

COLUMBIA SHUSWAP REGIONAL DISTRICT

ELECTORAL AREA A/TOWN OF GOLDEN AQUATIC CENTRE FEASIBILITY STUDY ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORKSHOP

Minutes of the workshop held on Thursday, April 1, 2021
Via Zoom Electronic Meeting Software

Note: The following minutes are subject to correction and are draft until adopted by the Feasibility Study Advisory Committee at the next meeting.

PRESENT

Advisory Committee Members

Darcy Mooney (Chair)	Manager, Operations Management, CSRD
Spencer Lainchbury	Scott Weir
Justin Telfer	Brian Gustafson
Kat Coatesworth	Stefanie Chomiak
Karen Cathcart	Director, Electoral Area A
Ron Oszust	Mayor, Town of Golden
Jordan Petrovics	Manager of Recreation Services, Town of Golden

Staff

Phaedra Turner	Team Leader, Administrative Services, CSRD
----------------	--

Project Consultants

Paul Fast	Partner in Charge
-----------	-------------------

The meeting commenced at 7:05 PM MST.

CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

The Chair called the meeting to order and provided a summary of the project to date.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA/MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

THAT:

- The agenda be approved with one amendment - remove Review Final Report item.
- CARRIED

THAT:

- Approval of the minutes from the November 25, 2020 be tabled to the next Advisory Committee meeting.

REVIEW TECH MEMO #4

Paul Fast, HCMA Partner in Charge, provided accolades to the group for their contribution and work over the past year on the project and with HCMA. An overview of Tech Memo #4 was provided which summarizes the following:

- The preferred concept is a six lane, 25 metre pool, a separate leisure pool, a hot pool, a steam and sauna room and a multipurpose room.
- Site Plan – conversations have occurred with the Town of Golden planning staff which has helped to refine some issues with the required parking spaces and the existing bylaw. The possibility of utilizing the empty property across the street from the facility for a parking lot is not an option. If the project does move forward, there is adequate room within the existing site to accommodate the

**REVIEW TECH MEMO #4
(cont.)**

- required parking for the facility. There will also be adequate space for additional spaces if a future gymnasium was added to the site.
- An outdoor spray area is planned to be accommodated on the site.
 - The mechanical room was relocated from the basement to the second level and has helped to reduce some costs.
 - Potential for integration with the arena lounge space once a more detailed design occurs.
 - The design of the facility is a good arrangement for both cost and efficiency.
 - The exterior perspective will add some real attractiveness to the existing arena and site.
 - The interior perspective has a row of glazing around the building which will allow users to be in the pool but still feel connected to the landscape and mountain views etc.
 - A wood or mass timber roof would be well suited for this type of building and could be locally sourced.
 - There is a desire for the facility to meet a sustainable effort that is on par with a LEED gold standard or equivalent.
 - There are no significant issues with services being supplied to the building (storm drain, water etc.). The existing water and sewer lines will need to be relocated.
 - HCMA has assumed a modest energy concept for environmental sustainability. It is yet to be determined if recapturing heat from arena chillers can occur.
 - There are two transformers on site that need to be removed and a new pad transformer will be installed to supply adequate electrical service to the complex and for any future needs.
 - Capital cost estimate – the estimated construction costs are \$27,210,900, including contingencies. With project costs, connection fees, permits, etc., the entire cost adds up to approximately \$31,000,000.
 - There are three different types of contingencies in a Class C estimate: Design, Construction and Escalation. An explanation of how those items are determined was provided.
 - The fitness component of the operational cost estimate was removed, and costs were updated, the fitness facility is not part of the preferred option.

The Committee members had several questions and discussion points for HCMA:

Q: Is the spray park removal and relocation part of the estimated costs?

A: *HCMA will follow up with that and confirm. (follow up confirmed that the spray park is included and was costed at approximately \$500,000)*

Q: What about the flood plain requirements.

A: The Town of Golden planner suggested mitigation measures rather than elevating the building.

Q: Does the facility need to be identified as a LEED gold standard or equivalent?

A: *An explanation of the strategy was provided, and the environmental standard will be identified in the detailed design phase once all factors have been determined.*

Q: Are there opportunities for grants to help cover costs of LEED standard.

A: *It is better to have some form of environmental standard identified. The language in Tech Memo 4 will be softened to indicate an advanced green building standard rather than identifying specifically as a LEED gold standard building. It is important to note that environmental sustainability of the building was identified as important to the community.*

**REVIEW TECH MEMO #4
(cont.)**

Q: Do the operational cost estimates of \$519,000 annually include the debt servicing and asset renewals?

A: *The operating costs do not include the debt servicing or asset renewals. Debt servicing will depend on the amount of funds borrowed over a 30-year term. The asset renewal for this type of facility was identified at a 50% funding. It is understood that large renewals may need grants etc. The language will be included for clarification. The projected capital loan amortization period is planned for a 30-year term. The "On-deck" website will be revamped moving forward and will be the point of truth for all information regarding the project and the next phase.*

Q: Why was the multi purpose room determined to be that size?

A: *The space was determined based on a maximum gathering space of 40-50 people.*

Q: Why are the contingencies so high, can you please explain?

A: *The contingencies are real costs; they are just being represented as contingencies now in the documents because of the concept design phase. Once the detailed design for the facility is completed, most of the contingencies will then be identified as real costs. Additionally, there is a 10% premium in the estimate because of the location.*

Some general comments, responses and discussion points from the Committee were noted:

- Ensure that the website outlines what the average taxpayer is paying now for the current facility vs what will they pay for a new facility, to enable benchmarking and comparison. Please do a comparison for municipal taxpayer vs area a taxpayer.
Yes, that information will be clearly outlined on the website.
- An FAQ document is critical and should be considered.
The website does have an FAQ section, and everyone should be directed to it as the point of truth, in order to ensure rumours and falsehoods do not gain traction and confuse the situation.
- Ensure the current outdoor pool costs vs the proposed new year-round pool facility costs are clearly identified on the website and in the document so the readers clearly understand the difference between the three-month facility vs a year-round facility.

All comments and a senior review of the final Tech Memo will be completed within seven to ten days and will be sent out to the Committee once complete.

REVIEW BROCHURE

The brochure needs some refining, those edits will be incorporated in the final document. A question was posed regarding the plan for the brochure and how will it be distributed. The Chair identified that the brochure release date is yet to be determined and will be discussed with the Committee after the CSRD Board receives the final report of the Feasibility Study. The idea is the brochure will be available at key points in the community, and may also be mailed out to every resident, in advance of the referendum once the communication plan has been finalized. There may be other documents that will be distributed as well, including an FAQ type fact sheet.

NEXT STEPS

- Update Tech Memo #4 and the Final Report document and review
- HCMA and CSRD staff presentation to Town of Golden Council – May 2021 (date tbd).

NEXT STEPS (cont.)

- HCMA and CSRD staff presentation to the CSRD Board of Directors at the May 20, 2021 regular Board meeting.

Potential next steps for project completion:

- October 2022 – Voter assent (coinciding with municipal and local elections)
- If successful - 2023- Detailed Design takes about a year and tendering
- 2024 Construction Start – approx. 2-year construction build.
- 2026 Project Completion – Q1

A question was raised regarding the Advisory Committee and when its role will end and what are next steps for it. The Chair explained that the Committee will likely meet one more time after the CSRD Board meeting presentation to finalize the project and wrap up the feasibility phase. A “Working Group” Committee will be formed next, and then if the referendum is successful, an “Implementation Group” would be formed.

The Chair provided explanation regarding the existing arena service area bylaw, which the Province has confirmed can be utilized for the addition of an aquatic centre to the site. There was some discussion about how much is the right amount to ask for approval to borrow in the referendum. Discussion ensued regarding asking for approval from the public to borrow the entire sum, vs a reduced amount that is contingent on grants. The Chair will work out some budget scenarios for next meeting regarding the impact on taxation for the whole, with grants, etc.

The Chair reiterated that the existing tax rate numbers from the TOG are needed to complete the exercise so the most accurate picture for the taxpayers of both the Town of Golden and Area A can be outlined, so they will clearly understand the financial impact of a new indoor pool vs keeping the status quo outdoor pool going.

NEXT MEETING

To be determined.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:03 PM MST