project needed to be more than just an arena. This is where the performing arts, gymnasium and multi use space came from. It was very prominent in the community consultation that these areas are also missing and if we are putting in a second ice surface, we know we need second ice surface, now is the time to address the other areas that the community is lacking in the arts and recreation.

It was suggested that this development price is not just about the expansion project, but means many other things which means further costs. The relocation of the ball diamonds which includes the new site development needs to be considered, as the ball users are also asking for more and for improvements to the diamonds. It is suggested that a four plex ball diamond development is approximately \$800,000 to \$1M. This may be a low estimate as lands would also need to be included. Baseball members have increased over the years and there are likely close to 1,500 people playing this season. The recent partnership development with Kenora Baseball League is another excellent example of community partnerships and what their intentions for the JM fields will do. Until a decision is made on this project, we cannot make future plans with further partnerships for improvements to the fields.

Colleen agreed with Council that two years ago this is exactly what we heard previous to the Canada 150 funding coming out, we haven't seen language around recreation facilities, arenas for years.

What Council has been hearing from the Federal government is social infrastructure, that level of infrastructure, is not going to roll out for now. Point being, if they are not going to fund arenas and want event centres attached, the taxpayers are going to pay long term debt anyway, and if event centre can get access to funding this may be a good option.

Colleen received an email April 26, 2016 regarding capital investments in recreation and there are categories that we haven't seen in a long time.

It was questioned if the other associated costs including the relocation of ball diamonds, the relocation of the boat ramp (if required), traffic changes, have been included in the presented data.

Colleen reminded Council that the traffic study was part of the main project which is now complete.

David Nelson from Nelson Architecture added that according to our own zoning bylaw it provides the guidelines for the size for capacity you have to provide for parking. The designs presented include and meet the requirements for the building proposed for parking.

Councillor Reynard questioned that based on the current design and the way the design is presented, is it designed so it can be phased in, or will it impact the design if we don't move forward with entire project. He questioned what our options are with current design. It is designed so it could be phased in and if that is what Council feels is right answer, that is up to them. It does impact the overall development as some costs will be associated with developing separately. If the consultant team knows the scenario they will try to minimize those impacts. The way it is laid out by design it can be phased.

Councillor Goss questioned the projected revenues for the multi-purpose space with revenues of \$130,000 per year or \$13,000 per month.

Colleen explained when we look at ice rental and gym use space we don't have house league for kids and adults for "pick up" sports. We do not have any vacancies in either area to program options like these that fall into that category. The money comes from user fees. The City would be running the event space and operating it similar to the rest of the facility with janitorial shared.

Councillor Smith questioned how much we already subsidize all ice time. Colleen explained it is at a 55% recovery for youth and 65% recovery for adult. Colleen added that our rates are mid to low for the region.

Councillor Smith questioned if that means that the City will subsidize the other user space? Colleen explained that rates are all different depending on the type of event but we make sure rates are set so that everyone can access the facility.

Councillor Reynard noted that during the presentation there were a number of flags that came up for him. One alluded to school boards and not enough gym time for programs they decide to bring into gyms. Unless schools are willing to come onto this program how are we going to compete?

Colleen advised that the school board conversation needs to take place. There is already increased demands on ice time from the school boards with constant ask for additional ice time that we need to find for them.

Councillor Smith noted that we know that a casino is coming and they need to do the same thing with this development. We need to make sure we are making a decision with all the information in front of us which means we need to know what is going to happen with that development.

Colleen reminded Council that a casino development is not going to build a gymnasium.

Councillor McMillan questioned if we can phase in the project and if that is something that we as a Council are interested in pursuing. If so, that is the conversation we should have with proponents but is there a way to move forward with the immediate needs of the community. There are aspects of this project that could proceed without continued delays for other long term answers.

Mayor Canfield expressed that with things he heard at the FCM Conference on funding, there is a redirection and money they have been saying is there, the money is not there. What is the casino doing, what are they going to provide? Mayor Canfield noted that he has a hard time believing there is no gym time. The financing for this project is the biggest concern.

Councillor Reynard noted that the report from Stantec is thorough and this is a significant project. It wasn't developed as this size of a project because they decided this is what Kenora needs, it was developed through numerous focus groups. It is now up to Council to decide what we need and want. Some of the best things we have done since being on Council is partnerships in the community. If some of the project must revolve around the casino we could bring in the second ice surface right away, and if we have to, can put off other part until we know what the casino development looks like. If we can work partnerships then the taxpayer doesn't need to pay. Maybe our best way to do this is in phases. Look after the priority which is the ice surface as we know the potential is there. The proposals are going to come in within the next year for a casino and we can look at the next phase once that is known.

Councillor Smith expressed that she feels the funding is not going to be there. There is no additional funding to deal with. That is the stuff we need to be considering when looking at all priorities. She does not feel we should be rushing into anything because of too many unknowns right now.

Councillor Goss noted that if we could find a similar partnership with a model for partnerships for community collaboration it would be easier to move forward.

Colleen noted that change is constant. Administration needs to know what direction Council is going as we can't build the model if we don't know where we are going. No one has a clear sense of where we are going.

Karen Brown, CAO noted that David Nelson from Nelson Architecture is here and explained earlier that it is designed so it could be a phased in project. David has a basic split out but he didn't deal with doing one at a time during the initial development of the proposal. He advised that it is something they could look at and could be reasonably quick to get the response back to Council and Administration.

Council agreed that they would like to see the information of splitting the project out into phases and David will bring this information back to Council for review. Another meeting will be called once Council has had time to review the new information.

Meeting adjourned at 10:32 a.m.