



COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE AGENDA

Community Services Committee Meeting
Monday, July 8, 2013
Tom Davies Square

COUNCILLOR RON DUPUIS, CHAIR

Terry Kett, Vice-Chair

11:15 a.m. COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBER

Council and Committee Meetings are accessible. For more information regarding accessibility, please call 3-1-1 or email clerks@greatersudbury.ca.

DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST AND THE GENERAL NATURE THEREOF

COMMUNITY DELEGATIONS

1. Arena Renewal Strategy Plan - Save the Levack Arena Committee
(ELECTRONIC PRESENTATION) (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)

- Steve Bastien, Spokesperson, Save the Levack Arena Committee

(This presentation will provide the Save the Levack Arena Committee the opportunity to share information they have regarding the Arena Renewal Strategy Plan.)

PRESENTATIONS

2. Report dated July 2, 2013 from the General Manager of Community Development regarding Arena Renewal Strategy - Community Survey Results.
(ELECTRONIC PRESENTATION) (RECOMMENDATION PREPARED)

4 - 60

- Rob Blackwell, Manager, Quality, Admin & Finance
- Ray Mensour, Manager of Arenas

(This report provides the results of the community consultation.)

REGULAR AGENDA

MANAGERS' REPORTS

- R-1. Report dated June 28, 2013 from the General Manager of Community Development regarding City of Greater Sudbury CHPI - Update.
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY)

61 - 64

(This report provides information regarding the Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative (CHPI) guidelines.)

- R-2. Report dated June 27, 2013 from the General Manager of Community Development regarding Municipal Ski Hill Operations - Financial Review.
(RECOMMENDATION PREPARED)

65 - 68

(This report provides details with respect to financial impact of operating each ski hill; and further review of cold weather policy for ski hills.)

ADDENDUM

CIVIC PETITIONS

QUESTION PERIOD AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

NOTICES OF MOTION

ADJOURNMENT

BRIGITTE SOBUSH, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

FRANCA BORTOLUSSI, COUNCIL ASSISTANT

Request for Decision

Arena Renewal Strategy - Community Survey Results

Presented To: Community Services Committee

Presented: Monday, Jul 08, 2013

Report Date Tuesday, Jul 02, 2013

Type: Presentations

Recommendation

WHEREAS the City of Greater Sudbury has undertaken an Arena Renewal Strategy, and;

WHEREAS community consultations and analysis of the current state of ice facilities have been completed, and;

WHEREAS the City's arenas are aging and require significant capital repairs in order to maintain a sustainable inventory of ice facilities to meet the demand of the community, and;

WHEREAS municipal arenas cover a diverse geographical area and add great value to communities, providing a central social hub for community activities and events.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Greater Sudbury approve the Arena Renewal Capital Plan based on the results of the Community Consultation, and;

THAT a report on funding and capital cost breakdown be submitted to Community Services Committee for the repairs to Chelmsford Community Arena and a new OHL facility, and;

THAT the City of Greater Sudbury recommend that the surplus funds from the Gerry McCrory Countryside Sports Complex project be applied towards the repairs to the Chelmsford Arena with the additional capital requirements to be funded through 2014 Leisure capital envelopes and reserve funds, and;

THAT a user fee structure be implemented to include incentives to increase usage at the I. J. Coady Arena in the Greater Sudbury community of Levack, and;

THAT opportunities be explored to replace the Sudbury Community Arena, including the consideration of Public-Private-Partnerships and Reserves.

Finance Implications

Any projected revenue reductions re: incentives and discounts for the I.J. Coady Arena will be absorbed in the Arena's section base budget. A capital funding plan will be prepared by staff for consideration of

Signed By

Report Prepared By

Rob Blackwell
Manager, Quality, Administrative and Financial Services
Digitally Signed Jul 2, 13

Division Review

Real Carre
Director of Leisure Services
Digitally Signed Jul 2, 13

Recommended by the Department

Catherine Matheson
General Manager of Community Development
Digitally Signed Jul 2, 13

Recommended by the C.A.O.

Doug Nadorozny
Chief Administrative Officer
Digitally Signed Jul 3, 13

Committee and Council. The plan will include funding (Leisure capital envelopes and reserve funds) to repair the Chelmsford Arena and options for the construction of an OHL facility to replace the Sudbury Community Arena.

As the existing capital funding levels are not sufficient to fund the anticipated future capital needs of the arena renewal capital program, staff will explore debt financing and increases to user fees and taxes to fund the capital funding shortfalls.

See attached report

Background

The Arena Renewal Strategy was requested by Council in the spring of 2010. The original report that introduced the initiative was presented to City Council on ***April 14, 2010***, and was included as part of the overall decision that provided approval for the construction of the second ice pad at the Gerry McCrory Countryside Sports Complex and the capital investment at the Cambrian Arena.

The deliverables were identified by Council on April 14, 2010 as:

- 1. A review of physical and functional condition of existing arenas*
- 2. A review of demand for ice time*
- 3. Community input/consultation*
- 4. Recommendations on the closure of existing arena(s) if appropriate*
- 5. Recommendations on if and where new arena(s) should be constructed*
- 6. Explore capital sources of revenue for 2012 budget deliberations*

On ***June 15th, 2011***, Council was presented with a report that provided an introduction to the Arena Renewal Strategy, including: the terms of reference, timelines, principles and deliverables that would be produced by the initiative.

In ***December 2011***, an information report was presented to Council to provide a summary of the results of community consultations that were held during the fall of 2011.

On ***January 21, 2013***, a report and electronic presentation were received by the Community Services Committee, regarding the Arena Renewal Strategy. Staff presented the findings of the analysis, which included a report from Monteith Brown Partners, regarding:

- A review of the physical and functional conditions of existing arenas, including building condition assessments, capital cost considerations and cost recovery data
- A review of demand for ice time
- A summary of the previous community consultations from the fall of 2011
- Key considerations and scenarios based on data from the analysis

The January 21, 2013 report (Appendix A) highlighted the capital costs associated with maintaining the current inventory of arenas, and presented demographic and ice usage trends which suggested that the City of Greater Sudbury has an over-supply of ice pads (approximately 0.9 ice pads, primarily for users outside the former City of Sudbury).

At that time, the Committee discussed the need to engage in further consultation with the user groups regarding the next steps in determining ice facility renewal or replacement. Staff were directed to:

- 1) Consult the community regarding increasing the usage of the I.J. Coady Arena in Levack
- 2) Conduct a survey regarding the community's opinion on renewing or replacing facilities.

Current Report

To address the feedback requested by the Community Services Committee, the following initiatives were undertaken to engage and consult with the community:

- Public input session with concerned citizens regarding the I.J. Coady Arena.
- A Community Survey was completed

The current report will provide the results of the community consultations. The report will also provide a summary of the prioritization of capital costs, as previously identified in a life cycle analysis of arenas, and will seek direction on other emerging issues.

Public Input Session

At the suggestion of the Ward Councillor, a presentation of the Arena Renewal Strategy analysis and a public input session was held at the Onaping Falls Community Centre on March 20, 2013 to provide concerned residents with an opportunity to comment and provide feedback on the arena renewal strategy. The public input session was well attended, with approximately 170 citizens. The session was moderated by the Director of Leisure Services and attendees were able to ask questions and comment on the arena renewal strategy. Attendees asked several questions and commented on the usage of I. J. Coady Arena. Several concerns were raised regarding the availability of ice times, and there was strong support for ensuring that the facility remains open.

Community Survey Results

Methodology

The survey was designed to incorporate the specific details that Committee had requested from the January 21st, 2013 Community Services Committee meeting. The survey, besides gathering demographic information, asked about ways to increase usage at the I.J. Coady Arena in Levack, asked for opinions regarding replacing vs. renewing existing arenas, and sought opinion regarding the Sudbury Community Arena and the use of Public-Private-Partnerships (3 P's) in renewing ice facilities (see ***Appendix B*** for the full survey).

The survey was available for completion on-line via “SurveyMonkey”, and paper copies were also made available at some Sudbury Community Arena events, and at Citizen Service Centres throughout the City of Greater Sudbury. The survey has been marketed to user groups and promoted through Citizen Action Networks (CANs) and other stakeholders. The opportunity to complete the survey was also available to ice users that attended the Ice Allocation meeting in May, 2013.

A total of 1,239 surveys were completed (from March 11 to May 18, 2013).

Results

The statistical profile of survey respondents suggests that 33% resided in the former City of Sudbury, while 21.8% respondents indicated that they lived in the community of Onaping Falls

(Table 1). 36.5% of respondents indicated that they were between the ages of 31 – 45 years (Figure 1). The majority of respondents indicated that they were ice hockey users (50.7%), and patrons of the Sudbury Community Arena (50.6%) (Table 2).

Table 1: Responses for Q#1 re: residency

Question 1: Please indicate in which community you currently reside		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Walden	6.8%	84
Former City of Sudbury	33.0%	409
Nickel Centre	5.1%	63
Rayside Balfour	7.8%	97
Onaping Falls	21.8%	270
Valley East	12.3%	152
Capreol	13.3%	165
Total Responses		1240

Figure 1: Age of respondents




Table 2: Responses for Q#3 re: level of involvement with arenas

Question 3: Please indicate your level of involvement with arenas (you may choose more than one selection)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Association Executive	4.7%	58
Association Member	7.6%	94
Community Action Network Member	3.6%	44
Ice user (hockey, ringuette, figure skating, speed skating, public skating)	50.8%	626
Parent of an ice user (hockey, ringuette, figure skating, speed skating)	43.0%	530
Sudbury Community Arena patron (Sudbury Wolves, concerts, trade shows)	50.6%	624
answered question		1233

Respondents were asked to indicate which option/strategy they would support to increase ice usage at the I.J. Coady Arena (incentives for bookings, further discounts, marketing, other comments) as illustrated in Table 3. 29.1% of respondents indicated that they would support additional incentives for booking ice. A total of 357 respondents also provided anecdotal comments regarding other strategies or options. Table 4 provides a summary of the top themes of the anecdotal comments that were provided by respondents.

Table 3: Responses for Q#4 re: strategies for I.J Coady ice usage

Question # 4: Due to the low utilization of the I.J. Coady Arena, Council has directed staff to seek opinions/strategies to increase the ice usage and generate additional revenue for this facility. Would you support the following (may choose more than one selection)?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Incentives for bookings (i.e. 1 free hour for every 5 hours booked)	29.1%	334
Further discounting user fees to promote usage	23.1%	265
Marketing campaign to make users aware of available ice	24.9%	286
Other (please comment below)	22.8%	262

Table 4: Summary of top comments from Q #4

	#	%
Try all listed options	100	28%
Close the I.J. Coady Arena	38	11%
Administration of Ice time (how ice is booked)	32	9%

A series of questions were included in the survey (Questions 5 – 8) dealing specifically with respondent's opinions regarding maintaining and/or replacing community arenas based on the scenarios of potential actions with suggested geographical clusters of current ice facilities that were presented in the January 21, 2013 report. The respondent's overwhelmingly indicated that they would prefer maintaining existing facilities and not replacing aging facilities with new multi-pad facilities, as illustrated in Figures 2 – 5.

Figure 2: Responses for Q#5 - maintain or replace I.J. Coady, Chelmsford, Dr. Edgar Leclair




Figure 3: Responses for Q#6 – maintain or replace Capreol, Centennial, Raymond Plourde




Figure 4: Responses to Q#7 - maintain or replace Garson, Toe Blake




Figure 5: Responses for Q#8 - maintain or replace TM Davies, McClelland




Table 5 summarizes the responses and illustrates that, for all scenarios, respondents indicated a preference for maintaining existing facilities.

Table 5: Summary of Results from Q#5 - Q#8

	<i>IJ Coady/ Chelmsford/ Dr. Edgar Leclair</i>	<i>Capreol/ Centennial/ Ray Plourde</i>	<i>Garson / Toe Blake</i>	<i>TM Davies / McClelland</i>
<i>Continue Maintaining Arenas</i>	60.4%	69.1%	79.1%	82.0%
<i>Replace Arenas with multi-pad facility</i>	39.6%	30.9%	20.9%	18.0%

Regarding the Sudbury Community Arena, **Questions 9 and 10** asked respondents for their opinions regarding replacing that facility with either a multi-pad (a twin pad including a new OHL facility), which would also replace the Carmichael Arena, or replacing the existing Sudbury Community Arena with a single ice surface, OHL facility. Table 3 provides the responses.

Table 6: Responses from Question # 9 and 10

<i>Question 9</i>	<i>Sudbury Community Arena / Carmichael Arena</i>
<i>Continue Maintaining Arenas</i>	46.2%
<i>Replace Arenas with multi-pad facility</i>	53.8%

<i>Question 10</i>	<i>Sudbury Community Arena</i>
<i>Continue Maintaining Arena</i>	33.1%
<i>Replace Arena with OHL facility</i>	66.9%

Respondents were also asked to comment on their support for Public-Private-Partnerships (3P) regarding the replacement of arenas. **Question 12** asked specifically about the Sudbury Community Arena, and 60.2% of respondents supported a 3P for the replacement of that facility, with 39.8% indicating that the City should continue to operate the arena (Figure 6). **Question 13** asked about support for “municipal arenas” and 58.3% of respondents indicated that they would prefer to have the City continue to operate the arenas, 41.7% indicated they would support a 3P (Figure 7).

Figure 6: Responses to Q#12: Opinions re: 3P's and the Sudbury Community Arena





Figure 7: Responses to Q#13: Opinions regarding 3P's and municipal arenas



Capital Program

A detailed life cycle analysis was completed in 2012, with the full results presented with the January 21, 2013 report to Community Services Committee. The total estimate for long term (10 year plan) needs for the community arenas approximately was \$24M. A further analysis of the building condition reports has been completed in order to prioritize the capital needs of the City of Greater Sudbury's ice facilities until 2022. The prioritization could be used to inform the

development of a formal capital program to address the aging infrastructure issue in a strategic manner, and to assist in the planning of capital budgets moving forward.

Table 7 provides the cost estimates for the priority capital repairs that were identified in the building condition reports. The calculation includes repairs that were identified as “must”, “critical” or “urgent”. Additionally, specific areas concerning health and safety and accessibility have been assigned a high priority. Table 7 also provides a total for each arena net of accessibility estimates.

As illustrated in the table, Chelmsford Arena has a significantly higher cost estimate, as the replacement of the arena floor, bleachers and boards/glass has been identified as a high priority.

Table 7: Summary of prioritized capital costs by arena (2013 - 2022)

Arena	Estimated Cost of Repairs	Estimated Cost of Accessibility Upgrades	Total Cost (top three priority rankings - must, critical, urgent)
Chelmsford	\$1,105,000	\$125,000	\$1,230,000
Sudbury Community Arena	\$440,000	\$630,000	\$1,070,000
Capreol	\$420,000	\$175,000	\$595,000
Tom Davies	\$215,000	\$125,000	\$340,000
Toe Blake	\$210,000	\$150,000	\$360,000
Garson	\$180,000	\$100,000	\$280,000
McClelland	\$172,000	\$90,000	\$262,000
Centennial	\$170,000	\$85,000	\$255,000
I. J. Coady	\$165,000	\$100,000	\$265,000
Cambrian	\$154,000	\$155,000	\$309,000
Raymond Plourde	\$145,000	\$125,000	\$270,000
Carmichael	\$141,000	\$150,000	\$291,000
Dr. Edgar Leclair	\$140,000	\$25,000	\$165,000
Gerry McCrory Countryside	\$55,000	\$25,000	\$80,000
	\$3,712,000	\$2,060,000	\$5,772,000

Emerging Issues

Dressing Rooms

Additionally, there has been some concern from the community regarding dressing rooms in some of the community arenas, and the need for additional changing/shower facilities due to the increase in participation of girls in minor hockey. As part of the capital program, Council could consider providing direction regarding further review of options to address this concern.

Gerry McCrory Countryside Sports Complex

The Gerry McCrory Countryside Sports Complex was completed in 2011, under-budget, with a surplus of approximately \$661K. Some recent additional requirements to address the snow and ice guards (chevrons) in order to protect the public heating vents will require approximately \$40K to complete necessary modifications, resulting in an available \$621K in capital.

A report to Community Services Committee in June 2012 outlined potential uses for the surplus for Council's consideration:

1. Apply the surplus towards debt repayment (outstanding debt is approximately \$5.9M)
2. Transfer the surplus funds to be used towards additional arena renewal initiatives associated with the Arena Renewal Strategy
3. Allocate the surplus to develop 3 full size soccer fields and dressing rooms at the Countryside Complex (\$2.7M for natural turf/\$4.4M for 1 artificial turf and 2 natural turf)
4. Allocate the surplus to energy initiatives (lighting retrofits/solar panels) (approximately \$750K)
5. Allocate the surplus to the “future roof reserve” for the Grace Hartman Amphitheatre (estimated \$2.4M, \$200K already in reserves)

In light of the current report and the recommendation to develop a capital program, Council could consider applying the surplus to the Arena Renewal Capital Program to allow for a greater impact regarding repairs and addressing some of the major capital issues.

Conclusions/Next Steps

Respondents to the survey were clear in indicating that there is a strong preference for maintaining existing facilities. In order to address the aging infrastructure issue, a capital program, as suggested above would be required to properly identify the priority of repairs and ensure the sustainability of existing ice facilities. The review would be completed in time to be implemented for the 2013-2014 ice season, with an review of the effectiveness of any changes completed after the 2013-2014 ice season.

A meeting took place on June 20th, 2013 with CGS Arena staff and the “Save the I.J. Coady Memorial Arena” Committee in attendance. Various options for increasing ice usage at that facility were discussed:

- The committee plans on raising \$15,000 which will be used to purchase 6 (1 hour blocks) of minor prime season ice (20 weeks x \$121 = \$2,420 x 6 = \$14,520)

- The Committee is requesting that the Onaping Falls Minor Association consider booking additional ice time and increase the registration fee this fall
- The Committee will request that the Onaping Falls Minor Hockey Association move their weeknight bookings to the weekend this will allow user groups to potentially book between 6-8pm and increase the usage of the arena
- The Committee is requesting that the City add the IJ Coady Arena and Sudbury Arena Administration telephone numbers on the "ice availability website" as this will allow people to call the Arena directly to see if ice is available as online it says "Booked" instead of "Not Available" (ie. at 4pm)
- The Committee is requesting that a process be developed such that the "311" Citizen Service Centre staff contact the Sudbury Arena when someone is inquiring about IJ Coady Arena to confirm ice availability.
- The Committee is requesting that Leisure Services add a Public Skating Session on Sundays to increase the usage and make more hours available for booking
- The Committee is requesting that Leisure Services offer a special booking incentive (book 5, get one free) and advertise it on the City of Greater Sudbury website

In order to effectively review the replacement of the Sudbury Community Arena, further analysis and consultation will be required. Opportunities for multi-use facilities, which could include a new OHL facility, may exist. Further investigation of Public-Private-Partnership opportunities should also be undertaken.

Appendix A

Executive Summary

The Arena Renewal Strategy was requested by Council in the spring of 2010. The original report that included the resolution containing the request was presented to City Council on April 14, 2010, and was included as part of the overall decision that provided approval for the construction of the second ice pad at the Countryside Sports Complex and the capital investment at the Cambrian Arena.

The strategy included the following deliverables, as identified by Council on April 14, 2010:

- 1. A review of physical and functional condition of existing arenas*
- 2. A review of demand for ice time*
- 3. Community input/consultation*
- 4. Recommendations on the closure of existing arena(s) if appropriate*
- 5. Recommendations on if and where new arena(s) should be constructed*
- 6. Explore capital sources of revenue for 2012 budget deliberations*

The report contains an exhaustive analysis of the City of Greater Sudbury's arena facilities, including

- A summary of the recent life cycle analysis
- Cost recovery data
- Demand and ice usage for City facilities
- General demographic data regarding population and trends in ice usage
- A summary of the community consultations
- Other considerations and some replacement vs. repair scenarios

The findings of the analysis generally suggest that Greater Sudbury will experience little or no growth in the number of ice users, based on current trends. The city has 16 ice pads, which, based on the geography of Greater Sudbury, is a reasonable inventory to meet current demand. As the population ages, there may be a need to decrease the inventory, unless alternate programming is introduced. Information regarding specific facilities suggest that arenas in the farthest reaches of Greater Sudbury are used the least, and in fact, I.J. Coady Arena in Levack is facing serious challenges in terms of lack of usage.

As of 2013, the analysis comparing ongoing annual levy impact with the estimated cost of internally debt financing a new facility (as illustrated in the scenarios for various geographical hubs) would suggest that Council consider repairing the city's current inventory of ice facilities. The exception, as suggested by Scenario B, would be for consideration of planning for a twin pad facility in the Chelmsford area that would replace the I.J. Coady, Chelmsford and Edgar Leclair Arenas. This would effectively reduce the arena inventory by one ice pad, but would "right-size" the inventory for projected future demand.

Background

Chronology

The Arena Renewal Strategy was requested by Council in the spring of 2010. The original report that included the resolution containing the request was presented to City Council on April 14, 2010, and was included as part of the overall decision that provided approval for the construction of the second ice pad at the Countryside Sports Complex and the capital investment at the Cambrian Arena.

The following resolution was carried at the April 14, 2010 meeting:

Resolution 2010-133:

WHEREAS Cambrian Arena is closed and needs to be replaced;

AND WHEREAS Council provided direction for staff to cost out options for arena renewal;

AND WHEREAS the two options were identified as: an additional ice pad at Countryside Arena or a new two pad facility at Lorraine Street;

AND WHEREAS Council requested a financial plan for these options;

AND WHEREAS the primary shortage of ice is in the city core, as identified in the Parks, Open Spaces and Leisure Master Plan which is compounded by the closure of Cambrian Arena;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT plans for construction of a second ice pad at Countryside Arena commence effective May 2010 as outlined in the report dated April 9, 2010 from the General Manager of Community Development;

AND THAT the Community Development Department undertake a detailed Arena Renewal Strategy for a multi-pad arena opportunity consistent with the principles of the Constellation Report for equitable placement of facilities across the City of Greater Sudbury;

AND THAT the strategy considers recommendations from the Parks Open Space and Leisure Master Plan, advice gathered from community consultation for the multi use recreational complex along with additional broad based community consultation regarding future multi pad opportunities;

AND THAT the Arena Renewal Strategy be completed in advance of Budget 2012;

AND THAT staff be directed to notify Greater Sudbury Utilities Inc. regarding Council's intent to redeem the preferred shares;

AND THAT any operating budget savings from the closure of the Cambrian Arena for 2010 and 2011 be transferred to the Capital fund

The deliverables were identified by Council on April 14, 2010 as:

1. *A review of physical and functional condition of existing arenas*
2. *A review of demand for ice time*
3. *Community input/consultation*
4. *Recommendations on the closure of existing arena(s) if appropriate*
5. *Recommendations on if and where new arena(s) should be constructed*
6. *Explore capital sources of revenue for 2012 budget deliberations*

On June 15th, 2011, Council was presented with a report that provided an introduction to the Arena Renewal Strategy, including: the terms of reference, timelines, principles and deliverables that would be produced by the initiative.

In December 2011, an information report was presented to Council to provide a summary of the results of community consultations that were held during the fall of 2011.

In order to provide relevant, subjective data for the Arena Renewal Strategy analysis, Monteith Brown Planning Consultants (MBPC) (see Appendix A) was engaged to provide:

- Identification of current trends in ice participation, arena demand, and arena provision across Ontario and the country;
- A cursory assessment of the City's arena needs (in terms of quantity) based on utilization and provision targets;
- Discussion of the types of public-private partnerships that may be available to the City for the construction and/or operation of community arenas, and
- A high level examination of the costs to build an OHL-size arena (the home of the Sudbury Wolves – the Sudbury Arena – was built in 1951 and there is a need to begin the planning for its potential renewal or replacement) and the types of partnership arrangements that might be considered¹

1. A Review of Physical and Functional Condition of Existing Arenas

Life Cycle / Building Condition Assessment

The average age of the ice facilities in the CGS is 40 years old and the Sudbury Community Arena is 61 years old. There has been significant investment in maintaining and repairing

¹ Monteith Brown Planning Consultants, Analysis Informing the City's Arena Renewal Strategy, December 2012

the existing facilities, but, a substantial level of capital funding will be required to maintain the current inventory of arenas.

Certainly, the current physical state of the arena infrastructure requires extensive analysis. As an example of the capital costs involved with repairing arenas, the recent activity in the City of Greater Sudbury suggests that the cost of repairing Cambrian Arena was \$1.2M. The scope of the renovation included: replacement of the rink slab with a new sub-surface heating system, roof repair/replacement and the purchase and installation of rink boards and condenser unit. The capital renewal of Cambrian Arena was necessitated by a floor failure and a need to complete emergency repairs. The capital project is expected to have extended the life of the facility by a minimum of 10 years. The cost of construction a new ice pad at Countryside was approximately \$10.2M. For the purposes of this report, the cost of a new twin pad arena is estimated to be \$22M, the estimated cost that was presented to Council in April 2010 for a proposed two pad ice facility on Lorraine St. in Greater Sudbury.

Building condition assessments have been completed by Construction Control Incorporated, using the standard guidelines of ASTM E-2018-08, *Standard Guide for Property Condition Assessments*, to properly identify and prioritize capital requirements and risks with the existing facility inventory. The study has provided a detailed analysis of the capital needs of the facilities along with cost estimates for immediate needs (1 – 5 years) and future needs (6 – 10 years).

The following table provides a summary of the “opinion of probable costs” provided by the consultant regarding the building conditions of municipal facilities. Detailed data regarding the type of capital investment required is contained in Appendix B. The complete set of reports is available on the CGS website.

Table 1: Capital Estimates - Opinion of Probable Costs, Life Cycle Analysis/Building Conditions Report

Facility	Immediate Need (1 to 5 Years)	Long Term Needs (6 to 10 years)	Total
Sudbury Community Arena	\$2,375,000	\$1,450,000	\$3,825,000
Capreol (both pads)	\$2,015,000	\$1,037,000	\$3,052,000
Chelmsford	\$1,760,000	\$1,057,000	\$2,817,000
Edgar Leclair	\$751,000	\$1,173,000	\$1,924,000
Carmichael	\$921,000	\$756,000	\$1,677,000
Cambrian	\$895,000	\$687,000	\$1,582,000
Centennial	\$637,000	\$911,000	\$1,548,000
I.J. Coady	\$682,000	\$795,000	\$1,477,000
Ray Plourde	\$764,000	\$602,000	\$1,366,000
Tom Davies	\$563,000	\$737,000	\$1,300,000
Toe Blake	\$785,000	\$382,000	\$1,167,000
McClelland	\$533,000	\$602,000	\$1,135,000

Garson	\$420,000	\$462,000	\$882,000
Gerry McCrory Countryside	\$137,000	\$275,000	\$412,000
	\$13,238,000	\$10,926,000	\$24,164,000

Data from "Building Condition Assessments", Construction Control Incorporated, November 2012

Cost Recovery

Historically, municipal arenas are operated on a partial cost recovery basis, therefore, there is some reliance on the tax levy to fund the operations of arenas. As illustrated in the Table 2, the total revenue generated by an arena is able to fund, on average, 64% of the total **direct operating costs** for each arena. Data is sourced from the 2011 cost centres for each facility, using the actual for 2011. 2011 data was utilized as it provides a full budget year of actual revenues and expenditures.

Table 2: Direct Operating Cost Recovery 2011

	Expense Total	Revenue Total	Cost Recovery
Gerry McCrory Countryside (both pads)*	\$582,018	\$476,139	*82%
Sudbury Arena	\$1,472,387	\$1,150,131	78%
TM Davies	\$599,234	\$452,901	76%
Raymond Plourde	\$452,987	\$338,901	75%
Garson	\$421,559	\$284,048	67%
Carmichael	\$432,420	\$281,527	65%
Capreol (both pads)	\$461,788	\$297,752	64%
Chelmsford	\$451,218	\$283,436	63%
Dr. Edgar Leclair	\$426,692	\$263,495	62%
Cambrian	\$309,328	\$188,889	**61%
McClelland	\$538,828	\$314,717	58%
Centennial	\$384,890	\$219,369	57%
Toe Blake (Coniston)	\$424,474	\$228,033	54%
I.J. Coady	\$276,823	\$102,252	37%

*Gerry McCrory Countryside Sports Complex is projected to have 100% direct operational cost recovery for 2012, the first full year of operation for the twin pad facility.

**Cambrian Arena is projected to have 100% cost recovery for 2012, which includes additional revenue from all municipal arenas to offset direct operating costs of Cambrian Arena

Table 3 provides an estimated cost recovery if total costs are considered, **direct operating and annual estimated capital costs**. For the purpose of this analysis, the "opinion of probable cost", as reported in the building conditions analysis for immediate needs (1 – 5 years) was divided by five (5) to generate an estimated annual capital cost for each arena for years 1 – 5. An average for years 6 – 10 was then obtained using the same method.

These averages were then averaged (summed and divided by 2) to obtain an estimate for the 10 year annual average for capital expenses. The table also details the net levy cost of each facility and the cost recovery, including estimated capital costs.

Table 3: Total Cost Recovery (capital 2012 estimates and 2011 operating costs/revenues)

	<i>Direct Operating Expense</i>	<i>Average Annual Capital Expense (unfunded)</i>	<i>Total Expense (Op + Cap)</i>	<i>Revenue Total</i>	<i>Annual Net Impact on Levy</i>	<i>Cost Recovery</i>
Gerry McCrory Countryside	\$582,018	\$41,200	\$623,218	\$476,139	(\$147,079)	76.4%
TM Davies	\$599,234	\$129,800	\$729,034	\$452,901	(\$276,133)	62.1%
Sudbury Arena	\$1,472,387	\$382,500	\$1,854,887	\$1,150,131	(\$704,756)	62.0%
Garson	\$421,559	\$88,200	\$509,759	\$284,048	(\$225,711)	55.7%
Raymond Plourde	\$452,987	\$136,600	\$589,587	\$338,901	(\$250,686)	57.5%
McClelland	\$538,828	\$113,200	\$652,028	\$314,717	(\$337,311)	48.3%
Dr. Edgar Leclair	\$426,692	\$192,400	\$619,092	\$263,495	(\$355,597)	42.6%
Carmichael	\$432,420	\$167,700	\$600,120	\$281,527	(\$318,593)	46.9%
Centennial	\$384,890	\$154,800	\$539,690	\$219,369	(\$320,321)	40.6%
Toe Blake (Coniston)	\$424,474	\$116,700	\$541,174	\$228,033	(\$313,141)	42.1%
Cambrian	\$309,328	\$158,200	\$467,528	\$188,889	(\$278,639)	40.4%
Chelmsford	\$451,218	\$281,700	\$732,918	\$283,436	(\$449,482)	38.7%
Capreol (both pads)	\$461,788	\$305,200	\$766,988	\$297,752	(\$469,236)	38.8%
I.J. Coady	\$276,823	\$147,700	\$424,523	\$102,252	(\$322,271)	24.1%

Annual Capital estimate derived from an average of the 1-5 year average and the 6 -10 year average from the Building Conditions Report - Opinions of Probable Costs

***Cost recovery is projected to be significantly higher for Countryside and Cambrian for 2012 as both facilities are projected to recover 100% of operating expenses.*

The following table provides a comparison of the cost recovery percentages for direct operating cost and total cost (direct operating and capital) for 2011 . Again, the total costs are calculated from the 2011 cost centres and capital estimates are for a 10 year average based on the information contained in the building condition reports obtained from Construction Control Incorporated.

Table 4: Comparison of Direct and Total Cost Recovery Rates

	<i>without capital</i>	<i>with capital</i>
<i>Gerry McCrory Countryside</i>	82%	76%
<i>TM Davies</i>	76%	62%
<i>Sudbury Arena</i>	78%	62%
<i>Garson</i>	67%	56%
<i>Raymond Plourde</i>	75%	57%
<i>McClelland</i>	58%	48%
<i>Dr. Edgar Leclair</i>	62%	43%
<i>Carmichael</i>	65%	47%
<i>Centennial</i>	57%	41%
<i>Toe Blake (Coniston)</i>	54%	42%
<i>Cambrian</i>	61%	40%
<i>Chelmsford</i>	63%	39%
<i>Capreol (both pads)</i>	64%	39%
<i>I.J. Coady</i>	37%	24%

2. A Review of Demand for Ice Time

The current inventory of ice pads in the City of Greater Sudbury is at an all time high, with 16 pads in 14 facilities operating since the commencement of the 2011-2012 ice season. After one full ice season of operation with the current capacity, and the recent ice allocations for the 2012-2013 season having been completed, the City has been able to generate statistics regarding demand and ice requirements.

The ice usage statistics for Greater Sudbury arena facilities for the 2012-2013 ice season remain consistent with historical usage trends. As illustrated in the Table 5 below, the ice usage, particularly for minor prime hours, remains very high, with 5 of the ice pads reporting 100% usage available minor prime hours. Minor prime hours are defined as prime time ice hours for minor associations (figure skating clubs, hockey associations, speed skating, etc.). Minor Prime hours are Monday to Friday, from 5pm to 10pm and Saturday and Sunday, from 7am-10pm. Shoulder hours are defined as each week, Monday to Sunday from 10pm to 12am.

Table 6 presents the information regarding ice usage during the shoulder times and suggests a downward trend in all facilities except the Gerry McCrory Countryside Sports Complex. The data presented was collected from the “Daily Logs” which are established after ice allocation meetings have occurred with the community and was contained in the Monteith Brown Planning Consultants (MBPC) report, *Analysis Informing the City’s Arena Renewal Strategy*, December 2012.

Table 5: Minor Prime Time Ice Usage by Arena (Winter Season) (MBPC)

	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	Change (total hours)
Cambrian	100%	<i>Not in Service</i>		98%	98%	-2%
Capreol #1	95%	92%	90%	73%	86%	-9%
Capreol #2	95%	93%	96%	94%	90%	-6%
Carmichael	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%
Centennial	98%	98%	92%	96%	97%	-1%
Chelmsford	100%	97%	95%	97%	98%	-2%
Dr. Ed Leclair	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-2%
Garson	100%	100%	99%	97%	100%	0%
Countryside #1	100%	100%	100%	100%	98%	-2%
Countryside #2	<i>Not Yet Constructed</i>			98%	96%	n/a
I.J. Coady	83%	79%	67%	74%	58%	-30%
McClelland	<i>Not in Service</i>	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%
Raymond Plourde	96%	97%	95%	94%	96%	0%
T.M. Davies	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%
Toe Blake Memorial	100%	100%	100%	95%	97%	-3%
Sudbury	100%	98%	98%	98%	95%	-5%
CITY WIDE	98%	97%	95%	95%	94%	--

Table 6: Shoulder Time Ice Usage by Arena (Winter Season) (MBPC)

	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	Change (total hours)
Cambrian	75%	<i>Not in Service</i>		58%	47%	-14%
Capreol #1	43%	43%	21%	32%	29%	-33%
Capreol #2	39%	43%	43%	21%	25%	-36%
Carmichael	79%	57%	57%	71%	50%	-36%
Centennial	71%	68%	57%	46%	46%	-35%
Chelmsford	64%	39%	36%	54%	50%	-22%
Dr. Ed Leclair	61%	57%	57%	61%	50%	-18%
Garson	89%	79%	75%	61%	61%	-32%
Countryside #1	82%	71%	71%	46%	54%	-35%
Countryside #2	<i>Not Yet Constructed</i>			46%	50%	n/a
IJ Coady	14%	14%	7%	7%	7%	-50%
McClelland	<i>Not in Service</i>	68%	54%	46%	39%	-42%
Raymond Plourde	54%	54%	43%	36%	32%	-40%
TM Davies	79%	54%	61%	46%	43%	-45%
Toe Blake Memorial	71%	86%	86%	68%	68%	-5%
Sudbury	86%	82%	71%	79%	71%	-17%
CITY WIDE	65%	58%	53%	50%	46%	-

For Tables 5 and 6 - Utilization rates based on 55 prime hours being available each week (M-F 5pm-10pm, S-S 7am-10pm) and 14 shoulder hours each week (M-S 10pm to 12am).

How much ice do we need?

The City's 2004 *Parks, Open Space & Leisure Master Plan* established a provision standard of 1 ice pad per 12,000 population for the City of Greater Sudbury (the existing service level translates into 1 ice pad per 10,017 residents). However, in order to more accurately reflect the factors that affect ice usage, and the demand considerations (such as changing participation rates, an aging population, geographic inequities, etc.) in the City of Greater Sudbury, a target based on number of participants per ice pad was developed by MBPC.

The target used in this report reflects the differences between utilization rates in urban and rural arenas. For example, in urban rinks, utilization can approach 100% in many instances because excess demand can easily be shifted to a nearby rink; in rural areas, a certain amount of excess capacity – particularly for youth – is more common due to smaller populations and challenges in travelling to more distant rinks.

The MBPC report states, *“to help establish a reasonable provision target that is reflective of Greater Sudbury’s unique circumstances, it is helpful to consider current utilization as an indicator of demand. Most notably, the number of available prime time hours City-wide has increased every year between 2008/09 and 2012/13, from 18 hours to 48 hours per week. This unused ice equates to the equivalent of 0.9 surplus ice pads (based on 55 hours per week per rink) at present. There is no apparent latent demand (given the availability of prime ice in both the former City and broader community), thereby reinforcing the validity of this finding. With a current supply of 16 pads, demand for 15.1 pads, and youth registration of 6,139, the average provision level is approximately 405 youth registrants per ice pad. This provision level represents the equilibrium where arena demand equals supply in the City of Greater Sudbury.”*

As recommended in the MBPC report, a target of 1 ice pad per 405 youth registrants will be utilized for assessing City-wide arena needs. This target:

- Assumes that youth will use the large majority of minor prime time hours
- Allows for occasional usage from a broader market of users (e.g., tournaments and competitions).
- Is meant to be applied across the entire system and not to specific arenas as usage profiles will be different at each facility.

Based on this “benchmark”, the City had some pressure for expanding the ice supply, particularly in the downtown/Sudbury area (6,320 youth registrants and 14 rinks available in the 2008/09 season, this average was 451 per ice pad). This demand appears to have peaked in 2011/12 and was alleviated with the construction of the new ice pad at the Gerry McCrory Countryside Sports Complex. Recent data would suggest that registrations have declined and, based on available demographic data, this trend is projected to continue, potentially creating additional capacity within the system.

The following provides a projection of trends and the resulting number of ice pads required, based on a target of 1 ice pad per 405 youth participants. The projections assume

that the existing rate of participation is maintained (i.e., at 23.5%) and children and youth market segment (ages 5-19) will decline at the forecasted rate. It is expected that demand will decline over the next fifteen years as the primary arena market declines (i.e., children and youth). The analysis suggests that future population growth may eventually offset this, with the City returning to current demand levels by about 2031.

Table 7: Projection of Ice Pad Needs, City of Greater Sudbury (2011 to 2026) (MBPC Report)


	2012	2016	2021	2026
Forecasted Number of Youth Registrants (based on a 23.5% participation rate for youth ages 5 to 19)	6,139	5,918	5,836	6,008
Number of Ice Pads Required (based on 16 pads at present and a provision target of 1 ice pad per 405 youth registrants)	15.1	14.6	14.4	14.8
Surplus Ice Pads	0.9	1.4	1.6	1.2

Forecasts based on current youth participation rates applied against Ontario Ministry of Finance Projections
(Ontario Population Projections Update, 2011–2036)

Demographics

Recent census data and population studies completed by the Ministry of Finance, as illustrated in Figure 1, suggest that Greater Sudbury's population will grow at a consistent rate of approximately 5%. The primary users of arenas in the City of Greater Sudbury are minor sports participants under the age of 18. With this in mind, population data detailing the under 18 cohort has been presented in Table 8. The census information from Statistics Canada suggests that there has been a slight decrease in both males (5%) and females (6%) under 18 from Census 2006 to Census 2011. Projections to 2021 suggest that proportion of "children" (0 -9 years old) in the population will remain at approximately 10%, but the "youth" cohort (10 -19 years old) will decrease by approximately 2%.

Figure 1: Population Projections for the City of Greater Sudbury (MBPC Report)




Note: Housing Study forecast was prepared to the year 2021

Source: Statistics Canada Census, 1996-2011; Housing Background Study, 2005; Ministry of Finance, 2012.

Table 8: Total Males and Females <18 (Statistics Canada – Census Data)

<i>Year</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Total</i>
2006	16,875	16,290	33,175
2011	16,005	15,260	31,270
variance	-870	-1,030	-1,905
% change	-5.16%	-6.32%	-5.74%

Using GIS technology and 2011 Census information from Statistics Canada, the following map was created to provide a visual representation of the geographical location of Greater Sudbury residents that are under 18 years old. As suggested in Figure 2, there are heavier concentrations of youth in specific areas of Greater Sudbury. Specifically, the areas indicated in orange and red are neighbourhoods/communities that have more dense populations of children/youth. For ease of reference, locations of Greater Sudbury arenas have also been included on the map. As illustrated in the map, the areas in which there are more dense populations of children include Valley East, New Sudbury, Minnow Lake and the south end of the former City of Sudbury. It is also noted that the Onaping Falls, Levack area has little population density of children aged 0 -18.

Figure 2: Map of under 18 population and location of arenas

Participation Statistics

Table 9: # of Participants by Association


	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	% Change from 2009 to 2012
Association					
Minor Hockey Associations					
Capreol Minor Hockey	88	92	109	101	12.9%
Coniston Minor Hockey	97	106	101	100	3.0%
Copper Cliff Minor Hockey	550	522	540	516	-6.6%
Nickel Centre Minor Hockey	323	361	214	253	-27.7%
Nickel City Hockey Club			472	479	100.0%
Onaping Falls Minor Hockey	124	139	107	101	-22.8%
Rayside Balfour Minor Hockey	367	365	299	303	-21.1%
Sudbury Girl's Hockey	543	626	658	660	17.7%
Sudbury Minor Hockey	680	716	695	650	-4.6%
Sudbury Playground	573	550	538	489	-17.2%
Valley East Minor Hockey	635	682	716	741	14.3%
Valley East Progressive	128	128			
Walden Minor Hockey	351	347	249	286	-22.7%
Total Minor Hockey	4459	4634	4698	4679	4.7%
Figure Skating Clubs					
Chelmsford Figure Skating	129	105	126	118	-9.3%
Copper Cliff Figure Skating	244	256	310	257	5.1%
Nickel Blades Figure Skating	346	305	313	201	-72.1%
Sudbury Skating Club	201	166	255	267	24.7%
Valley East Figure Skating	297	235	259	207	-43.5%
Walden Figure Skating	137	147	127	103	-33.0%
Total Figure Skating	1354	1214	1390	1153	-17.4%
Ringette Associations					
Sudbury Ringette	75	84	96	103	27.2%
Valley East Ringette	152	130	149	119	-27.7%
Walden Ringette	104	125	126	85	-22.4%
Total Ringette	331	339	371	307	-7.8%

Note: Nickel City Hockey Club came into being in 2011-2012, at this time Walden, Rayside Balfour, Nickel Centre, Onaping Falls and Valley East Associations merged their "rep" hockey programs under the Nickel City Hockey Club governance model

Table 9 compares registrations for minor sports teams/associations that utilize arena facilities in Greater Sudbury, for the 2009-2010 through to the 2012-2013 ice seasons. A comparison over time indicates an increase in demand for minor hockey ice users, with a decrease in demand for figure skating and ringette. It is possible that the increase in hockey and decrease in figure skating and ringette is a result of the corresponding growth of girl's hockey in Greater Sudbury during this period.

Information from Hockey Canada and the Ontario Hockey Federation suggest that there has been an overall decrease in participation in organized sports, including hockey, nationally and provincially. Figure 3 presents national and provincial hockey registration information for the period 2002- 2011

Figure 3: National and Provincial Hockey Registration (youth and adult*), 2002-2011(MBPC)



Source: Hockey Canada, 2012

* For the purposes of consistency, 2011 registration data has been adjusted to remove participants registered in the new joint venture between Hockey Canada and Canlan Ice Sports (this adult recreation league data was first recorded in 2011).

3. Community Input/Consultations

In order to provide the citizens of Greater Sudbury an opportunity to provide input and feedback regarding the state of arenas in the city, seven (7) consultations were conducted throughout the month of September 2011, in several communities in Greater Sudbury. The consultations were designed as a drop-in and open house experience for citizens, with various fact and figures regarding arenas and arena usage posted on “story boards” with staff present to answer questions and provide additional information. Surveys were available to citizens to complete in order to provide more feedback and opinions regarding the direction that could be considered for the renewal strategy. The surveys were also available on-line. The City of Greater Sudbury’s website was utilized to provide information regarding the consultations, as were various social media applications (i.e. Facebook).

The results of the Arena Renewal survey and comments from the community consultations suggest that community arenas are still very important to residents. Although there was no overwhelming consensus on which direction the City of Greater Sudbury should pursue regarding arena renewal, it was clear from the responses that from the perspective of the citizens that participated in the consultations, existing facilities within communities should be maintained. This was suggested in the survey responses where respondents were asked to rank the ***importance of the potential actions*** (“1” being most important and “10” being least important). The lowest average ranking score, which would represent the most important action, was refurbishing current arenas (1.77).

The respondents appeared split in their opinion regarding whether the CGS should build new facilities or invest in repairing existing facilities. The survey asked about the current state of arenas and the respondents’ opinion regarding what the CGS should do, 45.8% indicated that they thought repairs were required and 42.6% indicated that the City should build new arenas. During the consultations, anecdotal comments often contained reference to multi-use facilities and the multi-pad facilities in Southern Ontario communities.

4. Considerations and Scenarios

The Arena Renewal Strategy has gathered and examined the data and provided quantitative facts associated with the operations of the existing arena facilities in the City of Greater Sudbury. Several significant issues and challenges are presented to Council for consideration.

Renewal vs. Replacement - Examples

Analysis of the Building Conditions report which provides the estimated capital costs for the next 10 years and the usage and demand statistics derived from historical data, suggests that in certain scenarios, replacement of arenas might present the best business case in terms of impact to the municipal levy, over time.

The following scenarios are examples of potential actions with suggested geographical clusters of current ice facilities that Council could consider regarding arena renewal or replacement. For the purpose of these scenarios, the estimated average net impact on the levy from Table 3 (page 5 of this report) is used in the calculations. The estimate for the annual cost of new facilities is based on debt financing calculated at 3.7% interest, over a 25 year amortization period.

Scenario A(i) provides an estimate for the replacement of the Sudbury Community Arena and Carmicheal Arena with a twin pad facility that could also host an OHL franchise. The estimate is based on a cost of \$70 million and assumes that if new facilities are built, they should consist of multi-pads to take advantage of operational efficiencies. **Scenario A(ii)** provides an estimate of replacing only the Sudbury Arena at an estimated cost of \$66M. Based on the capital needs of these facilities, it would appear that repair and ongoing capital maintenance would have a lesser impact on the levy than would replacement, though there has been some discussion regarding the need to replace the Sudbury Community Arena. There may be some interest in a public-private-partnership (P3) for the replacement of the Sudbury Community Arena, which would have an impact on the cost estimates.

Scenario B suggests the costs to continue to operate I.J. Coady, Chelmsford and Edgar Leclair arenas are slightly more than the costs to internally debt finance the construction of a new twin pad facility. This scenario assumes that, as has been the case with the Gerry McCorry Countryside Sports Complex, the direct operating costs would be recovered through revenue from the operations of the facility. Usage data suggests that a twin pad would have the capacity to meet the ice demand of these three existing facilities. In this scenario, because the replacement and repair costs are relatively similar, and because the Chelmsford Arena has historically had issues with the arena floor, consideration could be given to new construction.

The Valley East and Capreol communities currently have 4 ice pads located in 3 facilities. These facilities report consistent usage, and therefore, **Scenario C** suggests that a four pad facility could be considered to replace the existing arenas. However, given the estimated annual cost of debt financing such a facility, at the present time, consideration could be given to repairing and maintaining the existing arenas in that area.

There is also evidence to suggest that in some cases, the repairing of existing facilities that are well used would present the best business case. In **Scenarios D** and **E**, the Toe Blake (Coniston) Arena and the Garson Arena, along with the TM Davies Arena and McClelland Arena have the same assumptions applied. The usage at these arenas is very high and therefore, in each scenario, a twin pad would be required to replace both facilities if the same level of service was desired. Clearly, the cost of the capital investment to repair these facilities provides the most advantageous option.

A further assumption considered for replacement vs. renewal is the logic of building multi-pad facilities that offer operational efficiencies, allowing the facility to operate at 100% cost recovery. Also, the scenarios are based on current projections and cost estimates for repair and replacement, as well as the current trends for ice usage.

Table 10: Scenarios for Replacement vs. Repair (based on current estimates and projections)

<i>Scenario A(i)</i>	<i>Estimated annual net impact on levy (operating + capital)</i>
Sudbury Arena	\$704,756
Carmichael Arena	\$318,593
Total estimated annual impact on levy	\$1,023,349 ¹
Estimated annual cost of OHL facility (twin pad)	\$4,339,884 ²

<i>Scenario A(ii)</i>	<i>Estimated annual net impact on levy (operating + capital)</i>
Sudbury Arena	\$704,756
Total estimated annual impact on levy	\$704,756 ¹
Estimated annual cost of OHL facility single pad	\$4,091,890 ³

<i>Scenario B</i>	<i>Estimated annual net impact on levy (operating + capital)</i>
I.J. Coady	\$322,271
Chelmsford	\$449,482
Dr. Edgar Leclair	\$355,597
Total estimated annual impact on levy	\$1,127,350 ¹
Estimated annual cost of twin pad	\$1,363,963 ⁴

<i>Scenario C</i>	<i>Estimated annual net impact on levy (operating + capital)</i>
Capreol (both pads)	\$469,236
Centennial	\$320,321
Ray Plourde	\$250,686
Total estimated annual impact on levy	\$1,040,243 ¹

Estimated annual cost of quad pad **\$2,169,941** ⁵

Scenario D	Estimated annual net impact on levy (operating + capital)
Coniston (Toe Blake)	\$313,141
Garson	\$225,711
Total estimated annual impact on levy	\$538,852 ¹
Estimated annual cost of twin pad	\$1,363,983 ⁴

Scenario E	Estimated annual net impact on levy (operating + capital)
TM Davies	\$276,133
McClelland	\$337,311
Total estimated annual impact on levy	\$613,444 ¹
Estimated annual cost of twin pad	\$1,363,983 ⁴

¹ average of annual estimate for 10 years (avg for yr 1 to yr 5 + avg for yr 6 to yr 10)/2

² \$70M financed for 25 yrs @ 3.7%*, assumes operational costs are fully recovered

³ \$66M financed for 25 yrs @ 3.7%*, assumes operational costs are fully recovered

⁴ \$22M financed for 25 yrs @ 3.7%*, assumes operational costs are fully recovered

⁵ \$35M financed for 25 yrs @ 3.7%*, assumes operational costs are fully recovered

* 3.7% is the current OSIFA lending rate from Infrastructure Ontario as per Finance Section

For comparison purposes, annual impact to the levy is derived from a 10 year estimate, it is assumed that these annual estimates would continue on an annual basis for the useful life of the respective facility. Costs after 10 years would most likely increase due to the age of the facilities (ie. average of 50 years old) and have not been quantified. As a result, this may decrease the gap for comparison purposes.

Emerging Issues

Replacement of the Sudbury Community Arena

Another consideration for Council is the replacement of the Sudbury Community Arena. Already over 60 years old, the arena has surpassed its useful life. However, there has been considerable capital investment in the existing facility (a total of \$4.2M over the past 14 years) and the facility does have some historical value for many Greater Sudbury residents. The desire for a new building to house a Sudbury Ontario Hockey League (OHL) franchise has surfaced recently, with the advantages of a newer, efficient facility with a greater seating capacity to allow for the hosting of larger, more prestigious events. The estimated cost for an OHL facility is in the range of \$30 – 60M, depending on seating capacity, location and amenities. According to data obtained by MBPC, a conservative estimate for the development of an OHL facility would be approximately \$11,000 per permanent seat. The

current seating capacity of the Sudbury Arena is approximately 4662 (including suite seating). A new facility with approximately 6000 seats would be optimal.

The following table from the MBPC report provides a summary of OHL cities and the facilities that have been built in the past 17 years.

As illustrated in the table, replacement of the Sudbury Community Arena would require significant capital investment, and in many cases across Ontario, the municipality assumes/absorbs the risk of the facility, though several new facilities are operated by private sector contract managers. Greater Sudbury would need to carefully evaluate and analyze options for management partnerships.

Table 11: Summary of OHL facilities (MBPC)

Location	Opened	# Seats	Delivery Model	Cost	Risk Allocation
Barrie	1996	4,200	Design-build	NA	City absorbs all risk
Sarnia	1998	5,000	P3	\$18.5M	Shared risk formula
Brampton	1998	5,000	P3	\$24.5M	City absorbs operating risk
Mississauga	1998	5,400	Design-build	\$22M	City absorbs all risk
Guelph	2000	5,100	P3	\$21.5M	Shared risk formula
London	2002	9,100	P3	\$47M	Shared risk formula
Sault Ste. Marie	2005	5,000	Design-build	\$25M	City absorbs all risk
Oshawa	2006	5,400	Design-build	\$45M	City absorbs all risk
Kingston	2008	5,200	Design-build	\$46.5	City absorbs all risk
Windsor	2008	6,500	Design-build	\$40M	City absorbs all risk

Source: Spectator Facility Feasibility Study, City of St. Catharines, Deloitte, 2011

Laurentian University

Laurentian University has confirmed that they will be developing men's and women's varsity hockey teams, as well as intra-mural hockey programs. They have expressed their intent to have these teams ready as early as the 2013-2014 hockey season.

Regarding future plans, the following resolution was passed by the Laurentian University Board of Governors, June 22, 2012:

WHEREAS the Board of Governors approved in February 2010 a Multi-purpose athletics facility (Phase I – hockey arena), funded by the private sector as a long-term capital strategic direction;

AND WHEREAS the Strategic Plan 2012 – 2017 includes an outcome to reintroduce men's varsity hockey, and introduce women's varsity hockey;

AND WHEREAS facilities for varsity hockey practice and competition will be rented until a campus arena is available;

AND WHEREAS the 2012-2013 Operating Budget and multi-year forecast allow for the launch of varsity hockey teams in September 2013, without being contingent on the availability of a campus arena;

BE IT RESOLVED,

THAT the Board of Governors approve the Sudbury Campus Arena Project Proposal, as recommended by the Property Development and Planning Committee at its meeting of June 12, 2012.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Administrative Project Proposal Committee be structured to:

Pursue discussions with the City of Greater Sudbury regarding ice time availability;

Explore with the City of Greater Sudbury its interest in, and need for, additional ice; and








Investigate models of, and opportunities for, public-private partnerships (P3's) for an arena development.

As of the date of this report, the ice requirements for Laurentian's hockey programs will be accommodated at the Gerry McCrory Countryside Sports Complex.







Municipal Partnerships and Public-Private Partnerships

In their recent report, *Analysis Informing the City's Arena Renewal Strategy*, MBPC have provided detailed information regarding partnerships, their benefits and the differences in types of partnerships. In general, municipalities have entered into partnerships with the private sector as a means of transferring risk and attracting private capital.








1. Please indicate in which community you currently reside

		Response Percent	Response Count
Walden		6.8%	84
Former City of Sudbury		33.0%	409
Nickel Centre		5.1%	63
Rayside Balfour		7.8%	97
Onaping Falls		21.8%	270
Valley East		12.3%	152
Capreol		13.3%	165
answered question			1,240
skipped question			0





2. Please indicate which of the following most accurately reflects your age group.

		Response Percent	Response Count
0-15 years		6.1%	75
16-20 years		5.1%	63
21-30 years		12.4%	153
31-45 years		36.6%	450
46-55 years		19.8%	244
56 years or older		20.0%	246
answered question			1,231
skipped question			9



3. Please indicate your level of involvement with arenas (you may choose more than one selection)

		Response Percent	Response Count
Association Executive		4.7%	58
Association Member		7.6%	94
Community Action Network Member		3.6%	44
Ice user (hockey, ringuette, figure skating, speed skating, public skating)		50.8%	626
Parent of an ice user (hockey, ringuette, figure skating, speed skating)		43.0%	530
Sudbury Community Arena patron (Sudbury Wolves, concerts, trade shows)		50.6%	624
Citizen		60.5%	746
answered question			1,233
skipped question			7



4. Due to the low utilization of the I.J. Coady Arena, Council has directed staff to seek opinions/strategies to increase the ice usage and generate additional revenue for this facility. Would you support the following (may choose more than one selection)?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Incentives for bookings (i.e. 1 free hour for every 5 hours booked)		29.1%	334
Further discounting user fees to promote usage		23.1%	265
Marketing campaign to make users aware of available ice		24.9%	286
Other (please comment below)		22.8%	262
	Other (please specify)		357
answered question			1,147
skipped question			93



5. I.J Coady (Levack) , Chelmsford and Dr. Edgar Leclair (Azilda) Arenas.

		Response Percent	Response Count
Continue Maintaining Arenas (\$1.1M per year)		60.4%	654
Replace Arenas with a twin pad (\$1.4M per year)		39.6%	428
answered question			1,082
skipped question			158



6. Capreol (both pads), Centennial (Hanmer) and Raymond Plourde (Val Caron) Arenas

		Response Percent	Response Count
Continue Maintaining Arenas (\$1.0M per year)		69.1%	743
Replace Arenas with a four pad (\$2.2M per year)		30.9%	333
		answered question	1,076
		skipped question	164



7. Garson and Toe Blake (Coniston) Arenas

		Response Percent	Response Count
Continue Maintaining Arenas (\$500K per year)		79.1%	833
Replace Arenas with a twin pad (\$1.4M per year)		20.9%	220
		answered question	1,053
		skipped question	187



8. TM Davies (Walden) and McClelland (Copper Cliff) Arenas

		Response Percent	Response Count
Continue Maintaining Arenas (\$600K per year)		82.0%	865
Replace Arenas with a twin pad (\$1.4M per year)		18.0%	190
		answered question	1,055
		skipped question	185

9. Sudbury Community Arena and Carmichael Arena

		Response Percent	Response Count
Continue Maintaining Arenas (\$1.0M per year)		46.2%	493
Replace Arenas with a twin pad (including a new OHL facility) (\$4.3M per year)		53.8%	574
		answered question	1,067
		skipped question	173



10. Sudbury Community Arena

		Response Percent	Response Count
Continue Maintaining Arenas (\$700K per year)		33.1%	352
Replace Arenas with a new OHL facility (\$4.1M per year)		66.9%	711
		answered question	1,063
		skipped question	177



11. Based on the above scenarios, how would you rank the priority of actions that you think are required (1 being most urgent, 6 being the least urgent)?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Rating Average	Rating Count
I.J. Coady/Chelmsford/Dr. E. Leclair	33.3% (247)	9.7% (72)	12.0% (89)	11.9% (88)	11.7% (87)	21.3% (158)	1.00	741
Capreol/Centennial/Raymond Plourde	16.3% (121)	22.5% (167)	15.7% (117)	14.5% (108)	16.4% (122)	14.5% (108)	1.00	743
Garson/Toe Blake	1.9% (13)	10.4% (72)	28.4% (196)	26.5% (183)	23.6% (163)	9.3% (64)	1.00	691
TM Davies/McClelland	2.9% (20)	5.3% (36)	22.2% (151)	32.3% (219)	16.1% (109)	21.2% (144)	1.00	679
Sudbury Community Arena/Carmichael	12.0% (86)	29.5% (211)	17.2% (123)	8.4% (60)	23.2% (166)	9.7% (69)	1.00	715
Sudbury Community Arena	40.4% (309)	20.0% (153)	5.2% (40)	6.8% (52)	6.0% (46)	21.5% (164)	1.00	764
answered question								869
skipped question								371

12. Public-Private-Partnership for the Sudbury Community Arena

		Response Percent	Response Count
Continue to have the City operate the arena		39.8%	430
Support a Public-Private-Partnership		60.2%	650
answered question			1,080
skipped question			160

13. Public-Private-Partnership for municipal arenas

		Response Percent	Response Count
Continue to have the City operate the arenas		58.3%	626
Support a Public-Private- Partnership		41.7%	448
		answered question	1,074
		skipped question	166

Page 1, Q4. Due to the low utilization of the I.J. Coady Arena, Council has directed staff to seek opinions/strategies to increase the ice usage and generate additional revenue for this facility. Would you support the following (may choose more than one selection)?

1	can not choose more than one selection. 2nd selection deletes the first.	May 17, 2013 8:21 PM
2	None of the above	May 17, 2013 7:37 PM
3	All of the above. I could not select more than one	May 17, 2013 6:27 PM
4	All of the above. I could not select more than one	May 17, 2013 6:23 PM
5	Too far	May 17, 2013 7:15 AM
6	If it is going to cost the taxpayers more money don't do anything other than maybe close the facility.	May 17, 2013 5:44 AM
7	close it down and provide reasonable transportation to another arena that can be utilized better.	May 16, 2013 6:15 AM
8	Have a member of the Sudbury Wolves team show young kids how to play the game properly and donate a couple of tickets to certain participants and parent that try in different positions of the game. Allow a family evening at the end of the season to enjoy a family evening meal included with the Sudbury Wolves. Picture taken with the Sudbury Wolves in the newspaper and a plaque to commemorate the moment for the child and parents .	May 16, 2013 6:12 AM
9	Free Ice time but instead of 1 hour free for every 5, Give one full block free for every 5 sessions booked. Also, use marketing to encourage use and allow a few free bookings for casual leagues to encourage use.	May 15, 2013 8:43 PM
10	INDOOR SKATEPARK	May 15, 2013 5:36 AM
11	I would choose all of the above but the survey will not allow me to.	May 15, 2013 5:22 AM
12	No idea what arena this is...	May 13, 2013 7:46 PM
13	Shutting it down	May 13, 2013 7:08 PM
14	privitize	May 13, 2013 5:29 PM
15	it would not allow me to choose more than 1. I would endorse all of the above. Recreational facilities are a must in all communities to encourage new residents. I would encourage a study to found out how other communities handle this situation because it seems they handle it better than the City of Greater Sudbury does. So many other communities realize the importance of rec facilities to promote our childrens' health above all. The councils decision to not maintain the arenas over the past few years has led to this problem - maintain or close. Hum.... reminds of of the Gordon era.	May 13, 2013 2:47 PM
16	it would not allow me to choose more than 1. I would endorse all of the above. Recreational facilities are a must in all communities to encourage new residents. I would encourage a study to found out how other communities handle this situation because it seems they handle it better than the City of Greater Sudbury does. So many other communities realize the importance of rec facilities to promote our childrens' health above all.	May 13, 2013 2:43 PM

Page 1, Q4. Due to the low utilization of the I.J. Coady Arena, Council has directed staff to seek opinions/strategies to increase the ice usage and generate additional revenue for this facility. Would you support the following (may choose more than one selection)?

17	focus on more community activities - old and new - to take place at this arena whenever possible.	May 10, 2013 9:42 AM
18	Better management of ice time in the Greater City of Sudbury. Unable to choose more than one selection.	May 6, 2013 6:54 PM
19	Make it available and people will use it and make people use instead of sending them out of town	May 6, 2013 2:59 PM
20	CLOSE IT	May 6, 2013 10:31 AM
21	ALL OF THE ABOVE.	May 6, 2013 10:23 AM
22	INCENTIVES	May 6, 2013 10:18 AM
23	All of the above	May 6, 2013 10:14 AM
24	ALL OF THE ABOVE	May 6, 2013 10:10 AM
25	ALL OF THE ABOVE	May 6, 2013 10:08 AM
26	ALL OF THE ABOVE	May 6, 2013 10:05 AM
27	Allow people to book ice at arena.	May 6, 2013 10:00 AM
28	ALL OF THE ABOVE.	May 6, 2013 9:01 AM
29	INCENTIVES AND TRAVEL GRANT	May 6, 2013 8:59 AM
30	ALL OF THE ABOVE	May 6, 2013 8:42 AM
31	CLOSE IT.	May 6, 2013 8:34 AM
32	MARKETING	May 6, 2013 8:33 AM
33	ALL OF THE ABOVE.	May 6, 2013 8:29 AM
34	Further	May 6, 2013 8:27 AM
35	Incentives as well	May 6, 2013 8:08 AM
36	Close it.	May 6, 2013 8:07 AM
37	All of the above.	May 6, 2013 7:50 AM
38	ALL OF THE ABOVE	May 2, 2013 1:20 PM
39	ALL OF THE ABOVE.	May 2, 2013 1:19 PM
40	Further discounts	May 2, 2013 1:14 PM
41	ALL OF THE ABOVE	May 2, 2013 1:11 PM

Page 1, Q4. Due to the low utilization of the I.J. Coady Arena, Council has directed staff to seek opinions/strategies to increase the ice usage and generate additional revenue for this facility. Would you support the following (may choose more than one selection)?

42	MARKETING	May 2, 2013 12:42 PM
43	ALL OF THE ABOVE	May 2, 2013 12:41 PM
44	Further discounting and marketing.	May 2, 2013 12:32 PM
45	ALL OF THE ABOVE.	May 2, 2013 12:24 PM
46	ALL OF THE ABOVE.	May 2, 2013 12:16 PM
47	ALL OF THE ABOVE.	May 2, 2013 12:12 PM
48	All of the above.	May 2, 2013 12:09 PM
49	We need more ice not less. Let private people come in like they do down south.	Apr 30, 2013 12:14 PM
50	you cannot choose more than one	Apr 30, 2013 5:17 AM
51	Close and increase pads closer to our population.	Apr 30, 2013 5:14 AM
52	figure skating lessons.; free family skate times	Apr 29, 2013 9:14 AM
53	I agree with providing incentives and discounting to increase arean use.	Apr 25, 2013 11:08 AM
54	focus on building an indoor soccer centre. That is what the community wants and needs.	Apr 25, 2013 7:34 AM
55	all of the above	Apr 25, 2013 5:01 AM
56	not sure why that affects the surrounding communities arenas	Apr 24, 2013 11:39 AM
57	reasonablw hours for ice rental in evenings	Apr 23, 2013 10:57 AM
58	All of the above, does not allow more than 1selection as indicated.	Apr 21, 2013 11:43 AM
59	Will only let me choose one selection	Apr 20, 2013 8:19 AM
60	Where is this arena? Make known of available ice for extra icetime.	Apr 19, 2013 7:26 AM
61	Our arenas should be utilized during the summer as a hub for community activities. These arenas can be used for flea markets, workshops, and many other community related endeavours. Look for cheaper insurance rates and lower the user fees. Free advertising is available everywhere, and it should be utilized to let citizens and clubs know, when ice time in the winter is available.	Apr 18, 2013 2:38 PM
62	all of the above	Apr 16, 2013 3:49 PM
63	all the above	Apr 16, 2013 9:13 AM
64	all the above	Apr 16, 2013 9:13 AM
65	It won't let me choose more than one. I choose 1st 3 options.	Apr 15, 2013 8:48 PM

Page 1, Q4. Due to the low utilization of the I.J. Coady Arena, Council has directed staff to seek opinions/strategies to increase the ice usage and generate additional revenue for this facility. Would you support the following (may choose more than one selection)?

66	All above strategies are great	Apr 15, 2013 7:16 PM
67	it will not help, arena is too far away	Apr 15, 2013 6:51 PM
68	getting xstrata,vale and local contractors more involved to help with fees as a health program for employees	Apr 15, 2013 5:34 PM
69	Make it easier for home hockey associations to use their arena ice. I have to fight to get Capreol ice for our Capreol teams. We should have first pick for our ice.	Apr 15, 2013 5:12 PM
70	Make it easier for home hockey associations to use their arena ice. I have to fight to get Capreol ice for our Capreol teams. We should have first pick for our ice.	Apr 15, 2013 5:11 PM
71	We need arenas within the city close to hotels and restaurants.Hourly ice fees that are within reason because we pay more for ice in Sudbury then other arenas in the province and we are finding it difficult to pay the higher registration fees to keep our children in sports especially with 3 active kids.	Apr 15, 2013 4:50 PM
72	Can't comment as I'm not familiar with arena	Apr 15, 2013 3:39 PM
73	that you can rent for other that skating, parties etc.	Apr 15, 2013 2:00 PM
74	Decrease cost and increase use for events and service groups in off season events.	Apr 15, 2013 1:03 PM
75	all three	Apr 15, 2013 11:33 AM
76	only lets you pick one option	Apr 15, 2013 11:23 AM
77	Talk to greater sudbury roller derby leagues (crystal larose)to use during off seasons	Apr 15, 2013 10:49 AM
78	To have the City stop blocking off ice usage when it is needed.	Apr 15, 2013 10:32 AM
79	Private partnerships?	Apr 15, 2013 8:21 AM
80	Close	Apr 15, 2013 8:12 AM
81	n/a	Apr 15, 2013 8:04 AM
82	Shut it Down. It costs parents hundreds a year to drive to Levack from Sudbury for Practices. If the registrations from the town don't support an arena, why should we?	Apr 15, 2013 8:01 AM
83	close it	Apr 9, 2013 11:59 AM
84	Have NO CLUE where that arena is even located??	Apr 9, 2013 11:09 AM
85	Shut er down	Apr 9, 2013 8:41 AM

Page 1, Q4. Due to the low utilization of the I.J. Coady Arena, Council has directed staff to seek opinions/strategies to increase the ice usage and generate additional revenue for this facility. Would you support the following (may choose more than one selection)?

86	more big concerts	Apr 9, 2013 5:51 AM
87	Close it down	Apr 8, 2013 6:40 PM
88	never heard of this arena before this ..where is it ?????	Apr 7, 2013 6:20 PM
89	Close it.	Apr 7, 2013 3:17 PM
90	Close it	Apr 7, 2013 7:24 AM
91	Close it and build another arena in the valley or in new sudbury. Not the south end as that is way to far	Apr 7, 2013 6:29 AM
92	close the facility	Apr 7, 2013 5:23 AM
93	fix your survey,ie make more than1 selection	Apr 6, 2013 12:12 PM
94	close	Apr 6, 2013 8:53 AM
95	Close it. It's too far	Apr 6, 2013 5:52 AM
96	Shame on Sudbury, there current Wolves arena sucks, lets do the right thing and built a new complex that would be able to host a memorial cup which the wolves are heading. Wake up . that would allow to draw woeld curling special events etclve been whatching my wolves sice the 70s and sudbury needs a world class complex. shame an the previous council with there heads in the sand that had an opportunity when Valey arived.	Apr 5, 2013 6:25 PM
97	Perhaps you could mention where this arena is located. Never heard of it!	Apr 5, 2013 2:42 PM
98	I.J. Coady Arena - Where the hell is that?	Apr 5, 2013 1:51 PM
99	off season usage and all of the above	Apr 4, 2013 1:17 PM
100	all of the above	Apr 4, 2013 1:15 PM
101	Open year round and full time employee.	Apr 4, 2013 1:14 PM
102	Open full time with full time employee.	Apr 4, 2013 1:12 PM
103	full time worker, roller blading, twin pad	Apr 4, 2013 1:10 PM
104	Full time employees needed. Twin pad in Levack	Apr 4, 2013 12:58 PM
105	use the arena during the summer for lacross	Apr 4, 2013 12:56 PM
106	Let the arena manager do the bookings. More full time staff for bookings.	Apr 4, 2013 12:54 PM
107	keep ice longer.	Apr 4, 2013 12:52 PM
108	road hockey, lacross, roller blading and full time employee	Apr 4, 2013 12:51 PM

Page 1, Q4. Due to the low utilization of the I.J. Coady Arena, Council has directed staff to seek opinions/strategies to increase the ice usage and generate additional revenue for this facility. Would you support the following (may choose more than one selection)?

109	full time person at IJ Cody and roller rink for summer	Apr 4, 2013 12:49 PM
110	incentives and fundraisers, concerts, cheaper rates for schools.	Apr 4, 2013 12:46 PM
111	incentives and lacross, public skating and hockey school in summer.	Apr 4, 2013 12:44 PM
112	use the arena for road hockey and lacross in summer months	Apr 4, 2013 12:40 PM
113	incentives and open earlier and later.	Apr 4, 2013 12:38 PM
114	Incentives and more public skating	Apr 4, 2013 12:36 PM
115	Marketing and incentives	Apr 4, 2013 12:35 PM
116	Charge schools and hockey year round	Apr 4, 2013 12:33 PM
117	one full time person for just ice bookings	Apr 4, 2013 12:31 PM
118	All of the above	Apr 4, 2013 12:30 PM
119	all of the above	Apr 4, 2013 12:28 PM
120	All of the above.	Apr 4, 2013 12:27 PM
121	All of the above.	Apr 4, 2013 12:26 PM
122	OPEN ARENA MORE OFTEN, ALLOW ACCESS FOR OTHER EVENTS	Apr 4, 2013 8:50 AM
123	all three above. The CGS should phase itself out of the arena business and allow private ownership.	Mar 27, 2013 11:27 AM
124	Option 1 & 2	Mar 27, 2013 10:22 AM
125	Option 2 & 3	Mar 27, 2013 8:05 AM
126	ok if you really cared about our arena it would NOT have taken you TWO year to fix our water so that just goes to show how much you CARE. you people need to start thinking about the children and not about money they are the future and all they keep wondering if they are going to have a arena next year my son is a student at Levack public school and he is worried about this it make me sick that the kids at suck a young age have to stress about anything its terrible. We have lost way to much living in Levack when we were the town of onaping falls it was perfect. If you close the arena you better get a police officer on duty at all time because the children will have nothing to do but get in trouble. last year we went to sudbury to play a hockey game in your new double pad arena and we could NOT play because there was a hole in the ice because the roof was leaking so bad and that was your new pad great job building that anyway.	Mar 26, 2013 5:38 PM
127	Close the arena if the local population is not using it. I don't have the statistics but I don't believe that enough local people are using the arena. It has become a private club kept open to service a small group of people who are involved in hockey. Taxpayers may merely be subsidizing this small elite group.	Mar 25, 2013 7:23 PM

Page 1, Q4. Due to the low utilization of the I.J. Coady Arena, Council has directed staff to seek opinions/strategies to increase the ice usage and generate additional revenue for this facility. Would you support the following (may choose more than one selection)?

128	This won't let me tick off more than one choice. I think they all apply. Several points were brought up at the public meeting held in Onaping Mar 20(?). There should be some follow through to address the concerns raised for instance the discrepancy in quoted rental rates, the inability of some to book ice time because of erroneous or misleading information by people taking booking calls	Mar 25, 2013 8:34 AM
129	All of the above	Mar 25, 2013 7:09 AM
130	let the townspeople run it and guarantee it will be sustainable	Mar 25, 2013 5:55 AM
131	Close it.	Mar 23, 2013 2:56 PM
132	MORE USEABLE HOURS	Mar 22, 2013 9:37 AM
133	Holding City run power skating program	Mar 22, 2013 9:29 AM
134	All of the above, it will not allow me to select more than one item as the question states	Mar 22, 2013 8:53 AM
135	Option 1 & 2	Mar 22, 2013 7:19 AM
136	charge regular price and those that want arena's should pay the price i pay full price to attend events in these facilities	Mar 22, 2013 6:28 AM
137	Yes to the above, as well as a much better reservation system - there are accounts of many mistakes by parks and rec which have prevented people from reserving ice time, as well as far better tracking system of usage - there have been so many errors and omissions it gives the impression of intentionality.	Mar 22, 2013 5:27 AM
138	Quit taking the ice out early and people will use it more duh!	Mar 22, 2013 3:06 AM
139	all of the above	Mar 22, 2013 2:34 AM
140	Promote Birthday Party usage, Free or minimal cost Learn to Skate Programs (like swim lessons) etc..	Mar 21, 2013 8:06 PM
141	This question will not allow me to choose more then one answer. I wish to select the top three choices!	Mar 21, 2013 8:01 PM
142	all the above	Mar 21, 2013 6:47 PM
143	All of the above, but it won't let me pick them!	Mar 21, 2013 6:43 PM
144	I don't support more investment into a building which is not generating enough to break even.	Mar 21, 2013 6:39 PM
145	also, possible usage for Tri Sport Event and Ball Tournament Events	Mar 21, 2013 6:31 PM
146	Lived in Levack for 12 years, Ice time was hard to come by as it was always booked, I don't know why council is saying it is under used?	Mar 21, 2013 6:30 PM
147	close Chelmsford Arena instead as it is an inferior facility to Levack Arena	Mar 21, 2013 5:46 PM

Page 1, Q4. Due to the low utilization of the I.J. Coady Arena, Council has directed staff to seek opinions/strategies to increase the ice usage and generate additional revenue for this facility. Would you support the following (may choose more than one selection)?

148	Increased availability to book. Often when trying to book there is no option, but there is no one actually using arena at that time. Open up time slots or change the way the arena is booked.	Mar 21, 2013 5:01 PM
149	Lower fees and Community Event Usage	Mar 21, 2013 4:53 PM
150	Replace "new staff" for ice bookings so we can actually use our rink!!!!	Mar 21, 2013 3:04 PM
151	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 1:15 PM
152	Option 1 & 3	Mar 21, 2013 1:14 PM
153	Option 2 & 3	Mar 21, 2013 1:10 PM
154	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 1:09 PM
155	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 1:08 PM
156	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 1:08 PM
157	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 1:05 PM
158	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 1:04 PM
159	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 1:00 PM
160	Option 1 & 2	Mar 21, 2013 12:48 PM
161	I would like this arena to remain open because there are many children in Onaping area who play hockey. Hockey is a popular sport among teens and kids. A drive to Chelmsford may be hard for a parent to fit into their most likely already tight schedule. There is enough use of this arena for it to stay open in my opinion.	Mar 21, 2013 12:45 PM
162	I would hate to see our arena close, especially because it's one good thing that Levack has for all the kids...hockey, public skating, birthday parties, etc... This arena keeps Levack going - don't take it away	Mar 21, 2013 12:43 PM
163	Option 1 & 3	Mar 21, 2013 12:40 PM
164	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 12:38 PM
165	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 12:36 PM
166	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 12:27 PM
167	open it up to other activities and groups, including off-season	Mar 21, 2013 12:15 PM
168	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 12:06 PM
169	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 12:05 PM

Page 1, Q4. Due to the low utilization of the I.J. Coady Arena, Council has directed staff to seek opinions/strategies to increase the ice usage and generate additional revenue for this facility. Would you support the following (may choose more than one selection)?

170	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 12:00 PM
171	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 11:58 AM
172	None of the above	Mar 21, 2013 11:56 AM
173	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 11:55 AM
174	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 11:52 AM
175	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 11:51 AM
176	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 11:49 AM
177	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 11:48 AM
178	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 11:46 AM
179	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 11:44 AM
180	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 11:44 AM
181	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 11:42 AM
182	Option 1 & 3	Mar 21, 2013 11:40 AM
183	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 11:40 AM
184	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 11:38 AM
185	Option 2 & 3	Mar 21, 2013 11:28 AM
186	Option 1 & 3	Mar 21, 2013 11:25 AM
187	OPEN MORE HOURS TO ACCOMADATE BOOKINGS, GET RID OF BLOCK BOOKING	Mar 21, 2013 11:08 AM
188	Arena has tried many times to be booked for events with answers being the ice is already booked for that time. When in fact there was nothing booked and parking lot empty	Mar 21, 2013 11:00 AM
189	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 10:54 AM
190	Option 1 & 2	Mar 21, 2013 10:52 AM
191	Option 1 & 3	Mar 21, 2013 10:50 AM
192	Applies to all public arenas except Sudbury. Put a timer (that run on loonies or toonies) on the heaters (where fans sit) that	Mar 21, 2013 10:49 AM
193	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 10:38 AM

Page 1, Q4. Due to the low utilization of the I.J. Coady Arena, Council has directed staff to seek opinions/strategies to increase the ice usage and generate additional revenue for this facility. Would you support the following (may choose more than one selection)?

194	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 10:35 AM
195	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 10:33 AM
196	Option 1 & 3	Mar 21, 2013 9:16 AM
197	Levack, Walden, Rayside and like areas should host goalie clinics here instead of at R.H.P. Lots of SMHA temas book times in Warren or St. Charles due to discount	Mar 21, 2013 8:53 AM
198	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 8:50 AM
199	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 8:46 AM
200	leave them be - how can you increase ice usage when outside of city limits.	Mar 21, 2013 8:45 AM
201	Option 1 & 3	Mar 21, 2013 8:37 AM
202	None	Mar 21, 2013 8:27 AM
203	Option 2 & 3	Mar 21, 2013 8:23 AM
204	Save the money and close it	Mar 21, 2013 8:18 AM
205	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 7:42 AM
206	Option 1 & 3	Mar 21, 2013 7:32 AM
207	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 7:30 AM
208	All of the above	Mar 21, 2013 7:24 AM
209	why not get the few schools we have involved in skating in the community	Mar 21, 2013 7:17 AM
210	Undecided, as I am not familiar with this arena and where it is	Mar 21, 2013 7:09 AM
211	eliminate block booking	Mar 21, 2013 6:19 AM
212	In addition to some suggestions listed above, especially marketing available ice time, MAKE the time available. Online booking shows most times as booked when it is not. You're losing revenue and usage. Include only ICE time in ice usage stats, not facility usage. The IJ Coady is being set up to fail by relying on your faulty administration of services.	Mar 21, 2013 5:51 AM
213	Option 2 & 3	Mar 21, 2013 5:40 AM
214	Incentives for bookings and close it	Mar 21, 2013 5:38 AM
215	the arena should have activities for kids all yr round and cheaper fees also canteen services should be provided	Mar 20, 2013 4:54 PM
216	why doesnt the city run power skating program as they do at carmichael and	Mar 20, 2013 4:51 PM

Page 1, Q4. Due to the low utilization of the I.J. Coady Arena, Council has directed staff to seek opinions/strategies to increase the ice usage and generate additional revenue for this facility. Would you support the following (may choose more than one selection)?

	countryside in the fall? those programs fill up 2 weeks after leisure guide.comes out.in march....kids are turned away.from this program..there are alot of kids in onaping falls who would love.to be able to attend this program.	
217	Let Onaping Falls control their own recreation	Mar 20, 2013 4:08 PM
218	All options above	Mar 20, 2013 3:13 PM
219	I don t know how often I've heard that there is ice shortages in the surrounding area but yet a perfectly good arena sitting still not being used to it s full potential.	Mar 20, 2013 1:45 PM
220	Option 2 & 3	Mar 20, 2013 1:17 PM
221	FURTHER	Mar 20, 2013 1:16 PM
222	Option 2 & 3	Mar 20, 2013 1:14 PM
223	All of the above	Mar 20, 2013 1:13 PM
224	The farther the arena, the cheaper	Mar 20, 2013 1:08 PM
225	Option 1 & 3	Mar 20, 2013 1:06 PM
226	Close rink - too far to travel - our home ice this season. Wahnapiatae - Levack. Closer to go to North Bay!	Mar 20, 2013 12:53 PM
227	Close	Mar 20, 2013 12:49 PM
228	MARKETING	Mar 20, 2013 12:43 PM
229	No, too far away...gas is expensive. Gas card, maybe!	Mar 20, 2013 12:42 PM
230	Option 1 & 3	Mar 20, 2013 12:34 PM
231	ALL OF THE ABOVE	Mar 20, 2013 12:32 PM
232	Option 1 & 2	Mar 20, 2013 12:31 PM
233	Option 1 & 3	Mar 20, 2013 12:30 PM
234	INCENTIVES	Mar 20, 2013 12:23 PM
235	MARKETING	Mar 20, 2013 12:22 PM
236	All of the above	Mar 20, 2013 12:16 PM
237	All of the above	Mar 20, 2013 12:13 PM
238	All of the above	Mar 20, 2013 12:10 PM
239	Get rid of it	Mar 20, 2013 12:09 PM

Page 1, Q4. Due to the low utilization of the I.J. Coady Arena, Council has directed staff to seek opinions/strategies to increase the ice usage and generate additional revenue for this facility. Would you support the following (may choose more than one selection)?

240	MARKETING	Mar 20, 2013 12:07 PM
241	Option 1 & 2	Mar 20, 2013 12:07 PM
242	Tear down double pad or 4 plex in Chelmsford	Mar 20, 2013 12:05 PM
243	ALL OF THE ABOVE	Mar 20, 2013 12:04 PM
244	ALL OF THE ABOVE	Mar 20, 2013 12:02 PM
245	All of the above	Mar 20, 2013 12:01 PM
246	Option 2 & 3	Mar 20, 2013 11:56 AM
247	MORE ICE TIME FOR MENS LEAGUE	Mar 20, 2013 11:55 AM
248	Option 1 & 2	Mar 20, 2013 11:53 AM
249	MARKETING	Mar 20, 2013 11:51 AM
250	ALL OF THE ABOVE	Mar 20, 2013 11:37 AM
251	MARKETING	Mar 20, 2013 11:32 AM
252	ALL OF THE ABOVE	Mar 20, 2013 11:31 AM
253	Close	Mar 20, 2013 11:29 AM
254	ALL OF THE ABOVE	Mar 20, 2013 11:29 AM
255	DISCOUNTS AND MARKETING	Mar 20, 2013 11:26 AM
256	MARKETING	Mar 20, 2013 11:14 AM
257	NEW ARENA	Mar 20, 2013 11:13 AM
258	MARKETING AND OTHERS	Mar 20, 2013 11:10 AM
259	DISCOUNTED USER FEES	Mar 20, 2013 11:08 AM
260	MARKETING CAMPAIGN	Mar 20, 2013 10:37 AM
261	Option 2 & 3	Mar 20, 2013 9:54 AM
262	Close	Mar 20, 2013 9:48 AM
263	All of the above	Mar 20, 2013 9:41 AM
264	Option 2 & 3	Mar 20, 2013 9:35 AM
265	Close	Mar 20, 2013 9:24 AM

Page 1, Q4. Due to the low utilization of the I.J. Coady Arena, Council has directed staff to seek opinions/strategies to increase the ice usage and generate additional revenue for this facility. Would you support the following (may choose more than one selection)?

266	Option 1 & 2	Mar 20, 2013 9:17 AM
267	Close and save money \$\$	Mar 20, 2013 9:04 AM
268	All of the above & never heard of the IJ Coady Arena - promote	Mar 20, 2013 9:02 AM
269	Option 2 & 3	Mar 20, 2013 9:00 AM
270	Build new arena	Mar 20, 2013 8:54 AM
271	Option 1 & 3 - Comment: More events	Mar 20, 2013 8:40 AM
272	All of the above	Mar 20, 2013 8:38 AM
273	Marketing	Mar 20, 2013 8:38 AM
274	Option 1 & 3	Mar 20, 2013 8:35 AM
275	Marketing Campaign	Mar 20, 2013 8:32 AM
276	All of the above	Mar 20, 2013 8:31 AM
277	Option 1 & 3	Mar 20, 2013 8:29 AM
278	All of the above	Mar 20, 2013 8:25 AM
279	coordination of transportation to location to facilitate those people who want to use the facility but cannot access it by personal vehicle i.e. public transit scheduling and routes during key arena times	Mar 20, 2013 8:10 AM
280	Further discounting user fees to promote usage and marketing campaign to make users aware of available ice	Mar 20, 2013 8:02 AM
281	Further discounting and marketing.	Mar 20, 2013 8:01 AM
282	Marketing campaign to make users aware of available ice	Mar 20, 2013 7:58 AM
283	Also further discounting user fees to promote usage and marketing campaign to make users aware of available ice	Mar 20, 2013 7:52 AM
284	post available ice time on a website and lower fee on peak times	Mar 20, 2013 7:32 AM
285	booking at the arena rather than through city hall	Mar 19, 2013 2:49 PM
286	Arena's today must be multi-functional, and offer more than just ice time. They should also feature other events that could help reduce overhead such as rotating home and garden shows as well as sportsman's shows and adult fitness centres just to name a few.	Mar 19, 2013 7:48 AM
287	i think that the city could send information packages to the nickel district hockey association and give them an alternate list of available ice surfaces locally and just outside the city.. we have gone as far as massey for practice ice. it is almost	Mar 19, 2013 6:46 AM

Page 1, Q4. Due to the low utilization of the I.J. Coady Arena, Council has directed staff to seek opinions/strategies to increase the ice usage and generate additional revenue for this facility. Would you support the following (may choose more than one selection)?

	as far as levack and probably half the price. i think that the cost of practice ice is unacceptably high. as is the canteen prices, but i guess that is for another day.	
288	None. If teams travel outside the city for ice time, no additional incentives will bring them to Levack	Mar 18, 2013 7:27 PM
289	Accessibility, much improved availability of public transportation. Couldn't choose more than one selection btw.	Mar 18, 2013 9:29 AM
290	Was unable to choose more than one option - would support incentives for booking and marketing; add seating in the waiting area and fix the heat across from the "home" bench; add mats throughout the waiting area for walking with skates	Mar 18, 2013 8:09 AM
291	Not able to choose more than one selection	Mar 18, 2013 6:05 AM
292	let the public know there is still ice time available rather than say there is no ice time available	Mar 17, 2013 10:23 AM
293	It is unfortunate that this rink is located where it is to be properly used. In order to use this rink you have a combined driving time of at least 90 min. if the weather is good plus your prep and usage time of at least 90 min. It just doesn't make sense for minor hockey or any club to use this facility for a season. I know over the years that many teams have been forced to use this ice but at a great overall cost. I know the city has a great challenge in fulfilling its obligations of providing a needed service to the community at the same time trying not to lose too much money. Essentially the city tries to keep costs in line as best as possible. Why not build a new much needed multi use facility and put the emphasis there rather than continue to throw good money and time at this facility. The upside of a new multi use facility in close proximity to the main population has huge potential for usage all day which in turn increased income potential. Good Luck	Mar 16, 2013 4:59 PM
294	Do nothing. Deal with the losses and close it down if necessary, but this area needs an arena	Mar 16, 2013 11:06 AM
295	Open a new complex (4 pad min.) and close IJ Coady Arena	Mar 16, 2013 8:35 AM
296	all of the above suggestions should be tried	Mar 15, 2013 11:00 AM
297	All of the above - would not let me select all	Mar 15, 2013 10:22 AM
298	Build a new multi pad facility at a central location	Mar 15, 2013 9:40 AM
299	limited free public skate	Mar 15, 2013 6:09 AM
300	Restructure system to add efficiencies	Mar 15, 2013 5:58 AM
301	Too far away from majority of population	Mar 14, 2013 7:10 PM
302	offer skating programs out of Levack at a reduced rate.	Mar 14, 2013 3:54 PM

Page 1, Q4. Due to the low utilization of the I.J. Coady Arena, Council has directed staff to seek opinions/strategies to increase the ice usage and generate additional revenue for this facility. Would you support the following (may choose more than one selection)?

303	promotion of letting people know the other parts of the "greater city of sudbury"	Mar 14, 2013 3:54 PM
304	only one option was available in this survey - Marketing campaign is my second choice	Mar 14, 2013 3:32 PM
305	All of the above!!!!	Mar 14, 2013 3:28 PM
306	Close the arena!	Mar 14, 2013 3:12 PM
307	All of the above (it would only let me pick one)	Mar 14, 2013 2:52 PM
308	When there is free ice time, offer last minute discounts	Mar 14, 2013 1:59 PM
309	all of the above	Mar 14, 2013 1:53 PM
310	Explore other uses for ice surface year round, ie figure skating, broomball, speed skating ringette. Dedicate rink to one of the named sports such as figure skating.	Mar 14, 2013 12:50 PM
311	I can't select more than one option. I think all have some merit. The resistance by non local users to travel here is an issue that needs to be addressed if we are all part of the city	Mar 14, 2013 10:41 AM
312	Shut it down. If it is underutilized, there's no point of keeping it open.	Mar 14, 2013 9:05 AM
313	Don't want to travel that far to use this arena	Mar 14, 2013 8:43 AM
314	I tried to select option 1 and option 3 but the form would not accept two answers, even though your question said I could.	Mar 14, 2013 8:26 AM
315	Close facility and use monies to support other arenas	Mar 14, 2013 7:33 AM
316	NEW ARENA OR 4-PAD FACILITY	Mar 14, 2013 5:19 AM
317	Have more ice available, longer hours in Levack	Mar 13, 2013 4:56 PM
318	I would choose all 3 specified, survey not allowing me to do that	Mar 13, 2013 3:18 PM
319	Arena is closed when online it says its booked	Mar 13, 2013 1:08 PM
320	+ / or further discounting user fees to promote usage	Mar 13, 2013 12:52 PM
321	renewal of iron broom	Mar 13, 2013 10:31 AM
322	Build Rinks closer to the city	Mar 13, 2013 8:35 AM
323	stop telling people that there is no ice time available when there is ice available	Mar 13, 2013 4:55 AM
324	insist more tournaments are held there rather than Countryside	Mar 13, 2013 4:30 AM
325	Closer location to city	Mar 12, 2013 7:49 PM
326	first of all, it says you may choose more than one but it isn't letting me, I choose	Mar 12, 2013 5:38 PM

Page 1, Q4. Due to the low utilization of the I.J. Coady Arena, Council has directed staff to seek opinions/strategies to increase the ice usage and generate additional revenue for this facility. Would you support the following (may choose more than one selection)?

	all of them. Secondly it's hard to book the arena when it always says "booked" when you try to book it!! Many times we wanted to rent it and it said booked, meanwhile we drive by and its actually closed?!?!?!?	
327	Why does the arena have to be used in winter only? Surely there are uses in the summer as well....eg skateboarding, rollerblading (what about a summer hockey league using rollerblades?)	Mar 12, 2013 5:15 PM
328	Please consider funding for a complex (swimming and skating) in the Valley. Our arenas and the Howard Armstrong are horrible!	Mar 12, 2013 4:44 PM
329	Further Discounting	Mar 12, 2013 4:20 PM
330	Shut it down	Mar 12, 2013 11:04 AM
331	close arena	Mar 12, 2013 10:50 AM
332	not enough population out there and too far to travel from city heart.	Mar 12, 2013 9:41 AM
333	Raise taxes to provide services previously taken away	Mar 12, 2013 9:29 AM
334	Build a twin pad in Azilda	Mar 12, 2013 8:12 AM
335	local teams pay the same as Capreol but outside teams or associations get the discount. More importantly in bad weather let them cancel but book another ice time in exchange.	Mar 12, 2013 8:02 AM
336	Both Incentives for bookings and further discounts. Ice in Sudbury is just way to expensive Period. City council should allow for the privatization of the Arenas. Give the task of maintaing the facilites to someone who knows how to make money. Put a double pad with a much needed pool with the new casino located at Sudbury Downs location between Azilda and Chelmsford.	Mar 12, 2013 7:47 AM
337	All of the above	Mar 12, 2013 7:36 AM
338	Do not say ice is booked when it is not. Ice should be available at any time through the day unless it is really booked for the requested time.This has been proven to happen.	Mar 12, 2013 6:57 AM
339	one of the farthest arenas to drive to do not like going to Levack	Mar 12, 2013 6:03 AM
340	Closure	Mar 12, 2013 5:49 AM
341	open our arena same time as others	Mar 12, 2013 5:05 AM
342	Letting the arena worker book the ice times since someone at the City is obviously boycotting the use of this arena. Many people have gone in or tried to call and it says the ice is booked when in fact it is not! More free public skating for the kids currently only have 1 hr on Friday nights, more ice time for local hockey teams, 2 hrs of ice time a week, organize a family hockey tourny, hockey school	Mar 12, 2013 4:47 AM

Page 1, Q4. Due to the low utilization of the I.J. Coady Arena, Council has directed staff to seek opinions/strategies to increase the ice usage and generate additional revenue for this facility. Would you support the following (may choose more than one selection)?

343	advertise ice time availability	Mar 12, 2013 2:48 AM
344	Have the ice actually available... Every time I try to book ice time the website says its booked and when I drive by the arena is closed. Kind of hard to utilize the arena when it's closed.	Mar 11, 2013 7:10 PM
345	All of the above and more...give the Community a chance	Mar 11, 2013 4:14 PM
346	I choose all choices and unfortunately it only allows you to select on choice	Mar 11, 2013 3:36 PM
347	Just make ice available to book, every time we try to book ice we are told it is already booked. My husband tried to run a hockey camp last sept,oct and he was told by the city that there was no ice available. Hard to keep an arena running when they will never open it!!	Mar 11, 2013 2:38 PM
348	none of the above - Inappropriate to use Tax dollars to force usage	Mar 11, 2013 1:16 PM
349	close it and build a twin pad with rec centre (pool) in chelmsford	Mar 11, 2013 1:13 PM
350	All of the above (it won't let me select more than one). In addition, I would suggest looking at your online booking option. Almost all times at the IJ Coady arena show as booked, but the arena remains empty! I've tried several times to find ice time for parties, practice, etc. OFMHA plans to increase advertising for hockey registration. If ice was easier to book (or was put in earlier), I've heard from people who would be interested in organizing hockey training camps, shinny hockey, and other activities. If the space is advertised as unavailable, people will not book it. There are several arenas that are older and need more improvements than the Levack arena. Onaping Falls already lacks several services that are available to the other communities of Greater Sudbury. Taking this away would be the nail in the coffin for the towns of Onaping and Levack, with Dowling close behind.	Mar 11, 2013 12:48 PM
351	Unfortunately no campaign can reduce the travel time to the rink.	Mar 11, 2013 12:33 PM
352	travel icentive from Sudbury	Mar 11, 2013 12:32 PM
353	I tried to click more than one but it wouldn't let me!	Mar 11, 2013 12:28 PM
354	All of the above	Mar 11, 2013 12:19 PM
355	Close or sell it.	Mar 11, 2013 11:59 AM
356	No discount - close the IJ Coady Arena	Mar 11, 2013 11:40 AM
357	Community Partnerships	Mar 11, 2013 11:30 AM

For Information Only

City of Greater Sudbury CHPI - Update

Presented To: Community Services Committee

Presented: Monday, Jul 08, 2013

Report Date: Friday, Jun 28, 2013

Type: Managers' Reports

Recommendation

For information only

Finance Implications

For 2013 and 2014, there is no financial impact as this CHPI program can be funded within existing budgets.

Background

This report is to provide an update on the Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative (CHPI). The year 2013 is considered to be a transitional year for program and policy development for the CHPI program.

The Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative (CHPI) is a consolidation of five provincially funded homelessness programs:

- Community Homelessness Prevention Program
- Provincial rent bank
- Emergency Energy fund
- Emergency Hostel services
- Domically hostel

The consolidation of the five programs into one funding envelope took effect January 1st, 2013. As well, effective December 31st 2012, the Province eliminated the Community Start Up and Maintenance Benefit (CSUMB) from social assistance benefits, which resulted in a significant funding gap for providing support to persons who are homeless or at risk of homelessness within our community. A one time investment from the Ministry of Community and Social Services for January 2013 to March 2014 has been provided to support communities as they transition to the CHPI program.

The Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative (CHPI) has four broad service categories:

1. Emergency shelter solutions
2. Housing with related supports

Signed By

Report Prepared By

Gail Spencer
Coordinator of Shelters and Homelessness
Digitally Signed Jun 28, 13

Division Review

Luisa Valle
Director of Social Services
Digitally Signed Jun 28, 13

Recommended by the Department

Catherine Matheson
General Manager of Community Development
Digitally Signed Jun 28, 13

Recommended by the C.A.O.

Doug Nadorozny
Chief Administrative Officer
Digitally Signed Jun 28, 13

3. Other services and Supports
4. Homelessness Prevention

The vision of CHPI as set out by the Province is a better coordinated and integrated service delivery system that is people-centered, outcome focused and reflects a Housing First approach to prevent reduce and address homelessness in communities across Ontario. This vision reflects the transition to a system that will shift the focus of services over time from reactive responses to homelessness to services that focus on more proactive and permanent solutions.

Communities have the opportunity to create solutions to address homelessness that are locally driven and partnership based.

Local Program

Upon release of the new CHPI guidelines from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, details were reviewed to determine the intent and the parameters of the program. The Province has established two key program outcomes for CHPI, which will measure performance and ensure accountability:

1. People who are homeless obtain and retain housing
2. People at risk of homelessness remain housed

Utilizing the information available, staff analyzed how the five consolidated homelessness programs and Community Start-up and Maintenance Benefit (CSUMB) had been utilized in our community, as well as consulted with other municipalities to determine what the new program would focus on based on community needs. Planning took into account that the available funding was lower than previous amounts and that the client base expanded to include not only social assistance recipients both on Ontario Works (OW) and Ontario Disability Support Program (ODSP) but also low income households.

As a result of the review, two key program areas were identified for the inception of this program:

1. Continuing to fund existing Emergency shelter programs
2. Support for persons who are homeless or at risk of homelessness that would incorporate elements of the previous CSUMB, Provincial rent bank, and Emergency Energy Fund, were identified as priorities for funding within the initial local CHPI program

Attached to this report are the current CHPI Guidelines, effective June 2013.

Community Agency Consultation

On June 17th, 2013 a community agency consultation was held to receive feedback and input from community partners on the guiding principles for allocation of CHPI funding. Members of the Sudbury Coalition Against Poverty (S-Cap) made a presentation at the consultation. Following the consultation a survey was sent electronically to community agency partners so that they could provide input into the community priorities and also provide feedback with regards to the eligible service categories. The information will be compiled and be reported back to Council in the fall and will also assist in the development of the CHPI policy.

Moving Forward

The year 2013 is a transitional year for developing guidelines and policy for the local CHPI program.

The CHPI program will continue to use the existing guidelines, including the exceptional circumstances provision until December 31, 2013, the end of the transition year. The financial forecast for 2013 indicates that there will be sufficient funding to continue with the assistance of the one time transitional

funding received from the Province .

Community development staff will review the input provided through the community agency consultation and subsequent survey, and will use this information to develop priorities for developing long term CHPI guidelines effective January 1, 2014.

Staff will return to Council in the fall with CHPI policy and guidelines effective January 1, 2014.

How to Apply	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Through Social Services caseworkers for people in receipt of Ontario Works ✓ Through ODSP caseworkers for people in receipt of ODSP ✓ Through the Canadian Red Cross for persons with an income below the Household Income Limits (HILS) determined by the Provincial Government who are not in receipt of OW or ODSP benefits 												
Frequency	Once every 24 months												
Funding Guidelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Last month's rent deposit for persons who are homeless or at risk of homelessness; or ✓ Rental arrears for persons who are facing eviction; or ✓ Utility arrears for persons who are facing disconnection of utilities; or ✓ Utility deposit for persons who are homeless or at risk of homelessness <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Family Size</th><th>Maximum Amount</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Singles/Couples (with no children or with dependent adults)</td><td>Up to \$800</td></tr> <tr> <td>Families with children under the age of 18</td><td>Up to \$1,500</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Providing an amount for household items for persons who are in receipt of OW or ODSP benefits and meet one of the following exceptional circumstances: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The necessity to relocate as a result of a catastrophic event (e.g., flood, fire); or ➤ The necessity to relocate as a result of domestic violence; or ➤ Leaving a shelter or transitional housing facility; or ➤ Being discharged from an institution such as a hospital, correctional facility or addiction treatment program; or ➤ the necessity to relocate as a result of a disability (e.g., where the recipient is moving to a home that better meet's their disability-related needs). <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Family Size</th><th>Maximum Amount</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Singles/Couples (with no children or with dependent adults)</td><td>Up to \$800</td></tr> <tr> <td>Families with children under the age of 18</td><td>Up to \$1,500</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Family Size	Maximum Amount	Singles/Couples (with no children or with dependent adults)	Up to \$800	Families with children under the age of 18	Up to \$1,500	Family Size	Maximum Amount	Singles/Couples (with no children or with dependent adults)	Up to \$800	Families with children under the age of 18	Up to \$1,500
Family Size	Maximum Amount												
Singles/Couples (with no children or with dependent adults)	Up to \$800												
Families with children under the age of 18	Up to \$1,500												
Family Size	Maximum Amount												
Singles/Couples (with no children or with dependent adults)	Up to \$800												
Families with children under the age of 18	Up to \$1,500												
Documentation	Supporting documentation/verification is required												

Request for Decision

Municipal Ski Hill Operations - Financial Review

Presented To:	Community Services Committee
Presented:	Monday, Jul 08, 2013
Report Date	Thursday, Jun 27, 2013
Type:	Managers' Reports

Recommendation

WHEREAS the ski hills report provides Council with a net operating and net operating cost recoveries for each ski hills for the 2011 and 2012 ski season as requested at the May 6th, 2013 Community Services Committee meeting, and;

WHEREAS a review was completed for the operation of ski hill facilities during extreme cold temperatures colder than -35 C;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Ontario Snow Resorts Association (OSRA) comfort tips be adopted and the City of Greater Sudbury will close ski hill facilities when temperatures are colder than -35 C with the exception of when organized programs such as ski meets, races, major school bookings have been pre-scheduled.

Background

At the May 6, 2013 meeting of the Community Services Committee, a report was presented regarding municipally operated ski hills (Adanac, Capreol and Lively Ski Hills). A resolution was included in the report requesting that the City of Greater Sudbury approve the Ontario Snow Resorts Association (OSRA) policy for the operation of ski hill facilities during extreme cold temperatures which would result in closing facilities when temperatures are colder than -35°C. The policy would be implemented for the upcoming 2013 - 2014 ski season.

Council approved a motion to defer this matter and the following recommendation was presented:

CS2013-28 Barbeau/Cimino: THAT the City of Greater Sudbury direct staff to provide detail with respect to financial impact of operating each ski hill; AND THAT the temperature by which ski hills close be further reviewed.

The current report will:

- Provide an analysis of revenue and expenses for the three municipally operated ski hills for the 2011-2012 seasons
- Outline future capital considerations for the lift replacement at Adanac and Lively ski hills

Signed By

Report Prepared By

Rob Blackwell
Manager, Quality, Administrative and Financial Services
Digitally Signed Jun 27, 13

Division Review

Real Carre
Director of Leisure Services
Digitally Signed Jun 27, 13

Recommended by the Department

Catherine Matheson
General Manager of Community Development
Digitally Signed Jun 27, 13

Recommended by the C.A.O.

Doug Nadorozny
Chief Administrative Officer
Digitally Signed Jun 27, 13

- Provide options regarding extreme cold temperatures and a trigger temperature that would result in the possibility of closing ski facilities

Financial Analysis

Financial information for the years 2011-2012 was used for the analysis. The data is from the cost centre reports for the ski hill operations and are the annual "budget" and "actuals" data from the operating budgets.

Table 1 provides a summary of budget vs. actual, with the variance illustrated. The table also provides the direct operating cost recoveries for each ski hill (budget and actual).

Table 1: Revenue and Expenses - Calendar Year

<i>Ski Hills</i>	<i>Expenses</i>	<i>Revenue</i>	<i>Net Cost</i>	<i>Direct Operating Cost Recoveries</i>
2012				
Adanac				
Budget	\$461,670	\$380,000	\$81,670	82%
Actual	\$527,109	\$427,888	\$99,221	81%
Lively				
Budget	\$107,604	\$16,056	\$91,548	15%
Actual	\$104,400	\$15,606	\$88,794	15%
Capreol				
Budget	\$45,457	\$7,000	\$38,457	15%
Actual	\$47,304	\$3,478	\$43,826	7%
2011				
Adanac				
Budget	\$423,327	\$358,001	\$65,323	85%
Actual	\$494,023	\$313,781	\$180,242	64% *
Lively				
Budget	\$99,863	\$15,588	\$84,275	16%
Actual	\$104,169	\$17,350	\$86,819	17%
Capreol				
Budget	\$44,721	\$12,824	\$31,897	29%
Actual	\$33,766	\$3,255	\$30,511	10%

* The revenue in 2011 was lower than originally budgeted due to the number of seasonal passes sold in December. The hill was opened later in the ski season. In addition, the expenses were higher in 2011 as a result of the cost for site work and off season ground preparation.

Future Capital Considerations (Lift Replacement)

A recent report provided by ANCAM Solutions Company, Ltd., regarding the capital estimates for the City of Greater Sudbury's ski facilities suggests that over the next 5 years, approximately \$1.2M in capital improvements are necessary to replace lifts at the Adanac and Lively ski hills. The capital needs for lift replacement have been identified in the 2014-2018 Community Development Capital Projects. Table 2 provides the information for ANCAM:

Table 2: ANCAM Capital Estimates 2013-2018

<i>Facility</i>	<i>Issue/Item</i>	<i>Estimated Cost</i>	<i>Timing of Purchase</i>
Adanac	Purchase of used elevating device asset for alignment (above surface)	\$500,000	2015
	Upgrades to elevating device to meet CSA Z98-07 requirements	\$250,000	2016
	Removal of existing double chair	\$50,000	2017
	Installation of refurbished elevating device and license testing	\$200,000	2017
	Total Lift Costs	\$1,000,000	
Lively	Purchase of used elevating device asset for this alignment (surface)	\$100,000	2016
	Upgrades to elevating device to meet CSA Z98-07 requirements	\$50,000	2017
	Removal of existing T-bar lift	\$10,000	2018
	Installation of refurbished elevating device and license testing	\$50,000	2018
	Total Lift Costs	\$210,000	
Capreol	The Capreol Ski Hill rope lift was recently replaced and does not require replacement in the near future		

Temperature Considerations

As presented in the May 6th, 2013 Community Services Committee report, the Ontario Snow Resorts Association (OSRA) has developed a scale that will enable the public to accurately reflect the level of comfort they may expect while engaged in winter recreation. This scale has been named Comfort Tips and specifically relates wind chill to a set of parameters the public can use to enable them to enjoy winter activities:

Temperatures Above -5°C

- Enjoy outdoor winter activities
- Consider wearing a hat and gloves

Temperature -5°C to -20°C

- Enjoy outdoor winter activities
- Dress in layers
- Exposed skin will be cold: consider wearing a hat, scarf, gloves/mittens and a wind-resistant layer

Temperature -20°C to -35°C

- Keep active while outdoors
- Dress in warm layers
- Limit amount of exposed skin
- Wear a hat, scarf, gloves/mittens and wind-resistant outer layer

Temperature Below -35°C

- Minimize outdoor activity
- Wear all essential winter clothing and layers
- Cover all exposed skin

It is recommended that the OSRA Comfort Tips be adopted and that the City of Greater Sudbury will close ski hill facilities when temperatures are colder than -35C with the exception of when organized programs

such as ski meets, races and school bookings have been pre-scheduled. In instances when facilities are closed due to cold temperatures, the City will strive to reschedule during alternate dates and times to make up for hours missed. As with all City run programs and facilities, all weather conditions and potential health and safety concerns are considered on an ongoing basis (i.e. cancellations due to freezing rain, heavy snow fall, etc..) City of Greater Sudbury ski hills have historically been promoted as weather dependent, noting that operating hours may change without notice. The adoption of the OSRA Comfort Tips will assist ski hill users in better preparing for winter conditions when utilizing facilities.