



2015 Facility Priority Assessment Research
Major Stakeholder Focus Groups
Report

October 7th, 2015



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND	3
2.0 METHODOLOGY	4
3.0 STAKEHOLDER FOCUS GROUP FINDINGS	5
3.1 Participant Profiles	5
3.1.1 Group One	5
3.1.2 Group Two	5
3.1.3 Group Three	5
3.1.4 Group Four	5
3.1.5 Group Five	5
3.1.6 Group Six	5
3.1.7 Group Seven	6
3.1.8 Group Eight	6
3.1.9 Group Nine	6
3.2 Group One Results	7
3.3 Group Two Results	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.4 Group Three Results	10
3.5 Group Four Results	11
3.6 Group Five Results	13
3.7 Group Six Results	14
3.8 Group Seven Results	15
3.9 Group Eight Results	17
3.10 Group Nine Results	18
3.11 Summary	19
APPENDIX A – MODERATORS’ GUIDE	20
APPENDIX B – STAKEHOLDER QUESTIONNAIRE	24
APPENDIX C – NEW FACILITY PRIORITIZATION ASSESSMENT MODEL PRESENTATION	29

1.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND

In 2015, the City of St. Albert (“the City”; “the Client”) developed a New Facility Priority Assessment Model (“the Model”) to provide empirical, analytics-based data to consider when making decisions and determining priorities for funding of new municipal infrastructure. By utilizing detailed analytics, the Model is intended to be a decision-making tool that considers the entire bundle of community and public services, and allows for conscious and holistic planning for new facility needs for St. Albert for the long term.

In summer 2015, Banister Research was contracted to assist with the Facility Priority Assessment Model Research in order to validate the assumptions of the Model and gather feedback from stakeholders regarding perceptions of new facility priorities. As part of the research, Banister Research conducted the following:

- **General Population Telephone Survey.** A total of 400-randomly selected respondents completed the telephone survey from September 1st to 9th, 2015. The objective of the survey was to determine residents’ opinions about new facility needs in the City of St. Albert.
 - Results provide a margin of error no greater than $\pm 4.9\%$ at the 95% confidence level, or 19 times out of 20.
- **Web-Based Stakeholder Survey.** A web-based version of the survey was available from September 1st to 20th, 2015, over which time a total of 537 submissions were completed.
 - Due to the opt-in or self-select nature of web-based surveys, results cannot be generalized to the population of the City of St. Albert.
- **Major User/Stakeholder Meetings.** Nine (9) focus group sessions were conducted with a total of twenty-three (n=23) major stakeholders of City-owned or operated facilities. Participants represented a variety of clubs/organizations that rent or use space in St. Albert community service facilities. The meetings were conducted between August 26th and September 15th, 2015.

This report documents the results of the General Population Telephone Survey. It is important to note that results have been reported in aggregate. A breakdown of the key responses by users of each facility type, as well as findings from the other research components, have been provided under a separate cover.

2.0 METHODOLOGY

Participants for the nine (9) major stakeholder focus group sessions were recruited from a contact list of organizations provided by the City of St. Albert. Individuals were contacted and invited to a focus group, scheduled based on their availability, that focused on their particular infrastructure type. There were also two (2) mixed session, where participants from different infrastructure types were invited to participate.

Each individual recruited received a notice prior to the session that provided the details of the groups, including times, dates, and the location, as well as all materials to be discussed during the session. Ultimately, twenty-three (n=23) respondents participated in the focus group sessions, conducted from August 26th to September 16th, 2015.

The focus groups lasted for approximately forty-five (45) minutes to an hour on average and were all facilitated by Tracy With, Vice President of Banister Research.

The focus groups were based on a moderator's guide, developed by Banister Research in conjunction with the Client. A copy of the moderator's guide, in addition to a handout developed for the discussion and a presentation explaining the New Facility Prioritization Assessment Model have been provided in Appendices A, B, and C, respectively.

The following sections provide a summary of the key findings for each of the topic areas investigated.

Please Note: Readers of this report should be cautioned as to the interpretation of results obtained from the focus group process. Focus groups provide qualitative data, and, while valuable insights were gained through this process, the results cannot be considered statistically representative. Moreover, the language used in the report is subjective in nature and should be read as indicators of key themes, rather than quantifiable measures. For example, a few respondents would indicate that two (2) or three (3) respondents (per group or overall, depending on the context) responded in a particular way. In contrast, the usage of the words "majority," "typically," or "mostly" indicate that approximately three-quarters or more of the participants felt similarly about a topic or theme.

3.0 Stakeholder Focus Group Findings

3.1 Participant Profiles

Overall, twenty-three (n=23) individuals participated in the focus group sessions, representing twenty-two (22) different organizations within St. Albert.

3.1.1 Group One

This group represented the major stakeholders of the Arden Theater. There were four (n=4) participants representing: St. Albert Chamber of Commerce, the Ukrainian Shumka Dancers, the St. Albert Community Band and Mary's Veil.

3.1.2 Group Two

This group represented major stakeholders of outdoor ball diamonds in the City of St. Albert. There were two participants (n=2) representing: the St. Albert Fastball Association and the St. Albert Slow Pitch Association.

3.1.3 Group Three

This group represented major stakeholders of bike parks and bike facilities in the City of St. Albert. There were two participants (n=2) representing: the St. Albert Bike Association and the St. Albert BMX Association.

3.1.4 Group Four

This group represented major stakeholders of indoor and outdoor soccer fields, as well as users of track and field facilities in the City of St. Albert. There were two participants (n=2) representing: the St. Albert Soccer Association and the St. Albert Track and Field Club.

3.1.5 Group Five

This group represented major stakeholders who used bookable space in the City of St. Albert. There were two participants (n=2) representing: the St. Albert Girl Guides and the St. Albert Community Information and Volunteer Centre.

3.1.6 Group Six

This group represented major stakeholders who used bookable space in the City of St. Albert and were also Family and Community Support Services. There were two participants (n=2) representing: the St. Victim Services and the St. Albert Further Ed.

3.1.7 Group Seven

This group represented major stakeholders who used indoor ice and arena facilities in the City of St. Albert. There were four participants (n=4) representing: the St. Albert Minor Hockey Association, the St. Albert Ringette Association, the St. Albert Skating Club and the St. Albert Catholic Schools Sports Academy.

3.1.8 Group Eight

This group represented major stakeholders of indoor pools in the City of St. Albert. There were three participants (n=3) representing: the St. Albert Special Olympics, the St. Albert Canoe and Kayak Club and the St. Albert Roadrunners Triathlon Club.

3.1.9 Group Nine

This group represented major stakeholders of track and field facilities in the City of St. Albert. There were two participants (n=2) both representing the St. Albert Physical Education Council.

3.2 Group One Results

Overview and Definition of Capacity

For the organizations who attended the session, the seating capacity and size of the Arden was not a concern. All of the organizations agreed the Arden was an appropriate size theater for the types of events they hold. The lack of secondary capabilities of a performing arts facility was raised, such as practice space and reception/lobby space. The lobby in the Arden has a smaller capacity than the theater, which makes it difficult hosting a reception for an event at the theater. The possibility of having a performing arts facility was raised, which would serve as a home for performing arts organizations. This would include practice, storage and office space for groups. The organizations agreed that the Arden is unique, in that it has a large pit which many other facilities do not have. Overall the largest capacity issue with the Arden is that peak or high demand dates such as weekends are very difficult to book because of the professional series programmed by the facility itself, which takes priority. It was felt that any measure of capacity needs to take into account availability of prime time usage.

Additional Infrastructure

The organizations discussed a proposed new facility being 300 seats, which is smaller than the Arden. It was raised that some of the schools would utilize a smaller theater which would take some of the pressure of the Arden and could potentially open some weekend dates for the Arden.

Model Assumptions

The organizations agreed that population growth was an appropriate metric for capacity and utilization, but there are many other factors that need to be taken into account, such as the brand the City wishes to embody, and the recreational interests and demand of the population at large.

Funding

Some of the organization would have funding available and would be willing to contribute to a capital project, especially if it meets their additional needs such as hosting and rehearsal space. Other organizations strictly raise money for charity though, and so would not be able to contribute.

Tax increase

Some of the organizations agreed with a property tax increase to cover the capital cost as long as it was of demonstrable value to the City, but stated non-profit should be operating the facility, not the City. Other organizations provided no comment.

3.3 Group Two Results

Overview and Definition of Capacity

St. Albert Fastball is primarily a female participant based organization (i.e., there is only one boys' team) with approximately 200 members. Most teams play out of Edmonton and around the province with a season from the beginning of January to mid July. This year the Association is making a bid for the Western Canadian Championships, to be hosted at the Meadowview softball complex. Recently, there has been higher demand for competitive fastball, and they have been participating in tournaments, sometimes traveling as far as the United States. They do not currently have waiting lists, as they try to accommodate everyone who wishes to join a team, whether within their organization or with other partners. The Association has no dedicated facility (only a storage locker at St. Albert Storage), and their capacity is not currently limited by infrastructure. The availability of fastball equivalent diamonds may become a limiting factor, but this has not posed a problem to date. Not all diamonds in the City are equipped for fastball, due to the lack of appropriate fencing.

The St. Albert Slow Pitch Association has been in existence for 30 years and hit its capacity with 56 teams in 2014. The Association is male only, whose players' ages range 18 to 82. The Association runs the Meadowview complex, which is quad diamond facility with a clubhouse and supporting infrastructure. They currently have a waiting list of 3 teams plus additional players, which totals between 50 and 100 individuals. They play games at 6:30pm, 8:00pm and 9:30pm Monday through Thursday, with games at 5:00 on Tuesday and Thursday. The 5:00pm games are predominantly for 60+ ages as, younger participants often cannot make that time. Teams play two games a week, so their capacity is defined by that standard of play and the primetime utilization. Fridays are saved for rainouts and tournaments. They disagreed with the 25% trigger, as their team limit has no flexibility.

Additional Infrastructure

For slow pitch, additional diamonds would allow their organization to add more teams. For fastball a facility would be an impetus for the growth for their organization, and they could host more tournaments. There is no industry standard or critical mass for triggering a new quad diamond; it is based on desire and commitment of users. The Fastball Association stressed a new facility would drive growth of their organization. There was additional discussion around what kind of facility could be triggered; whether diamonds should be triggered one at a time or facilities that have three or four diamonds should be triggered.

Model Assumptions

Both groups agreed the costs in the model were accurate. If lighting for the diamonds is being considered, both the capital and the operating costs need to be adjusted. There are additional costs for housing maintenance equipment as well. Examples of facilities that recently installed lights for cost estimates purposes included Irma and Morinville.

Funding

Slow pitch has had some sponsorship and no grants. Fastball has received some grants from external organizations, as well as the City. Slow pitch is primarily funded through revenue generating activity at the Meadowview complex.

Tax increase

Both groups were in favor of a property tax increase only if it is a shared responsibility project, where stewards of the facility have some responsibilities for costs.

Value to Community

Since fastball is predominantly played by females, it can be a sport they can take ownership of. Few sports are female dominated and this is one exception. With slow pitch's large age range, there are health benefits to a large part of the community.

3.4 Group Three Results

Overview and Definition of Capacity

The St. Albert Bike Association is relatively new organization with approximately 17 members. Their membership is expected to increase over winter substantially, due to the spin classes they offer. The Association was created to support the bike park that is being constructed and will open late in 2016. They are not currently over capacity, as their facility is not finished, and likely will not hit capacity for the foreseeable future. Once their facility is complete, the definition of capacity should be revisited, as they will have better insight into how their facility is used.

The St. Albert BMX Association has approximately 60 members and is also not currently at capacity. They define capacity as how many people could race on their track in daylight hours. Their membership has consistent growth of approximately 10 members a year. Currently they do not believe they will ever hit capacity in the near future. There is the potential for BMX to become an Olympic sport sometime in the next 10 years, and this could have an impact on the popularity of their sport.

Additional Infrastructure

Any additional infrastructure would need to service a different need, such as a constructing a different difficulty of bike park or building cross country trails. More infrastructure of a similar type split the membership of the organizations and be a detriment.

Model Assumptions

Both organizations agreed with model assumptions, with some minor corrections to existing facilities and facility cost.

Funding

Both organization have access to small grants in the order of \$5,000 to \$10,000.

Tax increase

Both organizations were in favor of a property tax increase to support the construction and operation of additional facilities.

Value to Community

Biking provides a healthy activity that families can engage in together, and fosters community bonding.

3.5 Group Four Results

Overview and Definition of Capacity

The St. Albert Track and Field Foundation is the parent organization that represents both the club and school participation in track and field. Currently, the Foundation is not at capacity for track use. While they are not currently turning anyone away, their winter training is experiencing difficulties and is likely over capacity. Children 13 and under train at Servus Place using bookable space, while children older than 13 train at the Kinsmen Sports Centre facility in Edmonton. They tend to cohabitate the track facility with other groups in the City, such as Special Olympics. There have been no issues sharing use with these groups, but issues have arisen from general public use due to a lack of facility knowledge and etiquette. Due to the number of groups that use the track facility, population growth may not be a good metric to measure capacity.

The St. Albert Soccer Association's programming is split between indoor and outdoor soccer. The outdoor program is currently not at capacity with the exception of U8 and U10, but this is being addressed with the City. Capacity for outdoor programs is defined by the number of players in the organization and wear and tear on the fields they use. They are currently limited to 4 games a week to prevent significant damage to fields, and cannot use fields on school property due to this. They use the artificial turf available in April as much as possible but have limited access due to football having priority use. Overall the outdoor program is not at capacity and has sufficient field access. Population growth as a measure of capacity is appropriate for the St. Albert Soccer Association.

The St. Albert Soccer Association's indoor program is experiencing issues with capacity, and has had to cut back to 3 teams sharing space during community training programs instead of two. Teams are on average only getting one practice a month, and the Association is already using the maximum usable hours they can for school gymnasiums. Over the last two years, enrollment has grown by 10% each year, but enrollment rates will likely decrease this year. The training programs they run have been capped at 40 members the last two years, and this year's program has already hit the cap with a week of registration still left.

Additional Infrastructure

Additional infrastructure would allow the St. Albert Soccer Association to keep pace with the needs of the growing population. The St. Albert Track and Field Foundation did not specify any additional outdoor infrastructure needs, but it was implied that there is a need to provide training opportunities during the winter season.

Model Assumptions

Both organizations agreed to provide registration and growth numbers outside of the session to better inform the model.

Funding

Both organizations stated they would be willing and able to contribute to the capital cost of new facilities. They have accessed money through various avenues such as grants and AGLC casinos.

Tax increase

Both organizations would be in favor of a property tax increase for the purpose of building additional infrastructure, but were not comfortable answering about a property tax increase to support operational funding. It was stressed that the communication on the increase would need to specify as to whether the tax increase would cease after the facility is financed, or if the increase was permanent.

Value to Community

The St. Albert Soccer Association has a participant age range of 4 to 72, and engages a wide range of the population in a healthy lifestyle. They also offer a wide range of skill level, from recreational to high level competitive sport, with a team almost making it to the nationals in 2014. St. Albert Track and Field Foundation offers healthy activities for children both in and out of school.

3.6 Group Five Results

Overview and Definition of Capacity

The St. Albert Girl Guides has approximately 250 girls and 40 leaders and meet in schools and the City owned clubhouses. The schools are sometimes unavailable due to gymnastics equipment being set up which can cause difficulty in finding places to meet. Programming is generally planned for a couple of hours a week, and other than occasional difficulties, there is currently sufficient space to meet demand. The primary limiting factor for the organizations is available leaders and volunteers. They are also struggling with sufficient space available for sleep over outings.

St. Albert Community Involvement and Volunteer Centre works out of a privately leased facility and receive FCSS funding to assist them pay rent. They run an information referral desk, a volunteer center, a mentor program for youths in need and a youth volunteer program. They also have a meeting space for rent within the center. They are not currently at capacity and could better utilized by St. Albert residents. They recently renovated their offices and so feel they have sufficient space.

Additional Infrastructure

Additional infrastructure would not benefit the day to day operations of either organization, with the exception of easier access to space to host sleep overs for Girl Guides, but both organizations could benefit from access to more affordable event space.

Model Assumptions

Population growth works as a metric for capacity for both organizations. The Volunteer Centre is likely underutilized for the current population and so they are undertaking marketing efforts to increase their visibility. Girl Guides is currently seeing an upward growth trend, which they said was possibly due to the recession and their affordability.

Funding

Girl Guides is funded exclusively through membership, while the Volunteer Centre is funded through various grants from organizations such as United Way and local service clubs.

Tax increase

Girl guides agreed with a property tax increase for the purpose of constructing new facilities, while the Volunteer Centre provided no official comment.

3.7 Group Six Results

Overview and Definition of Capacity

St. Albert Victim Services is housed out of the RCMP detachment and has grown rapidly over the last three years, from three staff and eight volunteers to five staff and twenty volunteers. The RCMP has recently moved detachments and Victim Services moved along with them. While this improved the available space, Victim Services is still somewhat crowded. They meet with clients in meeting rooms in their office space, but are sometimes pressured for space due to the emergency nature of their work. They also travel to clients' homes and meet in courthouses under certain circumstances. Other City facilities are only used for tertiary functions such as conferences and presentation. Victim Services prefers and needs to stay housed as a part of the RCMP detachment, as they work hand in hand with the RCMP and are able to respond more quickly in emergencies. Clients also have an easier time accessing them, and it guarantees that the sensitive information that Victim Services deal with is secure. While crowded, Victim Services is not currently at capacity, and are able to meet the needs of the community.

St. Albert Further Ed is housed in a leased facility on the second floor of the Mission Hill shopping center, which is currently not handicap accessible. They offer classes tailored to new Canadians, offer job retraining and hobby classes and also publish a magazine of classes the community can sign up for. They currently do not use any City facilities except the library, which they use for one on one tutoring for new Canadians. In general they are not at capacity for the variety of classes they offer, with the exception of computer classes. These classes are offered through the Northern Alberta Business Incubator's (NABI) computer lab, and they are currently at capacity and could use additional space. They also have a lack meeting rooms or private space in their current office, which can make certain office functions or meetings difficult.

Additional Infrastructure

For Further Ed, more computer lab space would mean they could offer more computer classes, which are in high demand. Victim Services would prefer to have a separate space still attached to the RCMP detachment, which would allow them to better serve their clients. This model is being explored and has been followed by Victim Services organizations in other communities around Alberta.

Model Assumptions

Measuring growth and capacity for Victim Services using population growth is an adequate measure. Demand for their services always grows, and does not decrease even as crime stats fall, due to a broadening definition of a victim of crime, and people's increasing willingness to accept help. Further Ed's demand is based on the rate of immigration of new Canadians to St. Albert as well as the

performance of the economy due to the retraining classes they offer, so population growth does not act as a straight line indicator of capacity.

3.8 Group Seven Results

Overview and Definition of Capacity

The St. Albert Ringette Association has stable in enrollment, with over 400 participants from entry level to AA high performance. This year they will be introducing a national team with affiliation to the St. Albert Association. They do not currently have a waiting list, and procure extra ice from outside the City to accommodate their needs. The extra ice they procure is to meet their minimum standards of practice they have set for their organization. Approximately 5% of their membership is from outside St. Albert. They have hosted tournaments in the past, and would like to host more frequently but are unable to because of ice availability.

The St. Albert Minor Hockey Association has over 1800 members and is growing every year. They have no waiting list and do not turn players away, instead accommodating new members by purchasing extra ice time from outside the City. Teams are allocated 22 half ice slots over the year, so teams and coaches pursue contracts with arenas to provide the extra ice time they need. The Association felt that on average, teams were not obtaining the minimum amount of ice time they needed. There are an increasing number of children joining the St. Albert Association from the surrounding towns and communities, as these communities have had trouble forming their own associations, especially for female participants. This level of outside participation remains low overall at approximately 1.5% of membership coming from outside of St. Albert. Starting sometime in the next two years, Hockey Canada will be introducing no hit hockey up to Bantam level, which should increase the retention of youth in the program. The Association hosts at least one tournament every year, and would prefer to host more but is limited by available ice. The Raiders level of hockey is the high performance stream for players. They are currently only meeting approximately half their ice needs, and are allocated the prime ice time by St. Albert Minor Hockey. The rate of membership from participants from outside St. Albert is 50% for Raiders level hockey.

The Greater St. Albert Sports Academy is the sports academy for the St. Albert Catholic School Board. They have approximately 240 athletes in 7 hockey groups, 2 soccer groups, and 2 gymnastics/cheer/dance groups. They predominately use ice during the day, with 21 hours of use a week September to January, 18 hours a week January until March, and 12 hours a week March till April. The Academy has a participation rate of approximately 15% by non-St. Albert residents, but this is due to children from the surrounding communities being enrolled in the St. Albert Catholic School District.

The St. Albert Skating Club has approximately 630 members. The Club offers learn to skate programs for young children, as well as high level figure skating for older youths. The learn to skate programs the Club offers relatedly fill up and have a waiting list of approximately 15% year after year. The approximate membership breakdown of their higher level figuring skating is as follows: 20 senior skaters, 15 intermediate, 30 junior and 30 novice. The learn to skate programs the Club operates are used to finance the purchase of ice for the older skaters so they can develop as athletes. According to the professional athlete development standards recommended by Skate Canada, the Club is only meeting 55% of the ice time they should be for long term athletic development. Tournaments are regulated by Skate Canada so are out of control of the local Club. Approximately 4% of their membership is from outside of St. Albert.

Additional Infrastructure

All of the organizations stated they would have to go outside of St. Albert less often if additional infrastructure was built in the City. Their organizations would be able to offer more competitive and convenient times to players, which could help with player retention, as well as offering less arduous times to younger children such as 6AM on weekdays. As for the amount of additional ice time needed, members of St. Albert Minor Hockey rents approximately 1800 hours of ice a year, while St. Albert Skating Association stated an extra 10 hours a week would be sufficient. The organizations stated they would be willing to pay the market rate price for ice rental in St. Albert as opposed to the subsidized price, as it would save time on travel. Additional ice would increase the opportunity for professional athlete development for all organizations.

Model Assumptions

The organizations felt that the 25% trigger point was too late, because a facility would not be completed for 3 or 4 years after the model is triggered. With the organization stating they are already struggling with capacity, they expressed that the timeline would be difficult for them.

The issue of professional athlete development versus recreational play was raised, and a distinction between the two is needed when deciding how to define capacity. This is an issue that the community needs to give direction on, and the organizations are not in a position to decide this for themselves. Depending on the focus of the facility, whether it be tournament hosting, professional athletic development or recreational play, different measures of capacity exist and the definition and goals of that facility need to be clear.

3.9 Group Eight Results

Overview and Definition of Capacity

The St. Albert Roadrunners Triathlon Club runs two swim groups and a junior swim group year round with a total of 66 pool lane hours of use per week. The current combined capacity for these programs is approximately 71 members with a waiting list of 25 people. They have requested additional pool lanes but are unable to acquire more from the City. These waiting lists are not a recent occurrence and have existed for at least the last 10 years of the program. Alberta is almost at capacity for available weekends to hold triathlon events. The sport is on an upwards growth curve overall and becoming increasingly popular.

The St. Albert Canoe and Kayak Club only uses the pool over the winter and currently has a registration of 15 for their winter program. They use one lane which is currently at capacity, and also use the children's pool which they have free reign of after 8pm. There is currently not any growth in the sport, but they are planning a push to grow their organization through marketing activities in the future.

St. Albert Special Olympics has approximately 150 athletes, and is currently at capacity for pool use as they have been unable to get more pool time. They have a small wait list of approximately 12 for their entire organization, and the growth of their organization follows population growth.

Additional Infrastructure

Additional infrastructure would allow the Triathlon Club to eliminate their waiting list and grow their swim program. Canoe and Kayak would utilize additional lanes in the pool, but they have alternative ways of growing their sport. Their preferred type of additional infrastructure would be an outdoor mid-sized lake. Special Olympics would promote themselves more to grow their organization if they had the capacity to support it. The major limiting factor for them is not infrastructure, but volunteer support. Currently both the Triathlon Club and Special Olympics would utilize additional indoor track space, as the track at Servus Place is unavailable.

Model Assumptions

Due to triathlon's popularity and the Canoe and Kayak club's effort to grow their sport, population growth may not be the most accurate measure of capacity for both of these sports. On the other hand, population growth works well for Special Olympics as special needs demand follows closely with population. One point raised around pool use was that organizations who rent out pool space tend to use it at a higher density than the public. They can have 4 to 5 people per lane while public generally has 2, so the utilization of available space and benefit to residents of pool space by rental groups is potentially higher.

Funding

Special Olympics has received grants as a part of a legacy grant from the Special Olympic Games. The other two organizations are funded primarily through registration and their provincial bodies. If the opportunity arose to assist in capital funding of a facility, all groups would pursue grants and other avenues to provide assistance.

Tax increase

All three groups expressed they would be in favour of a property tax increase to build additional facilities, but were also in favour of paying rent to use said facilities.

3.10 Group Nine Results

Overview and Definition of Capacity

The St. Albert Physical Education Council organizes athletic events for local junior high and elementary students while promoting physical education and health in the schools. The Elementary and Junior High schools through the Council use the Fowler Athletic Park from May 1st to mid-June for a combination of school track days, district competition and zone competition days. Every weekday during this period is either booked by a school for their track day, or is used for a zone or district competition, with a total of 20 to 25 schools bookings dates. This leaves no days for rainouts, and no space for additional schools unless schools double up on a day. Currently no St. Albert schools are being turned away from using the track, and the high schools do not use the facility as they are part of an Edmonton group. Capacity for the track from the schools perspective is better defined by available bookable days, rather than number of participants. The largest booking would be the zone competitions, which have approximately 500 participants.

Additional Infrastructure

Parking around the current track facilities can be an issue, as parents and spectators parking can block the bus routes to the nearby schools. Storage for the Council is currently adequate, as they have a garage on site. The Fowler Athletic Park has a speed track which is a unique aspect of the facility, and would not need to be replicated in a new facility. If a new track was to be constructed, a 400m track would be suitable. Overall, the current facility is high quality and very suitable for meeting the Council's needs.

3.11 Summary

While the individual groups focused on specific facility types, there were overall themes and trends that emerged. These included:

- Approximately a quarter of organizations that participated in the focus groups had waiting lists of individuals who would like to participate in their organizations activities but were unable to due to a lack of capacity. The other three quarters of the organizations that participated where able to accommodate additional applicants by adding more teams or volunteers, where applicable, or were just not at capacity.
- Capacity is defined in different ways in different facilities (e.g. bookable ice time for arenas, bookable lanes for pools, etc.). Capacity as measured by population may work for some facilities, but not all, in the eyes of stakeholders.
- Capacity for an organization is more often limited by available volunteers then by the availability of facilities.
- Many organizations identified statistics available from provincial or national bodies that demonstrate trends in their organization, though a large majority of groups did not provide these additional statistics. Advance warning in future consultations may yield more or better supplementary data.
- Most organizations have a lack of knowledge regarding the research of capacity and utilization for their facility type, or such research does not exist.
- Almost all participants agreed that the model was a worthwhile concept, though most thought the treatment of different facilities in the same way would be difficult and may lack sophistication. Most participants thought the model needed to better accommodate the differences by facility type.
- Some participants agreed with the 25% trigger point, while others felt it should be different, though few participants offered alternatives.
- Almost all participants appreciated the opportunity to participate as a key stakeholder and agreed that further consultation is required as the model is refined or reviewed in the future.
- Most organizations did not access grants or work with funding sources outside of membership, but a few select organizations did have or could access funds to contribute to a capital project
- Almost all participants expressed they would be in favour of tax increases to build additional infrastructure, but approximately half expressed this opinion with the caveat that the major stakeholder or steward associated with that new facility should also be expected to contribute financially. The large majority felt a tax increase should only apply to capital costs for a new facility, and not operating costs.

Appendix A – Moderators' Guide

Hello, my name is Tracy With from Banister Research and Consulting. On behalf of the City of St. Albert, I would like to thank you for this opportunity to speak with you.

The purpose of the stakeholder discussions is to gather feedback regarding your organization's needs of current and new facilities in St. Albert to inform the New Facility Prioritization Model. Your perceptions and feedback are very important.

Explain Process:

- It is an informal discussion that will be about 1.5 hours in length.
- There are no "right" or "wrong" answers.
- You don't have to agree with others in the room – we want to know what you think.
- There is a recording to help complete the report, as we are conducting up to 10 discussion sessions with different stakeholder groups.

Ground Rules

- Please put your phone on silent;
- Respect each others' opinions;
- Everyone's opinion is valued; and
- Facilitator reserves the right to "direct traffic."

Introductions

Quickly go around the table/room to capture the following information:

- Which organization you are here on behalf of; and
 - How long you have been with your current organization.
-

Section 1: Overview of Model (20-25 minutes)

We're going to start today with an overview of the New Facility Priority Assessment Model, by Monique St. Louis, Director of "Build St. Albert"

Are there any additional questions for Monique regarding the model?

Referring to Questions 3 of the Survey that was sent out in advance of the meeting – Do you feel like you have a good understanding of how the Model works and how it will be applied to new future capital projects in the City of St. Albert? [Show of hands – yes/no] [If no, continue to seek clarity and/or answer any questions]

Section 2: Key Stakeholder Discussion Questions

1. Now, I'd like to spend a few minutes discussing your organization's – these questions as also in the survey that was sent out in advance of the meeting – feel free to refer to your copy if you like :
 - a. [Q.4] What is your perspective on the future needs and/or lifecycle of your organization's activities and participants, in terms of enrollment, changes in service offerings, expansion, etc. that would have an impact on future capital projects for the City of St. Albert (i.e. facility, space needs, etc.)?
[PROBES – Is enrollment and participation with your organization increasing, staying the same or decrease year over year? Do you have a waiting list to participate at this point in time? Are you adding or changes the programs and services that you offer?]
 - b. In your view, is the facility that you are here to represent at capacity? How do you define that?
 - c. [Q.5] How/would more infrastructure (i.e. facilities, space, etc.) impact your organization's participation rates?
[PROBES: number of participants, percentage of participants, etc.]
 - d. [Q.8] Are you aware of any additional industry specific metrics that should be included to better reflect future infrastructure needs for your organization that we haven't already covered? [i.e. provincial trends, national trends related to your organization's programs and/or activities, etc.?]
 - e. [Q.9] HANDOUT – Please refer to the handout – Looking at the Model Assumptions – do you agree with the scope identified for your infrastructure type? [Yes/No, show of hands][If no – please tell me why you disagree?]
 - f. If the City of St. Albert were to build a new facility as described in the summary document, is your organization able to forecast the utilization, etc. of the new facility? [YES/NO, show of hands] [What sources would you use and please provide any additional details or information]
 - g. Are you aware of other situations and/or have you been successful in receiving capital or operating funds for the infrastructure type your organization uses from sources other than the City of St. Albert? [These could include external grants, a portion of memberships or

- registrations collected towards a building or operational fund] [YES/NO] [If yes, provide details about source, amount etc.]
- h. Do you feel it is appropriate for the City of St. Albert to fund additional services/facilities [both capital and operating] through tax increases? [YES/NO, please explain your response]
 - i. Please describe the value to the community of St. Albert that is provided through the infrastructure type that your organization uses and/or operates. [Please provide any additional information, analytics and/or research to support your statement]
2. That is all of the questions that I have for today's discussion – do you have any additional comments or feedback that you would like to provide?
 3. Monique will describe how the input will be used, next steps for the project, and timelines.
 4. Would you like to submit your completed survey at this time, or would like some additional time to complete and submit it to our offices?
 - a. Submit now [ensure labelled with organization, name of respondent, date]
 - b. Submit later – please email it to Monique when it has been completed and we will ensure it is added to the population for this consultation. Please note that it is required by ___ to ensure that your input is reported to Council.

Thank you very much for your input and hard work. Your efforts are very much appreciated.

Appendix B – Stakeholder Questionnaire



NEW FACILITY PRIORITY ASSESSMENT MODEL



Community Engagement Plan: STAKEHOLDER/USER SESSION/SURVEY

The purpose of the stakeholder discussions is to gather feedback regarding your organization's needs of current and new facilities in St. Albert to inform the New Facility Prioritization Model. Please note that the deadline for submission of this survey is [By September 25 2015]. **Please bring this with you to your scheduled meeting for discussion.**

1] Name of Respondent/Organization:

2] Infrastructure Type: _____

3] After participating in the meeting to introduce the Model, do you feel like you have a good understanding how the Model works and how it will be applied to new future capital projects?

___ YES ___ NO

4] Please provide your perspective on the future needs and/or lifecycle of your organization's activities/participants, in terms of enrollment, changes in service offerings, expansion, etc. that would have an impact on future capital projects for the City of St. Albert (i.e. facility, space needs).

5] And, how would more infrastructure (i.e. facilities, space) impact your organization's participation rates?

6] This model assumes that the provision of service is 25% over capacity before triggering a new facility; it then builds in a three year planning/build cycle. This is done to ensure that there will be adequate absorption of the service to allow for operational viability.

Do you agree with these assumptions?

YES NO

If no, explain and provide an alternative provision of service level below:

7] After reviewing the information and analytics ***related only to the specific infrastructure your organization uses***, please indicate if the information contained in the documents referenced beside each indicator below is correct:

- Comparator City Data (Attachment 1: Comparator Cities Benchmark Research 08-30-15)

YES NO

If no, provide correct information for each one below:

- Primary Utilization/Capacity Indicator (Summary Document: Primary Utilization/Capacity Indicator Area – Page 1)

YES NO

If no, provide correct information for each one:



- Secondary Utilization/Capacity Indicator (Summary Document: Primary Utilization/Capacity Indicator Area – Page 1)

___ YES ___ NO

If no, provide correct information for each one below:

- 8] Are there additional industry specific metrics that should be included to better reflect future infrastructure needs (number of participants in your organization, waiting lists, anticipated organizational growth, etc)?
If there are others, please provide.

- 9] Please refer to the planned project scope (refer to the document titled “Summary Document: Land Requirements and Project Scope, Model Assumptions)

a. Do you agree with the scope identified for the infrastructure your organization uses?

___ YES ___ NO

If no, please explain why, and provide the project scope that you recommend.



b. If the City were to build a new facility as described in the project scope (refer to the document titled "Summary Document: Land Requirements and Project Scope, Model Assumptions),

Are you able to forecast the utilization, etc. of the new facility by your organization?

YES NO

If yes, please provide details below:

c. Please explain your sources for the information you provide.

10] Are you aware of other situations and/or have you been successful in receiving non-City capital or operating funding for the infrastructure type your organization uses?

(Ex: external grants, a portion of memberships/registrations collected toward a building/operational fund)?

YES NO

If yes please provide details below:

11] Do you feel it is appropriate for City of St. Albert to fund additional services/facilities (both capital and operating) through tax increases?

YES NO

If yes please provide details below:



12] Please articulate the value to the community that is provided through the infrastructure type that your organization uses and/or operates. Please provide any information, analytics or research that supports your statement.

13] Please provide any other comments or thoughts you have about the model.

For Further Information

Monique St. Louis
Director, Build St. Albert
City of St. Albert
780-459-1503
mstlouis@st-albert.net



Appendix C – New Facility Prioritization Assessment Model Presentation



New Facility Prioritization Model

An Introduction to the Model

September 1, 2015

Presented by:

Monique St. Louis
Director, Build St. Albert
City Manager's Office



 stalbert.ca

 City of
St. Albert
Customize Life

Introduction to the Model

- The Model is a data based, and it relies on comparative analytics to produce outcomes
- It provides a framework to determine future needs of new municipal facilities based upon service level choice(s) and service categories
- It incorporates the entire bundle of community and public services to facilitate overall long term community planning

 stalbert.ca

2

 City of
St. Albert
Customize Life



Banister
Research & Consulting Inc.

Project Scope

- **In Scope**

- All existing city wide public and community service infrastructure (direct or indirectly operated)

- **Out of Scope (for this Model version)**

- Neighborhood infrastructure built on municipal reserve lands
- Utility service infrastructure
- Lifecycle and refurbishment projects
- Land for infrastructure
- New community demands as the City grows

Research

- Comparator cities provision of infrastructure
- Background and context of St. Albert's current level of service
- External market research regarding life cycle and trending of community services
- The impacts and future need of infrastructure as the community grows

Model Assumptions

- The current provision of infrastructure is at capacity
- The trigger to begin planning is 25% over service level
- The model triggers one new facility per year and if multiple facilities are required to “catch up”, the model will predict one new building/year until “caught up”
- the comparator communities are meeting the needs of their residents in terms of infrastructure
- The model uses the 2014, Population Forecast (base)

“the relative frequency with which an event occurs in repeated trials will converge to a stable value over time as the number of samples increases”

Bernoulli's law

Model Constraints

- Does not comment on quality of service provided
- Does not factor in utilization or capacity into the forecast
- focuses on the number and size of existing infrastructure
- does not comment on potential new community needs as the City grows

Model Methodology

- Establishes the current provision of St. Albert infrastructure service (baseline)
- Determines service category
- Provides context and service delivery approach
- Calculates service level triggers and predictions
- Builds in a three year planning cycle

Model Uses and Adaptability

- The power of the model is that a consistent methodology is consistently applied across all infrastructure types
- The results can be adjusted to any service level or new service levels can be developed
- It can also be configured to consider other inputs, such as forecasted demographic shifts or adding a new infrastructure type into the model

NFPM Mechanics: Ex Fire Stations

- **Start:** read in locations, other data
- **Calculations:** current fire stations required: # residents / fire stations per resident
- Ex: at population of 68,480 (2019);

$$FH(req) = \frac{68,480}{21,085} = 3.25, \text{ therefore start planning}$$



What Now ?

- Council has directed Administration to implement a Community Engagement Plan with select audiences
 - Service providers
 - Major stakeholders
 - Casual users
 - Community at large

Purpose of Engagement

- Explain the model and seek validation/correction of inputs
- Gather additional industry metrics
- Determine if there are funding sources not yet explored for new capital/operating
- Gain perspective on future needs of the service and lifecycle of service/activity

What will the City do with the Data?

- Correct any incorrect data
- Incorporate all feedback into the research documents

- Present to updated Model to Council on October 13, in time for consideration of the 2016-2018 Capital Budget

Questions?



 stalbert.ca

13

 City of
St. Albert
Custom Life