

**Minutes of the Arena Committee Meeting  
Held Wednesday, November 22, 2017**

**Present:**

Councillor King, Committee Chair  
Councillor Vaillancourt, Committee Member  
Councillor Shogren, Committee Member  
Councillor Mayne, Committee Member  
Mayor McDonald, Committee Member (7:50 a.m. to 8:15 a.m.)  
Keith Robicheau, Chief Administrative Officer  
John Severino, Managing Director Community Services  
Margaret Karpenko, Chief Financial Officer  
David Jackowski, Facilities Manager  
Paula McCloskey, Senior Manager Parks and Recreation  
Melinda Fry, Manager of Sports and Events

Special Arena Committee Chair, Councillor King, called the meeting to order at 7:50 a.m.

1. Introductory Remarks:
  - The Chair advised the Committee that the scope of this Committee's work is to determine the number of pads for the new arena, the preferred City owned lands site and the financial options.
2. Adoption of the Agenda:
  - The Agenda was adopted as presented.
3. Minutes:
  - The Minutes of the October 25, 2017 and November 1, 2017 meetings were approved and will be presented to Council on November 28, 2017.
4. Moving Forward:
  - Could we go back to the Terms of Reference for this Committee? I do not believe that it states that the only lands that the Committee is to look at are City owned lands.
    - It is not being suggested that the Committee cannot consider optional sites but what we are saying that if the Committee wishes to look at sites other than City owned lands a formal process will need to be followed.
  - Could this Committee not start a formal RFP/RFQ process?
    - Council could delegate this authority to the Committee then the Committee would direct staff to follow the public procurement process within the guidelines of the City's Purchasing by-law
  - This Committee could go to Council with their preference of City owned lands and let Council make the decision as to whether or not there should be a procurement process.
  - The next steps would be a Request of Interest.
    - I do not believe that the details should be discussed as there are potential interested parties in attendance at this meeting which gives them an unfair advantage.
  - The Committee should complete the work with what information we have in front of us regarding the City owned lands.
  - The Council could give direction to the Committee after the formal process has been completed to have Administration negotiate with the preferred proponent.
  - There will need to be a level playing field for all interested parties.
  - If the Committee wants to go out to RFP does that not give Canadore an unfair advantage as they had already approached the City regarding an arena?
    - That was for land and operation of the facility this proposal would only be for land.
  - We owe it to our citizens to evaluate all of the sites - when spending this type of money we need to be exploring all of the options.

## 5. Geotechnical Investigation Draft Report:

## (a) Site Specific

## (i) Memorial Gardens:

- Variable depths of fill were found across site from 1 to 2.4 meters below grade
- The fill is not suitable to support foundations. Will require excavation of 2.5 m depth in the foundation area / foot print of the building.
- The native soil needs to be removed in the “dry”.
- It is not uncommon to have to take out fill?
  - No it is not.
- There will need to be a dewatering process designed by professionals to protect the existing building (Memorial Gardens).
- The soils that have been removed where are you proposing they be dumped?
  - There is the possibility that they could be used on the sliding hill.
- Does the sliding hill fall under the jurisdiction of the Conservation Authority and if so, have you spoke with them to get permission?
  - Need to get clarification should we move forward

## (ii) Omischl Field:

- There are multiple potential locations on the site that can be utilized for placement
- There is bedrock and it would be suggested placing the site to take advantage of the bedrock to support conventional concrete footings.
- How would parking work here?
  - There is sufficient space for parking. Could share the existing parking lot and add parking to ensure we had the ability to expand in the future.

## Geotechnical in summary:

- Both sites are suitable to build the new facility, no show stoppers
- Drainage requirements at either site are anticipated to be similar
- Seismic conditions at either site remain to be determined
- Preparation of the MG site will be slightly more extensive due to dewatering requirements and therefore it is anticipated that it will lead to some additional costs

## (b) Next Steps:

- Detailed analysis remains to be completed
- Factors such as seismic, traffic, visibility, site servicing, etc. will need to be considered
- Staff will complete a Site Selection Analysis Report and present the Report to the Committee.
- Does the City have enough expertise within staff and does staff have the time to commit to preparing this Report?
  - Can complete 90-95% (traffic study at a high level)
- How long would it take to have a formal process (procurement) ready?
  - It would need to be published and given at least 3 to 4 weeks for responses. This would be a priority for evaluation. Could be a minimum of 12 weeks.

6. Recommendations to Council:

John Severino will prepare a Report to Council for the November 28<sup>th</sup>, 2017 Council Meeting, recommending to Council that staff to initiate a competitive process for consideration of non-city owned sites.

7. Next Meeting Date: Wednesday, November 29, 2017 at 7:45 a.m.

Meeting adjourned at 8:40 a.m.

---

Councillor Mark King  
Chair Arena Committee

w:\clerk\rms\c04\2017\arena committee\minutes\minutes - november 22, 2017.docx

---

Karen McIsaac  
City Clerk