

1] New Facility Infrastructure Category - Metric - Utilization	2] 2015, D Level Cost Projections & Land Requirements	3] Council Feedback re: Service Level Preference (April 29, 2015)	4] Additional Details and Administrative Context	5] Public Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	6] Administrative Response to Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	7] Administrative Conclusions
---	--	--	---	---	---	--------------------------------------

<p>1] Policing Services Infrastructure Requirements</p> <p>Metric: 1 detachment/ 31,628 residents</p> <p>Utilization: staffing levels as defined through the ST. Albert Policing Services Long Term Department Plan</p>	<p>Total Project Cost = \$10,610,000 (not including land costs)</p> <p>0.5 ha of land must be accessible, geographically distinct from existing detachments</p> <p>15,000 ft² standalone detachment</p>	<p>Council supported the staged take over of Beaudry Place</p>	<p>Beaudry Place identified as a second detachment/office space. St. Albert is considered the leader in the provision of infrastructure.</p> <p>Administration comment: Current plans have the RCMP take over space at Beaudry, first FCSS and Recreation and Parks, in 3 - 5 years. This requires new space for these two departments. Relocation of the Food Bank is the second stage of the plan. Consequently, a new build is not anticipated to be required to accommodate the future space needs. However, project charters will be advanced to request funding for renovations as the staged moves are planned.</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments</p> <p>The operator indicated that the metric should be square footage/staff person, the trigger and utilization at 100% capacity to respond to the Council Policy C-PS-02, Policing Services, and the Long Term Department Plan.</p> <p>In terms of scope and cost the operator agreed for the medium term, that Beaudry Place is the optimal solution, with the long term (25 years+) solution being the re-amalgamation of policing services into one detachment. This is projected to be outside of the 25 year horizon of this model.</p> <p>Major Stakeholder Comments – see operator responses</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results – n/a</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results – n/a</p>	<p>Administration accepts the metric, trigger, and utilization comments. Scope and cost comments are also accepted, however this is projected to be needed outside of the 25 year horizon of this model.</p> <p>Capacity has been reset to 100%.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2015 Average = >30 years Leader = 2015</p> <p>The administrative solution noted in Column 4 is recommended even though it is outside of the Model results. This solution is predicted to delay the need to build a new, combined police detachment for greater than 25 years, which is outside the time horizon of this model.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] this solution has been approved by Council 2] to achieve this solution renovation funds to fit up Beaudry Place are projected to be required, at earliest, 2024 3] there is nothing contained within the 2016-2025 Capital Plan for new policing services infrastructure</p> <p>Recommendation: A new Policing Services Building triggers outside of the model planning horizon.</p>
<p>2] Fire Services Infrastructure Requirements</p> <p>Metric: 1 fire hall/ 21,085 residents</p> <p>Utilization: Vehicle and personnel staffing levels (NFPA 1710 Industry Standard)</p>	<p>Total Project Cost = \$9,857,200 (not including land costs)</p> <p>Precise siting is required to ensure response time is maintained</p> <p>Double bay with two deep stations with living quarters for 6- 8 people and on-site parking.</p>	<p>Maintain Current Service Level</p> <p>2020: plan 2021: design 2022:implement</p>	<p>The following excerpt is contained within a report prepared to study fire response times in north St. Albert: Emergency Services Consulting Report (December 2013) found that only approximately 75% of the Erin Ridge North Phase 2 development can be reached within 10 minutes.</p> <p>Administrative comment: The 2013 Emergency Services Consulting Report highlights the need for Fire Hall #4 to both serve the growing community and to help with existing resource requirements as infill and densification continues. Administration continues to recommend a construction start date of 2020, which means planning is required to begin no later than 2018.</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments</p> <p>The operator indicated that the metric should be based upon roadway networks, traffic congestion, and development densities, the trigger and utilization should be at 100% capacity to respond to Council Policy C-PS-01, Fire Services.</p> <p>In terms of scope and cost the operator agreed.</p> <p>Major Stakeholder Comments – see operator responses</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results – n/a</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results – n/a</p>	<p>Administrative Responses</p> <p>Administration accepts the metric, trigger, and utilization comments. Scope and cost comments are also accepted.</p> <p>Capacity has been reset to 100%.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2015 Average = >30 years Leader = 2016</p> <p>The current administrative solution based upon the Emergency Services Consulting Report matches Councils service level preference and so it is recommended that Fire Hall #4 capital project be approved in accordance with the timing identified in Column 2.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] \$350,000 was approved in 2015 to fund the land purchase for a new fire hall. 2] the project costs contained in column 2 are in 2015\$, and so require escalation. 3] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan has a PC in 2020 for Fire Hall #4.</p> <p>Recommendation: A new Fire Services Building be considered for 2020.</p>

1] New Facility Infrastructure Category - Metric - Utilization	2] 2015, D Level Cost Projections & Land Requirements	3] Council Feedback re: Service Level Preference (April 29, 2015)	4] Additional Details and Administrative` Context	5] Public Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	6] Administrative Response to Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	7] Administrative Conclusions
--	---	---	---	--	--	---

<p>3] Public Works Facilities/ Garage</p> <p>Metric: 1 site/ 21,085 residents</p> <p>Utilization:</p>	<p>Total Project Cost = \$4,442,300 (not including land costs)</p> <p>1.0 ha of land in the NW quadrant to allow for efficiency in summer operations</p> <p>1,000 ft² of office space and 9,000 ft² of garage space for parking vehicles and equipment</p>	<p>Council supported Administrations timeframe</p> <p>2020: plan 2021: design 2022:implement</p>	<p>The driver comparator in this infrastructure category is the City of St. Albert, since comparable benchmarks were not available.</p> <p>Administrative Comment: This is an essential project to maintain efficient service levels for the community, as growth continues.</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments</p> <p>The operator agreed on the metric, indicated that trigger and utilization should be at 100% capacity to respond to Council Policy C-IS-06 and the Public Works Long Term Department Plan.</p> <p>In terms of scope and cost the operator agreed.</p> <p>Major Stakeholder Comments – see operator responses</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results – n/a</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results – n/a</p>	<p>Administration accepts the metric, the trigger and utilization comments. Scope and cost comments are also accepted.</p> <p>Capacity has been reset to 100%.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2015 Average = 2015 Leader = 2015</p> <p>Based upon Council feedback to maintain current service level this model concludes that the New Public Works Shop be recommend in accordance with the scope identified and in the following time frame:</p> <p>2020: plan 2021: design 2022:implement</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan has a PC for a new satellite facility in 2019 2] the project costs contained in column 2 are in 2015\$, and so require escalation 3] The model triggered in 2020 for all service levels because of lack of comparative data</p> <p>Recommendation: A new public works facility/garage begin to be planned in 2020.</p>
<p>4] Snow Storage Facilities</p> <p>Metric: 1 site/ 63,255 residents</p> <p>Utilization: 200,000 – 500,000 m³ of snow</p>	<p>Total Project Cost = \$2,113,000 (not including land costs)</p> <p>10 ha. Siting should be away from residential development for resident comfort and quiet</p> <p>10 ha, lined or have a sediment pond for melt water or discharge water to the sanitary sewer</p>	<p>On hold – pending Badger Lands Direction</p>	<p>The comparative cities data for this infrastructure type is limited to three municipalities.</p> <p>St. Albert’s snow storage facility is temporarily located at Badger Lands, and the site will require remediation when relocated. The existing snow storage facility is suitable for the needs of the City.</p> <p>Administrative Comment: The need for construction of a new snow storage site will emerge if the decision is made to make different use of the Badger lands. Administration is planning to begin preparation of an ASP for these lands in 2016 (if funded), and so the future of Badger lands is expected to be determined by mid-2017.</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments</p> <p>The operator did not agree on the metric, rather the metric should be based on the capacity of the existing snow storage facility. The operator also indicated that trigger and utilization should be at 100% capacity to respond to Council Policy C-IS-01 and the Public Works Long Term Department Plan.</p> <p>In terms of scope and cost the operator agreed.</p> <p>Major Stakeholder Comments – see operator responses</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results – n/a</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results – n/a</p>	<p>Administration accepts the metric, the trigger and utilization comments. Scope and cost comments are also accepted.</p> <p>Capacity has been reset to 100%.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2015 Average = 2028 Leader = 2016</p> <p>The administrative solution is to hold on the decision about a new Snow Storage Site as noted in Column 3, even though it is outside of the Model results. This is supported through Council feedback, since the need for a new site will be dependent upon the future uses of Badger lands and/or if the Province revokes the agreement that allows the City from operating the current snow storage site, as is currently being done.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] the project costs contained in column 2 are in 2015\$, and so will require escalation 2] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan has a Snow Storage Site in 2019.</p> <p>Recommendation: that the timing decision for a replacement snow storage site be delayed until decisions about the Badger Lands are concluded.</p>

1] New Facility Infrastructure Category - Metric - Utilization	2] 2015, D Level Cost Projections & Land Requirements	3] Council Feedback re: Service Level Preference (April 29, 2015)	4] Additional Details and Administrative Context	5] Public Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	6] Administrative Response to Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	7] Administrative Conclusions
<p>5] Civic Staff Office Space</p> <p>Metric: 240 ft²/staff person</p> <p>Utilization: 45,000 ft² of centralised office space for staff within the down town core</p>	<p>Total Project Cost = \$13,255,000 (not including land costs)</p> <p>An extra 30,000 (425/ft²) is forecasted to be needed by 2042</p>	<p>On hold – pending other administrative approaches</p>	<p>The need for more civic office space has been studied and discussed with council for a number of years.</p> <p>Administrative Comment: a decision regarding the civic office space deficiency will allow other project decisions: the RCMP expansion into Beaudry; the Museum expansion, St. Albert Place Redevelopment; and potentially the community library branch.</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments The operator indicated that the metric should be square footage/staff person, and the trigger and utilization should be set at 100% capacity to allow for appropriate space for civic services.</p> <p>In terms of scope and cost the operator did not agree, and instead indicated that it should be based upon 80,000 square feet, which is the current predicted need for the next 25 years.</p> <p>Major Stakeholder Comments – see operator responses</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results – n/a</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results – n/a</p>	<p>Administration accepts the metric, the trigger and utilization comments. Scope and cost comments are also accepted.</p> <p>Capacity has been reset to 100%.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2015 Average = 2018 Leader = 2036</p> <p>The administrative solution is to hold on the decision about building a new Civic office building, this is supported through Council feedback, and since the need for a new office building is dependent upon the outcomes of the other administrative initiatives planned to secure space.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] the project costs contained in column 2 are in 2015\$, and so require escalation 2] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan has a PC for a new civic building in 2021.</p> <p>Recommendation: that the timing decision for civic staff office be delayed until the confidential initiative currently underway is concluded.</p>
<p>6] Compost Yards</p> <p>Metric: 1 yard/ 63,255 residents</p>	<p>Total Project Cost = TBD (not including land costs)</p> <p>No definitive site, but should be situated away from residential development</p>	<p>On hold – pending Badger Lands Direction</p>	<p>St. Albert's compost yard is situated at the same location as the snow dump site, they are complementary uses at this time</p> <p>Administrative Comment: The need for construction of a new compost yard will emerge if the decision is made to make different use of the Badger lands. Administration is planning to begin preparation of an ASP for these lands in 2016, and so the future of Badger lands is expected to be determined by mid-2017.</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments The operator did not agree on the metric, rather the metric should be based on the capacity of the existing compost yard. The operator also indicated that trigger and utilization should be at 100% capacity to respond to Council Policy C-IS-01 and the Public Works Long Term Department Plan.</p> <p>Major Stakeholder Comments – see operator responses</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results - 11.4% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=129) would use it more, if more infrastructure was available</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results - 17.4% of those who rated in their top 5 (n=86) would use it more if more of the infrastructure was available</p>	<p>Administration accepts the metric, the trigger and utilization comments.</p> <p>Administration also acknowledges that scope and cost are not yet determined.</p> <p>Capacity has been reset to 100%.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2015 Average = 2015 Leader = 2015</p> <p>The administrative solution is to delay the decision about a new Compost Yard as noted in Column 3, even though it is outside of the Model results. This is supported through Council feedback, since the need for a new site will be dependent upon the future uses of Badger lands.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] there is nothing contained within the 2016-2025 Capital Plan for a new Compost Yard</p> <p>Recommendation: that the timing decision for a replacement compost yard be delayed until decisions about the Badger Lands are concluded.</p>

1] New Facility Infrastructure Category - Metric - Utilization	2] 2015, D Level Cost Projections & Land Requirements	3] Council Feedback re: Service Level Preference (April 29, 2015)	4] Additional Details and Administrative` Context	5] Public Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	6] Administrative Response to Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	7] Administrative Conclusions
---	--	--	--	---	---	--------------------------------------

<p>7] Recycling Depot¹</p> <p>Metric: 1 station/ 63,255 residents</p> <p>Utilization: with the introduction of curb-side recycling, capacity has increased enormously.</p>	<p>Total Project Cost = TBD (not including land costs)</p>	<p>Average Service Level</p> <p>2016: plan 2017: design 2018: implement</p> <p>Council Comment: support Administrative solution to partner with CofEdm,</p>	<p>the service mix for recycling and eco stations is typically 1 staffed site/community for mid-sized municipalities complemented by additional unstaffed drop off sites dispersed through the community.</p> <p>Administrative Comment: Staff has been in discussions with the CofEdm to discuss a partnership in a new eco station that St. Albertans can utilize. This solution would be more cost effective than construction of another recycle/eco depot.</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments The operator agreed on the metric, and indicated that trigger and utilization should be at 100% capacity to respond to Council Policy C-IS-07, Solid Waste Management and the Public Works Long Term Department Plan.</p> <p>Major Stakeholder Comments – see operator responses</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results - 27.6% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=144) would use it more, if more infrastructure was available</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results - 22.9% of those who rated in their top 5 (n=153) would use it more if more of the infrastructure was available</p>	<p>Administration accepts the metric, the trigger and utilization comments.</p> <p>Administration also acknowledges that scope and cost are not yet determined.</p> <p>Capacity has been reset to 100%.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = >30 years Average = 2037 Leader = 2029</p> <p>When curb side recycling was added in 2009 capacity of the existing Recycling Depot increased enormously. To reflect this excess capacity administration modified the capacity trigger. This resulted in a new recycle depot triggering outside of the model timeframe.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] there is nothing contained within the 2016-2025 Capital Plan for a new Recycle Yard</p> <p>Recommendation: The need for a new recycling depot is not predicted to be required within the time horizon of this Model.</p>
<p>8] Major Transit Locations</p> <p>Metric: 1 location/ 31,628 residents</p> <p>Utilization/capacity Peak requirements for off street bus stops.</p>	<p>Total Project Cost = \$21,200,000 (not including land costs)</p> <p>Adjacent to the approved alignment</p> <p>6 ha, new transit centre building with a 1,000 stall park & ride w/ surface parking</p> <p>This would be comparable to the major transit location recently opened at Lewis Estates in Edmonton</p>	<p>Maintain Current Service Level</p> <p>2022: plan 2023: design 2024: implement</p>	<p>St. Albert is currently in discussions with CofEdm to acquire land and build a shared south park 'n ride/terminal location. This is intended to become a primary transition point for St. Albert's transit riders, and eventually it will be the end of Edmonton's LRT northwest leg, planned to occur within 15-25 years. This time frame becomes the planning horizon for StAT, since the introduction of the LRT is projected to reduce the required fleet size by approximately 50% when StAT no longer travels into Edmonton.</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments Because of the LRT project and the integration project with Edmonton the operator is uncertain of the metric. The peak requirements for off street bus stops are the capacity indicator. The trigger is determined by Council Policy C-TS-01, Transit Services and the Transit's Long Term Department Plan.</p> <p>In terms of scope and cost the operator agreed with the information included in column 2...</p> <p>Major Stakeholder Comments – see operator responses</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results – n/a</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results – n/a</p>	<p>Administration accepts the metric, the trigger and utilization comments. Scope and cost comments are also accepted.</p> <p>Capacity has been reset to 100%.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2015 Average = 2030 Leader = 2015</p> <p>To maintain current service level, the Model predicts the need for an additional location in 2022; this coincides with the timing of the planned collaboration with the City of Edmonton to plan for a shared south transit location. This is also consistent with Council service level preference identified in Column 2.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] the project costs contained in column 2 are in 2015\$, and so require escalation</p> <p>Recommendation: A new major transit location be considered for 2022.</p>

1] New Facility Infrastructure Category - Metric - Utilization	2] 2015, D Level Cost Projections & Land Requirements	3] Council Feedback re: Service Level Preference (April 29, 2015)	4] Additional Details and Administrative Context	5] Public Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	6] Administrative Response to Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	7] Administrative Conclusions
<p>9] Transit Office & Garage</p> <p>Metric: 1 garage/ 63,255 residents</p> <p>Utilization: Vehicle and personnel space requirements</p> <p>140 ft²/fte 1,230 ft²/bus</p>	<p>Total Project Cost = \$4,305,267.50</p> <p>This is an expansion of the exiting transit garage by 15,630 ft². The building expansion will be garage space for bus storage with an additional maintenance bay.</p>	<p>Maintain Current Service Levels</p> <p>2016: interim measure 2019:plan 2020:design 2021:implement</p>	<p>The transit garage is currently over at capacity with 10 busses being parked outside. The office area is 10,125 ft² is currently occupied by 28 staff, and has capacity for 40 staff. There is adequate land on site for a garage expansion, so a new build is not required.</p> <p>Administrative Comment: indoor parking of the bus fleet is essential to efficient operations because the harsh northern climate.</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments The operator agreed on the metric, and indicated that trigger and utilization should be at 100% capacity to respond to Council Policy C-TS-01, Transit Services and City of St. Albert Transit Long Term Department Plan.</p> <p>The operator supported the project scope and costs.</p> <p>Major Stakeholder Comments – see operator responses</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results – n/a</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results – n/a</p>	<p>Administration accepts the metric, and accepts that the trigger and utilization comments. Scope and cost comments are also accepted.</p> <p>Capacity has been reset to 100%.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2015 Average = 2015 Leader = 2015</p> <p>Administration has reset the capacity to 100%, and the model predicts the need to begin the expansion in 2016. This is consistent with Council service level preference, and so the administrative solution is that the Transit Garage Expansion Project be approved as follows:</p> <p>2016: parking lot expansion (interim measure) 2019: plan/design 2020/21: implement</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan has a PC for the beginning of a staged expansion of the existing transit garage, beginning with asphalt expansion, in 2016. 2] the project costs contained in column 2 are in 2015\$, and so require escalation.</p> <p>Recommendation: A transit garage expansion be considered for 2016, and then in 2019.</p>
<p>10] Art Galleries</p> <p>Metric:75.68 ft²/ 1,000 resident</p> <p>Overall Utilization: 27,577 (2014)</p> <p>General Att: = 10,149 Ed. Programs = 15,093 Comm Programs = 2,335</p>	<p>TOTAL: 6,216.464</p> <p>No additional land requirements. The current facility is 4,600 ft². The AHF commissioned a study that recommended expansion of the existing building by 7,720 ft²</p>	<p>Maintain Current Service Level</p> <p>2028: plan 2029: design 2030:implement</p>	<p>The Arts and Heritage Foundation presented a concept that had the Gallery expand on their current site, the expansion equated to 195 ft²/1,000 population (12,325 ft²)</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments The operator responses are based upon the requested renovation and expansion of the AGSA. The response does not agree with the metric and trigger, and indicates that non conformance with building code, in terms of accessibility, should be a trigger. In regards to the utilization/capacity, the operator agrees with those and then states that because of the accessibility issues participation is impacted which affects utilization.</p> <p>The operator agrees with the scope and cost.</p> <p>Major Stakeholder Comments – see operator responses</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results - 46% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=21) would use it more, if more infrastructure was available</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results - 51.7% of those who rated in their top 5 (n=58) would use it more if more of the infrastructure was available</p>	<p>Existing building conditions are outside of the scope of the Model. Administration accepts the utilization, capacity, scope and cost comments.</p> <p>Capacity has been not been changed from 125%.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2028 Average = 2015 Leader = 2026</p> <p>The results of this engagement process have not provided substantial evidence that indicates that the inputs into this Model require adjusting. So, based upon Council preference to maintain current service level the model concludes that a new Art Gallery be recommended in accordance with the scope and timing identified in column 2.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] the project costs contained in column 2 are in 2015\$, and so require escalation 2] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan has a PC for an expansion of the existing Gallery in 2016</p> <p>Recommendation: A new/expanded art gallery project be considered for 2028.</p>

1] New Facility Infrastructure Category - Metric - Utilization	2] 2015, D Level Cost Projections & Land Requirements	3] Council Feedback re: Service Level Preference (April 29, 2015)	4] Additional Details and Administrative Context	5] Public Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	6] Administrative Response to Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	7] Administrative Conclusions
---	--	--	---	---	---	--------------------------------------

<p>11] City Wide Baseball Parks</p> <p>Metric: 1 park/ 31,628 resident</p> <p>Utilization: Primary = Players/hour</p> <p>Secondary = Program participants/year</p> <p>No data provided, however noted that they are turning teams away,</p>	<p>Total Project Cost: \$3,673,057 (not including land costs)</p> <p>No specific requirements</p> <p>10.12 ha (4 diamonds) including a clubhouse and four diamonds</p>	<p>Maintain Current Service Level</p> <p>2022: plan 2023: design 2034:implement</p>	<p>Two not for profit organizations operate and program two quad baseball diamond facilities, SAMBA and Meadowview Ball.</p> <p>There have been preliminary discussions with Fastball St. Albert who wishes to have similar infrastructure, but at this time the concept has not evolved further.</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments (Men's Slo-pitch)</p> <p>The operator agreed on the metric, and indicated that utilization should be at 90% capacity, and should also consider growth of the sport. In terms of primary utilization, did not support the metric, but did not provide an alternative. Supported secondary utilization metric. In terms of scope and cost agreed but indicated the need to add in funds for lights and maintenance facility.</p> <p>Major Stakeholder Comments – (Fastball)</p> <p>The stakeholder agreed on the metric, but did not agree on the trigger, but did not provide an alternative.</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results - 23.8 % of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=34) would use it more, if more infrastructure was available</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results - 36% of those who rated in their top 5 (n=25) would use it more if more of the infrastructure was available</p>	<p>Administration accepts the metric, does not accept the 90% utilization suggestion since this is not a public service,</p> <p>In terms of scope and cost, Administration accepts the inclusion of lights and a maintenance facility. This will be included in 2016 Model Update.</p> <p>Capacity has been not been changed from 125%.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2022 Average = 2043 Leader = 2020</p> <p>The results of this engagement process have not provided significant evidence that indicates that the inputs into this Model require adjusting. Consequently, based upon Council preference to maintain current service level the model concludes that a new City Wide Baseball Park be recommended in accordance with the scope and timing identified in column 2.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] the project costs contained in column 2 are in 2015\$, and so require escalation 2] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan does not have a PC included for a city wide baseball park</p> <p>Recommendation: A new city wide baseball park project be considered for 2022</p>
<p>12] City Wide Rugby Parks</p> <p>Metric: 1 park/ 63,255 resident</p> <p>Utilization: n/a</p> <p>utilization (April – June)</p>	<p>Total Project Cost: \$5,683,030.75 (not including land costs)</p> <p>No specific requirements</p> <p>6 ha (similar size to SARFC), including clubhouse</p>	<p>Maintain Current Service Level</p> <p>2029: plan 2030: design 2031:implement</p>	<p>St. Albert Rugby Football Club operates the premier rugby fields at the Riel Recreation Park. The fields recently were replaced and re-opened in 2014 as part of the Riel Park Environmental Remediation Project.</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments (Men's Slo-pitch)</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Major Stakeholder Comments</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results - 13.4% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=8) would use it more, if more infrastructure was available</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results - 15.4% of those who rated in their top 5 (n=13) would use it more if more of the infrastructure was available</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Capacity has been not been changed from 125%.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2029 Average = 2041 Leader = 2020</p> <p>The results of this engagement process have not provided significant evidence to indicate that the inputs into this Model require adjusting. Consequently, based upon Council preference to maintain current service level the model concludes that a new City Wide Rugby Park be recommended in accordance with the scope and timing identified in column 2.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan does not have a PC included for a city wide baseball park</p> <p>Recommendation: A new city wide rugby park project be considered for 2029</p>

1] New Facility Infrastructure Category - Metric - Utilization	2] 2015, D Level Cost Projections & Land Requirements	3] Council Feedback re: Service Level Preference (April 29, 2015)	4] Additional Details and Administrative Context	5] Public Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	6] Administrative Response to Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	7] Administrative Conclusions
--	---	---	--	--	--	-------------------------------

<p>13] City Wide Soccer Parks</p> <p><i>Metric = 1 park/63,255 residents</i></p> <p><i>Primary Utilization = Prime Season (April – September)</i></p> <p><i>Secondary Utilization = Shoulder season (mid Sept – mid Oct)</i></p>	<p>Total Project Cost = \$5,683,030.75 (not including land costs)</p> <p>No specific requirements</p> <p>6 ha (similar size to SASA site), including clubhouse</p>	<p>Maintain Current Service Level</p> <p>2029: plan 2030: design 2031:implement</p>	<p>St. Albert Soccer Association has created a “Field of Dreams” sub-committee to advance the business plan for a regional covered as the community indoor soccer centre, complete with outdoor fields.</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments (Men’s Slo-pitch)</p> <p>The operator did agreed to the metric instead indicating that expansion of existing may be required, but another entire facility is not anticipated. Stated that the outdoor fields are not at capacity, and that as long as neighborhood fields community to be added as the community grows, it is not anticipated that more premium fields will be required. Did not agree with the capacity trigger, exceeding 100%.</p> <p>In terms of scope and cost not agreed. Next expansion would need to include indoor sport requirements.</p> <p>Major Stakeholder Comments – see operator responses</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results -15.8 % of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=37) would use it more, if more infrastructure was available</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results - 75.8% of those who rated in their top 5 (n=178) would use it more if more infrastructure was available</p>	<p>Administration accepts the metric, does not accept the 100% utilization suggestion since this is not a public service,</p> <p>In terms of scope and cost, this requires more time to study, and it will be considered in the 2016 Model Update.</p> <p>Capacity has been not been changed from 125%</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2029 Average = 2015 Leader = 2015</p> <p>The results of this engagement process have not provided significant evidence that indicates that the inputs into this Model require adjusting. Consequently, based upon Council preference to maintain current service level this model concludes that a new City Wide Soccer Park be recommended in accordance with the scope and timing identified in column 2.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] the project costs contained in column 2 are in 2015\$, and so require escalation 2] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan does not have a PC included for a city wide soccer services</p> <p>Recommendation: A new city wide rugby park project be considered for 2029.</p>
<p>14] City Wide Tennis Park</p> <p>Metric: 1 park/ 63,255 resident</p> <p>Utilization: prime time utilization</p> <p>Prime season time utilization (May – Sept)</p> <p>200 adult members & 100 youth members</p> <p>Secondary utilization: Hours of reciprocal use</p>	<p>Total Project Cost = \$1,572,029.75 (not including land costs)</p> <p>No specific requirements</p> <p>Clubhouse and 4 courts</p>	<p>Average Service Level</p> <p>2024: plan 2025: design 2026:implement</p>	<p>As part of the Capital Partnership Program, Administration has had preliminary discussions with the St. Albert Tennis Club about their desire to add four indoor courts to provide year round programming to respond to the Club demand.</p> <p>This Model triggers on a four block city wide tennis facility</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments</p> <p>The operator did not agreed on the metric it’s not clear from reading the report if the operator agrees with the overcapacity factor, the operator then states that the benchmark data is not current but provides no further clarity. The operator then indicates that they have been at capacity and have had to turn participants away. The operator confirmed the primary utilization input, and indicated an alternate for secondary.</p> <p>In terms of scope and cost, agreed.</p> <p>Major Stakeholder Comments – N/A</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results - 72% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=9) would use it more, if more infrastructure was available</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results - 71.4% of those who rated in their top 5 (n=7) would use it more if more of the infrastructure was available</p>	<p>Administration accepts the secondary utilization metric and has incorporated it into the Model.</p> <p>Capacity has been not been changed from 125%.</p> <p>In terms of scope and cost, Administration accepts the operator’s comments.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2018 Average = 2024 Leader = 2016</p> <p>The results of this engagement process have not provided significant evidence to indicate that the inputs into this Model require adjusting. So, based upon Council preference to provide average service level the model concludes that a new City Wide four-court Tennis Park be recommended in accordance with the scope and timing identified in column 2.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan does not have a PC included for a new city wide tennis park</p> <p>Recommendation: A new city wide tennis park project be considered for 2024</p>

1] New Facility Infrastructure Category - Metric - Utilization	2] 2015, D Level Cost Projections & Land Requirements	3] Council Feedback re: Service Level Preference (April 29, 2015)	4] Additional Details and Administrative` Context	5] Public Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	6] Administrative Response to Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	7] Administrative Conclusions
--	---	---	---	--	--	---

<p>15] Curling Facilities Metric:6 sheets/ 63,255 population</p> <p>Utilization: Prime season and prime time utilization (August – April)</p>	<p>Total Project Cost = TBD (not including land costs)</p> <p>Scope to be determined</p>	<p>Maintain Current Service Level</p> <p>2029: plan 2030: design 2031:implement</p>	<p>This model assumes a minimum of a 6 sheet facility</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments</p> <p>The operator did not provide a response.</p> <p>Major Stakeholder Comments – N/A</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results - 0.0% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=11) would use it more, if more infrastructure was available</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results - 30.8% of those who rated in their top 5 (n=13) would use it more if more of the infrastructure was available</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2029 Average = 2036 Leader = 2016</p> <p>The results of this engagement process have not provided any evidence that indicates that the inputs into this Model require adjusting. Consequently, based upon Council preference to provide average service level for this infrastructure type this model concludes that a new Curling Facility with six sheets be recommended in accordance with the scope and timing identified in column 2.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] N/A</p> <p>Recommendation: A new curling facility project be considered for 2029.</p>
<p>16] Heritage Parks</p> <p>Metric: 1 park/ 63,255 resident</p> <p>Overall Utilization: 19,360 participants</p> <p>General – 6,327 attend</p> <p>Special events – 5,421 attend.</p> <p>Comm. prgm- 2,950 attend</p> <p>Ed prgm- 4,566</p>	<p>Total Project Cost = not included because the scope is extremely variable (not including land costs)</p>	<p>Maintain Current Service Level</p> <p>2029: plan 2030: design 2031:implement</p>	<p>Research indicates that typically every municipality has one Heritage Park, with the size and scope of development determined by the community.</p> <p>Administrative Comment: The current Heritage Sites project is comprised of 5 stages, with two funded. This Model is not designed to predict the need to complete the stages of the existing Heritage Park.</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments</p> <p>The operator responses are based upon the requested completion of the existing Heritage Park. The response does not agree with the metric and trigger, and indicates that the trigger is the condition of the buildings. The operator does not agree with the utilization/capacity, and indicates that the capacity should be measured by the ability to hold special events.</p> <p>The Model has yet to determine scope and cost.</p> <p>Major Stakeholder Comments – see operator responses</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results - 141% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=17) would use it more, if more infrastructure was available</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results - 57.6% of those who rated in their top 5 (n=33) would use it more if more of the infrastructure was available</p>	<p>Existing infrastructure completeness is outside of the scope of the Model.</p> <p>Administration accepts the utilization/capacity and scope and cost comments.</p> <p>Capacity has been not been changed from 125%.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2029 Average = 2020 Leader = 2015</p> <p>The results of this engagement process have not provided significant evidence that indicates that the inputs into this Model require adjusting. Consequently, based upon Council preference to maintain current service levels this model concludes that a new Heritage Park be recommended in accordance with the scope and timing identified in column 2.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan has a PC for the three additional expansion phases of this development, which are outside of the scope of this Model</p> <p>Recommendation: A new curling facility project be considered for 2029</p>

1] New Facility Infrastructure Category - Metric - Utilization	2] 2015, D Level Cost Projections & Land Requirements	3] Council Feedback re: Service Level Preference (April 29, 2015)	4] Additional Details and Administrative Context	5] Public Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	6] Administrative Response to Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	7] Administrative Conclusions
--	---	---	--	--	--	-------------------------------

<p>17] Indoor Ice Surfaces</p> <p>Metric: 1 ice surface/ 12,651 resident</p> <p>Utilization: Sept – March Prime Time Servus Place: 91% Akinsdale/ Kinex: 89%</p> <p>April – Aug Non-Prime Time Servus Place: 67% Akinsdale/ Kinex: 63%</p>	<p>Total Project Cost: Single Sheet - \$17,576,000 Double Sheet - \$32,435,000 (not including land costs)</p> <p>Two scope options:</p> <p>1] stand alone ice surface, with 800 seats with twinning requirements built in</p> <p>2] twin ice surfaces using the same program as above</p>	<p>Average Service Level</p> <p>2018: plan 2019: design 2020: implement</p> <p>The trigger assumes one additional sheet of ice</p>	<p>One element of the Servus Place Expansion plan explores the potential to add an additional to Servus Place. This requires further exploration to determine the feasibility, and also the potential to twin the ice surfaces in the future. The opportunity is that the land the ice would be added to, if an addition to Servus Place is feasible, is already within the City's inventory, and is serviced.</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments The operator accepts the metric, utilization, and capacity data, although stated that "the arenas are significantly overcapacity between October and March, but underutilized for dry floor in March to August".</p> <p>The operator accepts the scope and cost, and notes the economies of scale when building two together.</p> <p>Major Stakeholder Comments:</p> <p>Minor Hockey – verbally indicated they \$405,000 of full cost ice is bought outside St. Albert, but has not provided any further details or info</p> <p>Special Olympics – has 33 athletes who play floor hockey</p> <p>St. Albert Skating Centre – the younger program has a waitlist, and is at 17% overcapacity, also more advanced skaters leave the City because of the lack of ice time, this becomes a question of support to community vs. elite athletes</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results - 54% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=45) would use it more, if more infrastructure was available</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results - 70.1% of those who rated in their top 5 (n=97) would use it more if more of the infrastructure was available</p>	<p>Administration accepts the utilization/capacity and scope and cost comments.</p> <p>Capacity has been reset to 100% in 2010.</p> <p>Administration accepts comments re: scope and cost.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2015 Average = 2018 Leader = 2016</p> <p>The results of this engagement process have provided adequate evidence to indicate that trigger inputs into this Model require adjusting. The combination of the operator responses and the stakeholder data indicate the requirement to an adjustment to the date in which capacity was hit, this date is assumed to be 2010. Consequently, based upon Council preference to provide average service level this model concludes that a new indoor ice surface be recommended in accordance with the scope and timing identified in column 2.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan has a PC for a community branch library beginning in 2016. 2] the project costs contained in column 2 are in 2015\$, and so require escalation</p> <p>Recommendation: A new indoor ice surface project be considered for 2018.</p>
---	--	---	--	---	--	--

1] New Facility Infrastructure Category - Metric - Utilization	2] 2015, D Level Cost Projections & Land Requirements	3] Council Feedback re: Service Level Preference (April 29, 2015)	4] Additional Details and Administrative Context	5] Public Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	6] Administrative Response to Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	7] Administrative Conclusions
--	---	---	--	--	--	-------------------------------

<p>18] Field house/Indoor Sports Fields</p> <p>Metric: 1 indoor field/ 32,628 resident</p> <p>Utilization: 59% prime time utilization rate</p>	<p>Total Project Cost: \$13,321,500 (not including land costs)</p> <p>Similar to indoor sports field at Servus Place</p>	<p>Maintain Current Service Level</p> <p>2022: plan 2023: design 2024:implement</p>	<p>The trigger assumes one field house/sport field.</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments The operator did not comment on the metric, the utilization indicators or the scope and cost.</p> <p>The operator did indicate that the fields are at capacity from mid-October to mid-March with soccer indoor programs and an increasing trend of summer sports (fastball, baseball, lacrosse) operating off season training programs. There are many sports that are summer sports that would like more time for indoor play.</p> <p>There is demand for gymnasiums, which is not represented in this model.</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results - 25.1% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=47) would use it more, if more infrastructure was available</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results - 63.5% of those who rated in their top 5 (n=137) would use it more if more of the infrastructure was available</p>	<p>Administration accepts the operator comments, and will include gymnasiums in the 2016 Model update.</p> <p>Capacity has been not been changed from 125%.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2022 Average = 2039 Leader = 2015</p> <p>The results of this engagement process have not provided significant evidence that indicates that the inputs into this Model require adjusting. Consequently, based upon Council preference to maintain current service level this model concludes that a new Field house/indoor sport field be recommended in accordance with the scope and timing identified in column 2.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan does not contain a PC for a new field house/indoor sport field</p> <p>Recommendation: A new field house/indoor sports field be considered for 2022.</p>
<p>19] Indoor Swimming Pools and Water Parks</p> <p>Metric: 8 lanes/ 42,170 residents</p> <p>Utilization: 2013 attendance: 586,344</p>	<p>Total Project Cost = \$16,560,000</p> <p>Expansion of the Landrex Water Play Centre at Servus Place with the addition of lane swimming, leisure aquatics and expanded locker rooms.</p>	<p>Average Service Level</p> <p>2023 plan 2024: design 2025:implement</p>		<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments The operator did not comment on the metric, the utilization indicators or the scope and cost.</p> <p>The operator did indicate that both FPRC and LWPC are reaching capacity. Recommended that planning for a north end facility should begin due to aging infrastructure and high utilization of existing facilities.</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results - 38.5% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=147) would use it more, if more infrastructure was available</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results - 51.4% of those who rated in their top 5 (n=290) would use it more if more of the infrastructure was available</p>	<p>Administration accepts the comments provided.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2022 Average = 2023 Leader = 2015</p> <p>The results of this engagement process have not provided significant evidence to lead to the conclusion that the inputs into this Models trigger require adjusting. Consequently, based upon Council preference to provide average service level this model concludes that a new indoor swimming pool be recommended in accordance with the scope and timing identified in column 2.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan has a PC for an expansion to the aquatic centre at Servus Place, with construction noted to begin in 2022</p> <p>Recommendation: A new indoor swimming pool/water park be considered for 2023</p>

1] New Facility Infrastructure Category - Metric - Utilization	2] 2015, D Level Cost Projections & Land Requirements	3] Council Feedback re: Service Level Preference (April 29, 2015)	4] Additional Details and Administrative Context	5] Public Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	6] Administrative Response to Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	7] Administrative Conclusions
--	---	---	--	--	--	-------------------------------

<p>20] Libraries</p> <p>Metric: 439 square feet/ 1,000 residents</p> <p>Primary 1 library/63,255 residents</p> <p>2013 Per capita visits = 5.15, with the average of comparator cities being 4.91</p> <p>Secondary 2013 Per capita circulation = 15.56, average is 10.68</p>	<p>Total Project Cost = \$7,170,575 (not including land costs and based on 15,000 square feet)</p> <p>*build in potential to expand</p> <p>Utilizing average of comparators= to achieve 527 square feet/1,000 residents and plan for 100,000 residents = the scope requires an additional 25,000 square feet</p>	<p>Average Service Level</p> <p>2021 plan 2022: design 2023: implement</p> <p>The trigger is based on a 20,000 square foot library</p>	<p>Administration has not located any capital planning tools used by comparator cities. St. Albert Public Library continues to reference the square foot/resident ratio, with the standard of 0.6 square foot, which originated from the American Library Association in 1966.</p> <p>However, the City of Edmonton has developed a model that indicates a new branch is required when a population of an area is 20,000, which is projected to grow to 30-35,000 in the next five years, and when no other branch exists within 4-5 km. a medium sized (15,000) square foot branch will be recommended.</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments The operator does not agree with the metric, provided corrections to the benchmark data, has indicated that the primary utilization/capacity Indicator should be space/capita; the secondary utilization should be collection size.</p> <p>In terms of scope the operator indicated non agreement with the model scope, and instead suggests a new library of 23,000 square feet is required to adequately serve the community.</p> <p>Major Stakeholder Comments – see operator responses</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results - 36.5% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=176) would use it more, if more infrastructure was available</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results - 57.6% of those who rated in their top 5 (n=300) would use it more if more of the infrastructure was available</p>	<p>Administration accepts and has incorporated the benchmark data updates, indicates that the metric for this model remains as square feet/1,000 population, and that utilization indicators need to reflect consumption of service, so maintains visits, circulation, and program attendance as utilization indicators.</p> <p>Community and on-line survey responses indicate a strong degree of community support for the library and reasonable demand for additional need.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2033 Average = 2021 Leader = 2015</p> <p>The results of this engagement process have not provided adequate evidence to indicate that trigger inputs into this Model require adjusting. Consequently, based upon Council preference to provide average service level for this infrastructure type this model concludes that a new Library be recommended in accordance with the scope and timing identified in column 2.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan has a PC for a community branch library beginning in 2016. 2] the project costs contained in column 2 are in 2015\$, and so require escalation</p> <p>Recommendation: A new library be considered for 2021</p>
---	--	---	--	--	---	--

1] New Facility Infrastructure Category - Metric - Utilization	2] 2015, D Level Cost Projections & Land Requirements	3] Council Feedback re: Service Level Preference (April 29, 2015)	4] Additional Details and Administrative Context	5] Public Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	6] Administrative Response to Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	7] Administrative Conclusions
--	---	---	--	--	--	-------------------------------

<p>21] Museums</p> <p>Metric: 85 square feet/ 1,000 resident</p> <p>Utilization: 19,360 overall 2014 attendance</p> <p>10,413 - general attendance</p> <p>1,475 = special events</p> <p>3,473 = community programs</p> <p>3,729 = educational programs</p>	<p>Total Project Cost = \$1,619,440 (not including land costs)</p> <p>2,885 ft² expansion of existing museum into adjacent space, where the finance department currently resides</p>	<p>Maintain Current Service Level</p> <p>2015: plan 2016: design 2017: implement</p> <p>Council Comment: consider including the Museum in the civic office space planning</p>	<p>The expansion plan of the Museum plan, to expand into office space where Finance 1 currently resides, is dependent upon Finance 1 relocating. City Administration have initiated an initiative that may see Finance 1 relocate, however it is anticipated to take approximately 5 years for that to occur</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments The operator responses reference both the expansion plan in St. Albert Place, and completely relocating. The response states that the Museum is 25% overcapacity and is having difficulty maintaining industry best practices.</p> <p>The operator agrees with the scope and cost if they stay within St. Albert Place.</p> <p>Major Stakeholder Comments – see operator responses</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results - 60.8% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=21) would use it more, if more infrastructure was available</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results - 56.2% of those who rated in their top 5 (n=32) would use it more if more of the infrastructure was available</p>	<p>Existing building conditions are outside of the scope of the Model.</p> <p>Administration accepts the utilization/capacity and scope and cost comments.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2015 Average = 2015 Leader = 2015</p> <p>The results of this engagement process have provided adequate evidence that indicates that the inputs into this Model require adjusting, this is based upon the operator feedback stating that they are having difficulty maintaining industry best practise, the risk that the museum collection faces because of the sub-standard storage conditions, as well as the current provision of infrastructure is 40% of the comparators average.. As a result Administration has adjusted the trigger to reflect capacity being hit in 2010. This has resulted in the trigger being hit in 2016.</p> <p>Consequently, based upon Council preference to maintain current service level this model concludes that a new Art Gallery be recommended in accordance with the scope and timing identified in column 2.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] the project costs contained in column 2 are in 2015\$, and so require escalation 2] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan has a PC for an expansion of the existing museum into finance 1 space, for 2016 and 2017 (\$447,100 in 2016, and \$2,058,500 in 2017)</p> <p>Recommendation: A new/expanded museum be considered for 2016</p>
---	--	---	--	--	--	--

1] New Facility Infrastructure Category - Metric - Utilization	2] 2015, D Level Cost Projections & Land Requirements	3] Council Feedback re: Service Level Preference (April 29, 2015)	4] Additional Details and Administrative Context	5] Public Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	6] Administrative Response to Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	7] Administrative Conclusions
<p>22] Outdoor City Wide Sports Fields (Artificial Turf) Metric: 1 outdoor field/ 63,255 resident Utilization: 34% utilization</p>	<p>Grand Total: \$5,535,000 (not including land costs) Similar program at Riel field, with change rooms</p>	<p>Maintain Current Service Level 2029: plan 2030: design 2031: implement</p>	<p>There is a PC in the 2016-2025 Year Capital Plan, or 2016, to add an Amenities Building, for the existing artificial turf field</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments The operator did not comment on the metric, the utilization indicators or the scope and cost. The operator did indicate that with the anticipate amenity building constructed in 2016 that capacity for events and \other large tournaments will increase, and thus increase utilization of the overall infrastructure. Major Stakeholder Comments – Community Telephone Survey Results - 23.6% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=11) would use it more, if more infrastructure was available Casual Participant On-line Survey Results - 70.4% of those who rated in their top 5 (n=54) would use it more if more of the infrastructure was available</p>	<p>Administration accepts the comments provided.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2029 Average = >30 years Leader = 2029 The results of this engagement process have not provided significant to lead to the conclusion that the inputs into this Models trigger require adjusting. consequently, based upon Council preference to maintain the current service level this model concludes that a new outdoor city wide artificial turf field be recommended in accordance with the scope and timing identified in column 2. Additional Notes: 1] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan does not contain a PC for a new artificial turf field Recommendation: A new outdoor city wide sports field be considered for 2029</p>
<p>23] Outdoor Swimming Pools & Splash Parks Metric: 1 aquatic park/ 31,628 resident 2013 attendance: 90,761 (Grosvenor and WPP)</p>	<p>Total Project Cost: Splash Pad - \$2,600,000 New Change Rooms - \$1,083,400 = \$3,683,400 (not including land costs) Splash park, similar to Woodlands water park</p>	<p>Average Service Level 2015: plan 2016: design 2017: implement</p>		<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments The operator did not comment on the metric, the utilization indicators or the scope and cost. The operator did indicate that the city is underserved in terms of spray parks. Major Stakeholder Comments – n/a Community Telephone Survey Results - 37.7% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=71) would use it more, if more infrastructure was available Casual Participant On-line Survey Results - 49.5% of those who rated in their top 5 (n=99) would use it more if more of the infrastructure was available</p>	<p>Administration accepts the comments provided. In addition, this infrastructure type includes all outdoor aquatic services, but the research concludes that the greatest need is for outdoor spray parks/ splash pads.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2022 Average = 2015 Leader = 2015 The results of this engagement process have not provided significant evidence to lead to the conclusion that the inputs into this Models trigger require adjusting. So, based upon Council preference to maintain the current service levels this model concludes that a new outdoor spray park/splash pad be recommended in accordance with the scope and timing identified in column 2. Additional Notes: 1] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan does contain a PC for a new spray park/splash pad, planed for 2020/2021. Recommendation: A new outdoor swimming pool/splash park be considered for 2016</p>

1] New Facility Infrastructure Category - Metric - Utilization	2] 2015, D Level Cost Projections & Land Requirements	3] Council Feedback re: Service Level Preference (April 29, 2015)	4] Additional Details and Administrative Context	5] Public Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	6] Administrative Response to Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	7] Administrative Conclusions
---	--	--	---	---	---	--------------------------------------

<p>24] Performing Arts Facilities</p> <p>8 seats/ 1,000 residents</p> <p>74% prime time days utilized</p>	<p>Total Project Cost: \$9,465,625 (not including land costs)</p> <p>300 seat performing arts theatre</p>	<p>Maintain Current Service Level</p> <p>2029: plan 2030: design 2031:implement</p>		<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments The operator did not comment on the metric, the utilization indicators or the scope and cost. The operator did provide updated information about benchmarking that requires incorporation and reconsideration.</p> <p>The operator did indicate that volume of requests that the facility cannot accommodate, and the consideration that the Arden is a regional facility.</p> <p>Major Stakeholder Comments – Crystal to add</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results - 38.1% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=121) would use it more, if more infrastructure was available</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results - 41.8% of those who rated in their top 5 (n=153) would use it more if more of the infrastructure was available</p>	<p>Administration accepts the comments provided.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2029 Average = 2029 Leader = 2015</p> <p>The results of this engagement process have not provided significant evidence to conclude that the inputs into this Models trigger require adjusting. So, based upon Council preference to provide average service level this model concludes that a new performing arts theatre be recommended in accordance with the scope and timing identified in column 2.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan does not contain a PC for a new performing arts facility 2] An external organization has submitted through the CPP to request funding to construct a 200 seat theatre</p> <p>Recommendation: That planning for a new performing arts theatre be considered in 2029</p>
<p>25] Special Event Grounds (i.e. Riel Rodeo Grounds)</p> <p>1 event ground/ 63,255 residents</p> <p>Utilization: # of events/activities year</p>	<p>Total Project Cost = TBD (not including land costs)</p> <p>Scope to be determined</p> <p>Geographically distant from residential due to heavy traffic</p>	<p>Maintain Current Service Level</p> <p>2029: plan 2030: design 2031:implement</p>	<p>The current Special Event Grounds are situation at Riel Recreation Park, are owned by the City of St. Albert, and operated through long term lease to the Kinsmen Club of St. Albert.</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments The operator supported the metric and utilization indicators. The operator indicated that there was tremendous capacity, and that the Kinsmen Club is making efforts to increase utilization.</p> <p>Major Stakeholder Comments – see operator responses</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results - 52.6 % of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=11) would use it more, if more infrastructure was available</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results - 16.7% of those who rated in their top 5 (n=6) would use it more if more of the infrastructure was available</p>	<p>Administration accepts the comments provided.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2029 Average = 2031 Leader = 2015</p> <p>The results of this engagement process have not provided significant evidence to conclude that the inputs into the Model trigger require adjusting. Based upon Council preference to maintain current service levels this model concludes that a new special event ground be recommended in accordance with the scope and timing identified in column 2.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan does contain a PC for a new civic square (event ground) planned for 2020</p> <p>Recommendation: That planning for a new special event ground be considered in 2029</p>

1] New Facility Infrastructure Category - Metric - Utilization	2] 2015, D Level Cost Projections & Land Requirements	3] Council Feedback re: Service Level Preference (April 29, 2015)	4] Additional Details and Administrative Context	5] Public Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	6] Administrative Response to Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	7] Administrative Conclusions
<p>26] Skateboard/ Bike Park</p> <p>1 bike park/ 21,085 residents (when bike skills park is completed)</p> <p>Primary Utilization: # of participants</p> <p>Secondary Utilization: event/race capacity</p>	<p>Total Project Cost: \$715,000 (not including land costs)</p> <p>Construction costs based on the one designed at the Clareview Recreation Centre, simple concrete and allows for changing of equipment by building steel structures</p>	<p>Average Service Level</p> <p>>30 years</p>	<p>This infrastructure combines the entire continuum of bike parks, from the Skateboard Park, to the planned Bike Skills Park, to the BMX Park.</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments - City The operator did not comment on the metric, utilization, or scope. They did note that there will be new demand as the City continues to grow north.</p> <p>Operator/Service Provider Comments – BMX The operator supported the metric and utilization indicators. Does not support scope, instead indicated that 4-5 acres and \$3M to build.</p> <p>Major Stakeholder Comments – Bike Skills Park The operator supported the metric, utilization, and scope indicators. The operator indicated that they should not be grouped together with the rest of the “bike” parks because they serve different interested.</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results - 82.6 % of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=10) would use it more, if more infrastructure was available</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results - 71.9% of those who rated in their top 5 (n=32) would use it more if more of the infrastructure was available</p>	<p>Administration accepts the comments provided.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2020 Average = >30 years Leader = 2020</p> <p>The results of this engagement process have not provided significant evidence to conclude that the inputs into this Models trigger require adjusting. Consequently, based upon Council preference to provide average service levels this model concludes that a new bike park be recommended in accordance with the scope and timing identified in column 2.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan does not contain a PC for a new bike park</p> <p>Recommendation: That planning for a new bike park not be considered within the next 30 years</p>
<p>27] Track & Field Park</p> <p>1 field/ 63,255 residents</p>	<p>Total Project Cost = TBD (not including land costs)</p> <p>Scope to be determined</p>	<p>Average Service Level</p> <p>2035: plan 2036: design 2037:implement</p>		<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments - City The operator did not comment on the metric. They did note that there is capacity for the foreseeable future, with a short season of use and a large amount of capacity.</p> <p>Major Stakeholder Comments – St. Albert Physical Education Council The stakeholder supported the capacity assumption and noted that they expect 5-8% population increase in school facility, with low impact on future needs.</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results - 20.4 % of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=8) would use it more, if more infrastructure was available</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results - 24.0% of those who rated in their top 5 (n=25) would use it more if more of the infrastructure was available</p>	<p>Administration accepts the comments provided.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2029 Average = 2035 Leader = 2015</p> <p>The results of this engagement process have not provided significant evidence to conclude that the inputs into this Models trigger require adjusting. Consequently, based upon Council preference to provide average service levels for this model concludes that a new track and field park be recommended in accordance with the scope and timing identified in column 2.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan does not contain a PC for a new track and field park</p> <p>Recommendation: That planning for a new special event ground be considered in 2035</p>

1] New Facility Infrastructure Category - Metric - Utilization	2] 2015, D Level Cost Projections & Land Requirements	3] Council Feedback re: Service Level Preference (April 29, 2015)	4] Additional Details and Administrative Context	5] Public Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	6] Administrative Response to Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	7] Administrative Conclusions
<p>28] Bookable spaces (ex. Clubhouses)</p> <p>1 space/ 12,651 residents</p> <p>Servus Place Meeting Rooms 34%</p> <p>Clubhouses: 50% utilization</p>	<p>Total Project Cost: \$897,000 (not including land costs)</p> <p>Comparable to Grandin Clubhouse @ 2,000 ft²</p> <p>As new community recreation and cultural facilities are planned, the need and feasibility of including bookable spaces will be considered in the program development</p>	<p>Council comment: need to better understand supply/ demand/ utilization, enter into developer conversations, consider building bookable spaces with other new builds</p>	<p>This infrastructure type is has a great range of sizes, uses, locations, etc. The approach taken is that additional bookable spaces brought on line by the City would be in conjunction with another facility, as an added service/programming element.</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments - City The operator did not comment on the metric, scope, or utilization indicators. They did comment on the limitations do the current clubhouses.</p> <p>Major Stakeholder Comments – Girl Guides of Canada The stakeholder did not comment on the metric, but supported the scope. They did indicate that the capacity trigger should be 100%. The remaining comments focused on the limitations do the current clubhouses.</p> <p>Major Stakeholder Comments – St. Albert & District Further Education Association The stakeholder did not comment on the metric, but supported the scope. They did indicate that the capacity trigger should be 100%.</p> <p>Major Stakeholder Comments – St. Albert Community Information & Volunteer Centre The stakeholder did not comment on the metric and they did support the capacity metric. The scope they noted was sized to host major events with technology upgrades. Their remaining comments were related to their specific office space situation.</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results - 0.0% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=7) would use it more, if more infrastructure was available</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results - 61.1% of those who rated in their top 5 (n=18) would use it more if more of the infrastructure was available</p>	<p>Administration accepts the comments provided.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2018 Average = 2015 Leader = 2015</p> <p>The results of this engagement process have not provided significant evidence to lead to the conclusion that the inputs into this Models trigger require adjusting to reflect the excess capacity in the bookable spaces, that has lead to the conclusion that capacity limit be moved into the future.</p> <p>Consequently, because of the available capacity in service and the further research noted in Council's service level preference, Administrations recommendation is outside of this models output. The recommendation is to delay adding a bookable space.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan does not contain a PC for a new bookable space 2] It is not recommended that this space be built as stand alone, it is recommended that it be designed as a multipurpose facility or campus style</p> <p>Recommendation: that the timing decision for adding another bookable space be delayed until further research into available existing capacity is concluded.</p>
<p>29] Downtown Parking Structures</p> <p>157 stalls/ 1,000 residents</p>	<p>Total Construction Cost: Surface Parking \$12,000 - \$15,000/Stall</p> <p>Open Structure: \$18,000-\$20,000/Stall</p> <p>Closed Structure: \$40,000 - \$45,000/Stall</p>		<p>On hold – pending parking study decisions</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2029 Average = 2015 Leader = 2015</p> <p>Administration recommends that the 2016 update of the Model be updated with results of the Parking Study decisions</p> <p>Recommendation: that the timing decision for adding a downtown parking structure be delayed until the parking study is complete.</p>

1] New Facility Infrastructure Category - Metric - Utilization	2] 2015, D Level Cost Projections & Land Requirements	3] Council Feedback re: Service Level Preference (April 29, 2015)	4] Additional Details and Administrative Context	5] Public Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	6] Administrative Response to Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	7] Administrative Conclusions
<p>30] Fitness Centres</p> <p>91.5 square feet/ 1,000 residents</p> <p>2013 attendance: 90,761/918 visits/day</p>	<p>Total Project Cost:\$2,932,000</p> <p>Expand the Servus Place fitness centre and second floor concourse with 4,000 sf of new construction to build out the front entrance to expand the fitness floor space, relocate the locker rooms and relocate the meeting rooms.</p>	<p>Maintain Current Service Level</p> <p>2043: plan 2044: design 2045:implement</p>		<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments - City The operator did not comment on the metric, scope, or utilization indicators. They did comment on the existing Servus Place expansion plan, and noted that the planned elements should be implemented before another fitness is considered</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results - 36.0% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=113) would use it more, if more infrastructure was available</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results - 59.2% of those who rated in their top 5 (n=201) would use it more if more of the infrastructure was available</p>	<p>Administration accepts the comments provided.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2043 Average = 2017 Leader = 2015</p> <p>The results of this engagement process have not provided significant evidence to conclude that the inputs into this Models trigger require adjusting. Consequently, based upon Council preference to maintain current service levels this model concludes that a new/expanded fitness centre be recommended in accordance with the scope and timing identified in column 2.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan does contain a PC for the Servus Place fitness expansion, planned to begin in 2020</p> <p>Recommendation: That planning for a new/expanded fitness centre be considered in 2043</p>
<p>31] City Wide Gardens</p>	<p>Total Project Cost = TBD (not including land costs)</p> <p>Scope = similar in size and infrastructure to the St. Albert Botanic Park</p>	<p>Maintain Current Service Level</p> <p>2029: plan 2030: design 2031:implement</p>	<p>This infrastructure type was added just prior to the engagement process</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments – St. Albert Botanic Park The operator did not provide a response to the survey.</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results - 27.9% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=74) would use it more, if more infrastructure was available</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results - 38.7% of those who rated in their top 5 (n=80) would use it more if more of the infrastructure was available</p> <p><i>Please note that feedback from a representative of the Botanic Park Board advised Administration that the web survey was not clear and that volunteers may be underrepresented in the survey.</i></p>	<p>Administration accepts the comments provided.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2029 Average = 2034 Leader = 2015</p> <p>The results of this engagement process have not provided significant evidence to lead to the conclusion that the inputs into this Models trigger require adjusting. Consequently, because Council has not provided a service level preference Administrations' recommendation is to maintain current service levels so this model concludes that a new botanic park be recommended in accordance with the scope and timing identified in column 2.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan does not contain a PC for a city wide garden</p> <p>Recommendation: That planning for a new city wide garden be considered in 2029</p>

1] New Facility Infrastructure Category - Metric - Utilization	2] 2015, D Level Cost Projections & Land Requirements	3] Council Feedback re: Service Level Preference (April 29, 2015)	4] Additional Details and Administrative` Context	5] Public Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	6] Administrative Response to Engagement Responses (refer to New Facility Predictive Model Report for complete data)	7] Administrative Conclusions
--	---	---	---	--	--	---

<p>32] Artist Studio Space</p> <p>Available studio spaces/1,000 population</p> <p>Utilization: 100%</p>	<p>Total Project Cost = TBD (not including land costs)</p> <p>Scope to be determined</p>	<p>Maintain Current Service Level</p> <p>2022: plan 2023: design 2024:implement</p>	<p>This infrastructure type was added just prior to the engagement process</p> <p>This trigger assumes 9 artist studios</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments - City The operator did not comment on the metric. They did comments on the capacity noting that as the botanic arts city, they hope that the threshold for related facilities would be reduced. Additional utilization measures should be wait lists.</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results - 6.0% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=) would use it more, if more infrastructure was available</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results - 61.8% of those who rated in their top 5 (n=34) would use it more if more of the infrastructure was available</p>	<p>Administration accepts the comments provided.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2022 Average = >30 years Leader = 2022</p> <p>The results of this engagement process have not provided significant evidence to lead to the conclusion that the inputs into this Models trigger require adjusting. Consequently, because Council has not provided a service level preference Administrations' recommendation is to maintain service levels, this model concludes that a new bundle of artist studio spaces be provided in accordance with the scope and timing identified in column 2.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan does contain a PC for new artist studios, in DARP 004</p> <p>Recommendation: That planning for a new artist studio space bundle be considered in 2022</p>
<p>33] RV Parks / Campgrounds</p> <p>Metric = # of stall/1,000 population</p> <p>Utilization = % booked in prime time</p> <p>% booked in shoulder seasons</p>	<p>Total Project Cost = TBD (not including land costs)</p> <p>Scope to be determined</p>	<p>Maintain Current Service Levels</p> <p>2029: plan 2030: design 2031:implement</p>	<p>This infrastructure type was added just prior to the engagement process</p>	<p>Operator/Service Provider Comments – Kinsmen Club of St. Albert The operator did not comment on the metric. They did comments on the utilization, indicating that the park is well utilized, but they do not foresee another required for the long term utilization measures should be wait lists.</p> <p>Community Telephone Survey Results - 0.0% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=3) would use it more, if more infrastructure was available</p> <p>Casual Participant On-line Survey Results - 33.3% of those who rated in their top 5 (n=3) would use it more if more of the infrastructure was available</p>	<p>Administration accepts the comments provided.</p>	<p>The model triggers new facilities as follows: Maintain = 2029 Average = TBD Leader = TBD</p> <p>The results of this engagement process have not provided significant evidence to lead to the conclusion that the inputs into this Models trigger require adjusting. Consequently, because this is an infrastructure type that Council has not had provided a service level preference, Administration is recommending to maintain current service levels which results in a recreational vehicle park recommended in accordance with the scope and timing identified in column 2.</p> <p>Additional Notes: 1] the 2016-2025 Capital Plan does not contain a PC for a new recreational vehicle park</p> <p>Recommendation: That planning for a new RV park be considered in 2029</p>