



NEW FACILITY PREDICTIVE ASSESSMENT MODEL



PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PLAN & MODEL OUTCOMES

Index

1]	Introduction.....	Page 2
2]	Community Engagement Plan Methodology.....	Page 3
3]	Results of Engagement Plan.....	Page 4
	- Operator/Service Provider Engagement Plan Responses	
	- Major Stakeholder Engagement Plan Responses	
	- Casual Participant On-Line Web Survey Responses	
	- General Population Telephone Survey Responses	
	- Composite of All Survey Mediums by Infrastructure Type Responses	
4]	Outcomes of Model	Page 32
5]	Final Conclusions.....	Page 35

Appendices:

- 1] Community Engagement Plan
- 2] New Facility Model Update – 2014 Population Figures
- 3] Summary of New Facility Predictive Model Recommendations
- 4] Capital Growth Projects within the Draft 2016-2025 Capital Plan Impacted by the New Facility Predictive Model
- 5] Major Stakeholders Focus Groups Report
- 6] Web-Based Casual Participant Survey Report
- 7] General Population Telephone Survey
- 8] Infrastructure Background Documents (Available upon request)

1] Introduction

The New Facility Predictive Assessment Model (the Model) is designed to be a long term planning instrument using detailed analytics to predict the future needs of community and public service infrastructure for the next 30 years.

The primary purpose of the Model is to predict the need for new infrastructure, as the community, and consequent population, grows. Administration prepared a foundation document that examined St. Albert's current provision of infrastructure, comparator cities infrastructure, trends in the various services, etc. as the foundation for this Model.

The Model is designed with three service levels. The baseline is to maintain current service levels. This service level, in essence, predicts when new infrastructure is required, to provide exactly the same provision of infrastructure, as the population grown. Average service level is another selection, this predicted level compares the City of St. Albert's provision of infrastructure against the typical comparator cities, and indicates the amount of new infrastructure that will be required, to provide and maintain the average service level. Leader in the provision of infrastructure is another selection, this examines the comparator cities, picks the highest proportion of infrastructure/capita, and predicts the amount and frequency of infrastructure is required to become and remain leader in the provision of infrastructure.

This Model has seen a staged presentation to Council:

January 2015 – the intent, methodology, assumptions, and background research were presented. Along with the Model introduction, four service level outcome maps were provided that identified the draft outcomes of the Model, to illustrate how the Model worked.

March 2015 – this presentation focuses on 10 year capital plan implications, Council also provided preliminary service level feedback, and Council also identified number of capital projects that required more detailed, specific discussion.

April 2015 - Council discussed the projects that were highlighted in March, and provided service level preferences for all of the infrastructure types. Council also approved the implementation of a Public Engagement Plan to gather community and participant feedback, validate the inputs, and test the assumptions of the Model.

2] Community Engagement Plan - Methodology

The Community Engagement Plan reached out to four distinct audiences: service providers, major stakeholders, casual participants, and the community at large. The Engagement Plan was implemented through a series of focus groups, and on-line survey, and a community telephone survey.

Civic Administration prepared the plan, and contracted Banister Research to assist with the Model Research in order to validate the assumptions of the Model and gather feedback from stakeholders regarding perceptions of new facility priorities.

The City conducted the following:

- **Operator/Service Provider Meetings.** Eight (8) focus group sessions were conducted with a total of thirty-one (n=31) operators or service providers of City-owned or operated facilities. Participants represented the entire range of public and community services provide by the City. The meetings were conducted between June 29th and September 29th, 2015.

, 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.

3] Results of the Community Engagement Plan

Operator/Service Provider Engagement Plan Responses:

An operator/service provider is defined as any organization/individual that is responsible for the daily operations and programming of a facility within the community, and owned by the City of St. Albert. This process did not distinguish between direct city service providers or indirect.

Eight (8) focus groups were conducted with 31 service providers. The purpose was:

- to explain how the model works
- to seek validation of the model inputs including comparators city data, new facility scope, and utilization and capacity of existing infrastructure
- To ensure accuracy/completeness of Information
- To gather any additional Industry specific metrics
- To obtain projected operational, utilization, etc. Impacts of a new facility
- To determine if there are any external or other funding sources available or possible to contribute (operating and/or capital)
- To gain perspective on the future needs of the service they provide and the lifecycle of the service
- To understand the impact and value of the service to the community

The approach was to coordinate introductory meetings, and then discuss the critical aspects of feedback requested, and then to request that a survey instrument be completed and returned for inclusion into the final results.

The service providers were grouped into the following categories:

Public Service Operators of infrastructure types:

- 1] Police detachments/office space
- 2] Fire stations
- 3] Public works facilities/garage
- 4] Snow storage facilities
- 5] Civic staff office space
- 6] Compost yard
- 7] Recycling stations
- 8] Major transit locations
- 9] Transit office and garage

Community Service Operators of infrastructure types:

- 10] Art galleries
- 11] City wide baseball parks
- 12] City wide rugby parks
- 13] City wide soccer parks
- 14] City wide tennis parks
- 15] Curling facilities
- 16] Heritage parks
- 17] Indoor ice surfaces
- 18] Field house/indoor sports fields
- 19] Indoor swimming pools/water parks
- 20] Libraries
- 21] Museums
- 22] Outdoor city wide artificial turf sports fields
- 23] Outdoor aquatic parks
- 24] Performing arts theatre
- 25] Outdoor special events grounds
- 26] Specialty bike parks
- 27] Track and field parks
- 28] bookable spaces
- 30] fitness centres
- 31] RV Parks
- 32] Botanic Parks
- 33] Arts/Cultural Studios

Eight facilitated focus groups were held between June 29 and September 29, and 31 organizations were represented, and 29 completed surveys were received.

The following is a summary of the aggregate responses; please note that Appendix 2 contains further details as well as the infrastructure specific administrative conclusions, Attachment 5 provides complete responses and is available upon request due the size.

The Operators were asked if they agree with the Metric

(metric = a measure of provision of infrastructure, ex. # of /1,000 population, or square feet/1,000 population)

Response: Public Services Operators/Service Providers

no = 5, yes = 2, no comment/unclear = 1

The majority of the public service operators did not agree with the metric, primarily because their provision of service is mandated by Council Policy and so that is the primary driver.

Response: Community Services Operators/Service Providers:

no comment/unclear = 16, no = 4, yes = 2

The majority of respondents had no comment on this metric, the respondent that did provided service specific explanations, please refer to attachment for infrastructure specific comments.

The Operators/Service Providers were asked if they agree with Utilization and Capacity indicators included:

Utilization = an empirical measure of the participation in a service, often described as overall attendance to a facility or program

capacity = an empirical measure of the participation in a service, often defined as % of prime time utilized, or fill rates for programs

Response: Public Services Operators/Service Providers

no = 8, yes = 0, no comment/unclear = 1

The majority of the public service operators did not agree with the metric, primarily because their provision of service is mandated by Council Policy and so they indicated that the capacity should be set at 100%.

Response: Community Services Operators/Service Providers

no comment/unclear = 14, no = 5, yes = 4

The majority of respondents had no comment on this metric; rather the majority focused on provide information and perspectives relative to their specific service. Those that did comment and state non support was because their view was that the capacity trigger should be between 75 – 100%.

Agree with Scope and Cost of New Infrastructure:

Scope = in this case, an overall order of magnitude definition of the predicted capital project

Cost = in this case, a D level cost projection

Response: Public Services Operators/Service Providers

no = 1, yes = 6, no comment/unclear = 2

The majority of the public service operators did agree with the scope and cost, and those that were unclear was because there was no scope definer.

Response: Community Services Operators/Service Providers

no comment/unclear = 17, no = 2, yes = 5

The majority of respondents had no comment on this metric; rather the majority focused on provide information and perspectives relative to their specific service.

Overall Observations of Operator Responses:

This was a difficult survey for the various operators to complete. They were very animated in discussing their particular service, but have not typically articulated the service they provide in the terms required from the survey. Please see infrastructure specific responses contained in Attachment 4.

Major Stakeholder Engagement Plan Responses:

The Major Stakeholders are defined as those who utilized a community service facility on a frequent basis (as defined by the infrastructure type) and who could not easily find another infrastructure type to utilize for their activity/purpose, if their typical selection is not available.

Nine (9) focus groups were conducted with 23 representatives of major stakeholders. The meetings were planned to gather participants who utilized the same facility, and then “catch all” meetings were scheduled to gather those who were not available to attend the infrastructure specific meetings.

The purpose was:

- to seek validation of the model inputs including comparators city data, new facility scope required for their continued participation, and utilization and capacity of existing infrastructure
- To ensure accuracy/completeness of Information
- To gather any additional Industry specific metrics
- To determine if there are any external or other funding sources available or possible to contribute (operating and/or capital)
- Their perspective on the future needs and the lifecycle of the service/sport they participate in
- How would more infrastructure impact their participation
- Impact/Value to the stakeholder group they represent
- View point on paying for additional service through tax increases (both capital and/or operating)

The following is a summary of the aggregate responses; please note that Appendix 2 contains further details as well as the infrastructure specific administrative conclusions, and Appendix 3 provides transcribes themes from the focus groups.

The Major Stakeholders were asked if they agree with Utilization and Capacity indicators included:

Utilization = an empirical measure of the participation in a service, often described as overall attendance to a facility or program

capacity = an empirical measure of the participation in a service, often defined as % of prime time utilized, or fill rates for programs

Response: Community Services Stakeholders

no = 4, yes = 5, no comment/unclear = 8

This question received responses that focused on the need of the organization the participant represented, so typically the conversation would be around the specific infrastructure needs and allocation of time for the organization.

Overall Observations of Stakeholder Responses:

The discussions focused around the infrastructure needs of the stakeholders, and the ability of the existing infrastructure to provide adequately for those needs. The activities that the infrastructure supports ha a broad range of sophistication when it comes to documenting requirement to quantify industry specific need to relate back to capacity is typically not possible.

Casual Participant On-Line Web Survey Responses:

One of the four audiences identified for inclusion in the evaluation of the Model was the casual participant, those users who are not part of a larger group, but that walk in to a facility to consume services.

Banister Research and Consulting Inc. was contracted to develop, host, and evaluate an on-line survey, with the intent to understand casual user reactions to a services of questions.

The survey was hosted on the Banister web server to ensure anonymity and the confidentiality of responses. Banister's web programmer created a composite drawing of the survey and site design. Home and landing pages were created, as well as a sectioned survey form. The City of St. Albert communicated the survey opportunity; respondents reported having become aware of the survey through the following:

- E-mail invitation – 34% (n=184);
- City of St. Albert Social media – 26% (n=137);
- Postcard/poster at a City facility – 20% (n=106);
- Online (e.g., City website) – 9% (n=49);
- Word of mouth – 7% (n=37);
- Newspaper – 4% (n=21);
- City employee - <1% (n=2); and
- Telephone survey - <1% (n=1).

The survey was available online from September 1st to September 20th, 2015, during which time, a total of 537 surveys were completed (multiple responses permitted):

- Resident of St. Albert or other nearby community – 90% (n=483);
- Major user of a community facility¹ – 39% (n=211);
- Casual user of a community facility² – 29% (n=155);
- Member of an organization that represents/advocates on behalf of community interests – 14% (n=77);
- Facility operator/service provider – 3% (n=18);
- Member of an organization that represents business and/or commercial interests – 2% (n=10); and

¹ A person or organization that relies primarily on and heavily utilizes the facility in discussion to participate in their activity

² A person or organization that occasionally uses the facility type discussed, but does not rely primarily on the facility or has other options available to participate in their activity

- Other (e.g., student) - <1% (n=1).

Those who participated in the survey reported living in St. Albert (84%); Edmonton (8%); Sturgeon County (6%); Morinville (1%); Parkland County (1%); Spruce Grove (<1%); and Lac Ste. Anne County (<1%).

Following are most relevant aggregate excerpts from the results of the on-line survey; please refer to Appendix 4 for the facility specific responses, and for the complete report.

3.1 Current Household Visitation and Use

- Younger respondents (most frequently those aged 18 to 34) were significantly more likely than older respondents to have used or visited the St. Albert Soccer Association; St. Albert Grain Elevator Park; and the Outdoor Aquatic Spray Park or Pool in the past year.
- Older respondents (at least 35 years of age or older) were significantly more likely to have used the Art Gallery; St. Albert Botanic Park; the Compost Depot; the Public Library; the Musee Heritage Museum; the Arden Theatre; and the Recycling Depot.
- Females were significantly more likely than males to have used or visited the Art Gallery; Art/Cultural Studios; the Musee Heritage Museum; and the Arden Theatre in the past year.
- Males were more likely to have used City-Wide Baseball Parks; the St. Albert Soccer Association; the Field Houses at Servus Place; the Riel Outdoor Artificial Field; the Kinsmen Fair Grounds; and the Recycling Depot.
- Those who have lived in St. Albert for 10 years or less were more likely than those who have lived in St. Albert for longer periods of time to have used or visited the following in the past year: the St. Albert Grain Elevator Park; and Indoor Ice Surfaces.
- Those who have lived in St. Albert for 11 years or more were more likely to have used: the Art Gallery; the Compost Depot; the Arden Theatre; and the Recycling Depot.
- Households with children were significantly more likely than households without children, or households with more than two (2) adults to have reported using sports/recreational facilities.

- Households without children or with more than two (2) adults were more likely to have used: the Art Gallery; Arts/Cultural Studios; the St. Albert Botanic Park; and the Public Library.
- Those with a post-graduate level of education were more likely to have used the Art Gallery; while those with a college level of education were more likely to have used the Indoor Ice Surfaces and Bike Parks.
- Those with lower household incomes in 2014 (i.e., less than \$75,000, before taxes) were more likely than those with higher household incomes to have reported using: the Art Gallery; Arts/Cultural Studios; St. Albert Botanic Park; and the Musee Heritage Museum
- Those with higher household incomes (at least \$75,000, pre-tax, in 2014) were more likely to use: Bookable Spaces; City-Wide Baseball Parks; the St. Albert Rugby Football Club; the Soccer Association; the Field Houses at Servus Place; the Servus Place Fitness Centre; Indoor Ice Surfaces; Indoor Swimming Pools/Water Parks; Outdoor Aquatic Spray Park/Pool; the Riel Outdoor Artificial Field; the Kinsmen Fair Grounds; the Arden Theatre; Bike Parks; and the Fowler Athletic Park.

3.4 Potential Usage with More Infrastructure

- Those who felt it was appropriate for the City to fund the construction of more service-oriented community service buildings through tax increases were significantly more likely than those who felt it was not appropriate have indicated they would use the Field Houses at Servus Place and the St. Albert Public Library more if more infrastructure was available.
- Those aged 18 to 64 were more likely than those aged 65 or older to have indicated they would use the St. Albert Public Library more if more infrastructures were available.
- Males were significantly more likely than females to have indicated they would use the Soccer Association more if more infrastructures were available.
- Those who frequently use City facilities (i.e., 100 times or more in the past year) were more likely than less-frequent facility users to have indicated they would use the Soccer Association; Indoor Swimming Pools/Water Parks; and the Recycling Depot if more infrastructures were available.
- Those with a post-graduate level of education were more likely than those with a college level of education to have indicated they would use the Recycling Depot more if more infrastructures were available.

- Those with a college level of education were more likely to have indicated they would use the Soccer Association more (versus those with a post-graduate level of education).
- Those who have lived in St. Albert for 10 years or less were more likely than those who have lived in St. Albert for 11 years or more to have indicated they would use the following more if more infrastructures were available: Servus Place Fitness Centre; Indoor Swimming Pools/Water Parks; and the Outdoor Aquatic Spray Park or Pool.

General Population Telephone Survey Responses

One of the four audiences identified for inclusion in the evaluation of the Model was the overall community. Banister Research and Consulting Inc. was contracted to develop, manage, and report on a telephone survey to measure community reaction to a series of questions.

A total of 400 randomly-selected respondents completed the telephone survey, providing a margin of error no greater than $\pm 4.9\%$ at the 95% confidence level, or 19 times out of 20.

Below are key findings of the General Population Telephone Survey, please refer to Attachment3 for the complete report.

Current Household Participation and Use

- Respondents or other members of their household used or visited City facilities an average of 74.7 times in the past 12 months, or approximately once every 5 days.
- When asked which facilities they, or members of their household had visited or used in the past 12 months (n=370), respondents most often reported the following:
 - St. Albert Recycling Depot – 84% have used or visited at least once in the past year);
 - Compost Depot – 74%;
 - St. Albert Public Library – 73%;
 - Indoor Swimming Pools or Water Parks – 65%;
 - Arden Theatre – 61%; and
 - St. Albert Botanic Park – 56%.
- Facilities that were visited or used at least once per month, on average, included:
 - The Servus Place Fitness Centre (n=176³) – 47.7 times in the past 12 months, on average;
 - Indoor Ice Surfaces (n=98) – 34.6 times;
 - St. Albert Public Library (n=273) – 26.1 times;
 - Bike Parks (n=42) – 25.9 times;
 - Indoor Swimming Pools/Water Parks (n=242) – 23.2 times;
 - City-Wide Baseball Parks (n=99) – 20.8 times;
 - St. Albert Soccer Association (n=83) – 20.4 times;
 - The Field Houses at Servus Place (n=131) – 18.4 times;
 - The St. Albert Tennis Club (n=34) – 12.7 times;

³ Base: Respondents who used this facility at least once in the past 12 months.

- Respondents who reported that they have **not** used a facility in the past year were asked if they would use it if it were available to them. More than one-third of those **who do not use** each of the following facilities would use them if more were available:
 - St. Albert Recycling Depot (n=86) – 63% of those who have not used it would, if it were available or if there were more available;
 - Arden Theatre (n=159) – 55%;
 - St. Albert Botanic Park (n=197) – 52%;
 - St. Albert Public Library (n=134) – 46%;
 - Compost Depot (n=121) – 42%;
 - The Art Gallery of St. Albert (n=315) – 40%;
 - Indoor Swimming Pools/Water Parks (n=164) – 36%;
 - Servus Place Fitness Centre (n=236) – 36%; and
 - Musee Heritage Museum (n=301) – 34%.

Barriers to Use

- Those who reported they did not visit or use each of the 25 St. Albert community service facilities in the past year were asked if there were any particular barriers preventing them or others from their household from using the facilities. The most common responses garnered from non-users of all 25 types of facilities included:
 - Too busy or lack of spare time (9% to 38%, depending on the facility);
 - Lack of interest or no need to visit or use the facility (2% to 24%);
 - Children are too young or not old enough to use the facility (2% to 14%);
 - Lack of information about the facility (e.g., events, location, hours of operation) (2% to 12%); and
 - Admission is too costly or user fees are too expensive (4% to 16%).

Most Important Facilities

- Respondents were asked to list up to 5 of what they considered to be the most important types of community service facilities for their household. Facilities that were most frequently in respondents' top 5 included:
 - St. Albert Public Library – 54% of respondents placed this in their top 5;
 - St. Albert Recycling Depot – 43%;
 - Indoor Swimming Pools/Water Parks – 40%;
 - Servus Place Fitness Centre – 40%;
 - Arden Theatre – 39%; and
 - The Compost Depot – 37%.

Potential Facility Usage

- In the next section of the survey, respondents who rated a facility type in their top 5 were asked if they would use that type of facility more than they do now, or about the same, if more of that type of infrastructure was available. More than half of the respondents who rated the following in their top 5 would use these facilities more if more infrastructure was available:
 - Bike Parks (n=20)⁴ – 74% of those who placed it in their top 5 would use it more if more infrastructure was available;
 - St. Albert Tennis Club (n=12)* – 64%; and
 - Indoor Ice Surfaces (n=62) – 52%.

Gaps in Facilities or Services

- When asked if they could identify any other types of facilities or services that are missing from St. Albert or that the City will need over the next 5 years, respondents most frequently suggested the following:
 - More programs or services for seniors, in general (4% of all respondents);
 - A movie theatre (4%);
 - More BMX or skateboard park facilities (4%); and
 - More skating rink facilities (unspecified) (4%).
- More than half of all respondents surveyed (58%) felt that no services were missing or that no new facilities will be needed in the next 5 years.

Level of Support for Tax Increases for Increased Service Levels

- When asked which facility types they would support tax increases for, respondents most often reported the following:
 - St. Albert Public Library – 63% of all respondents would pay additional tax dollars to support more or expanded infrastructure;
 - Arden Theatre – 51%;
 - Indoor Swimming Pools and Water Parks – 50%.
- Forty-six percent (46%) of the respondents felt it is appropriate for the City of St. Albert to fund the construction of more service-oriented community services buildings through tax increases, while 48% felt that it is not appropriate. Six percent (6%) were unsure or did not provide a response.

⁴ Use caution interpreting results when n<30 (*)

Composite of All Survey Mediums by Infrastructure Type Responses (for Community Service Infrastructure)

#10 Art Galleries

Research Mode	Avg. # visits Per Year	% Who Rated in Top 5*	Would you pay additional tax dollars for more infrastructure?
General Population (n=85)	2.87 times	21.5%	31.4% yes

46.0% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=21**) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Web/Stakeholder (n=172)	5.07 times	33.7%	33.1% yes
-------------------------	------------	-------	-----------

51.7% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=58) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Major Stakeholders

- No individual participants

Facility Operators

- Accessibility to the facility is a primary issue
- The Gallery does not have a collection
- The planned expansion is intended to be purpose built

#11 City Wide Baseball Parks

Research Mode	Avg. # visits Per Year	% Who Rated in Top 5	Would you pay additional tax dollars for more infrastructure?
General Population (n=97)	20.8 times	35.4%	37.3% yes

23.8% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=34) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Web/Stakeholder (n=125)	12.5 times	20.0%	24.8% yes
-------------------------	------------	-------	-----------

36.0% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=25*) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Major Stakeholders

- Capacity is defined by facility availability during prime time usage
- Fastball is currently not at capacity
- Slow Pitch is at capacity and has a waiting list

Facility Operators

- The sport of “Ball” is comprised of a number of disciplines, next park needs to consider the focus
- Men’s slo-pitch has reached capacity, Fast Ball is growing and is primarily female, next ball park could be a combination with two diamonds of mixed league, and fastball

#12 City Wide Rugby Parks

Research Mode	Avg. # visits Per Year	% Who Rated in Top 5	Would you pay additional tax dollars for more infrastructure?
General Population (n=58)	6.82 times	12.0%	27.2% yes
			13.4% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=8*) would use it more if more infrastructure were available
Web/Stakeholder (n=73)	7.89 times	17.8%	24.7% yes

15.4% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=13*) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Major Stakeholders

- No individual participants

Facility Operators

- N/C

#13 City Wide Soccer Parks

Research Mode	Avg. # visits Per Year	% Who Rated in Top 5	Would you pay additional tax dollars for more infrastructure?
General Population (n=83)	20.4 times	42.7%	36.8% yes

15.8% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=37) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Web/Stakeholder (n=245)	42.7 times	72.7%	63.7% yes
-------------------------	------------	-------	-----------

75.8% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=178) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Major Stakeholders

- Outdoor soccer is not at capacity, but the indoor program is over capacity
- Organizations felt that population growth is a suitable metric

Facility Operators

- Outdoor fields have capacity especially with the continued development of neighborhood fields to support programming, the emerging need is for indoor fields

#14 City Wide Tennis Parks

Research Mode	Avg. # visits Per Year	% Who Rated in Top 5	Would you pay additional tax dollars for more infrastructure?
General Population (n=27*)	12.7 times	28.9%	47.9% yes

72.0% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=9*) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Web/Stakeholder (n=32)	10.0 times	21.9%	28.1% yes
------------------------	------------	-------	-----------

71.4% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=7*) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Major Stakeholders

- No individual participants

Facility Operators

- The St. Albert Tennis Club is at capacity, suggest a phased approach to new infrastructure, require a four court block immediately, and then another in approximately 2020

#15 Curling Facilities

Research Mode	Avg. # visits Per Year	% Who Rated in Top 5	Would you pay additional tax dollars for more infrastructure?
General Population (n=65)	8.97 times	12.7%	28.0% yes
	0.0% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=11*) would use it more if more infrastructure were available		
Web/Stakeholder (n=87)	7.52 times	14.9%	14.9% yes
	30.8% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=13*) would use it more if more infrastructure were available		

Major Stakeholders

- No individual participants

Facility Operators

- N/C

#16 Heritage Parks

Research Mode	Avg. # visits Per Year	% Who Rated in Top 5	Would you pay additional tax dollars for more infrastructure?
General Population (n=149)	1.98 times	9.3%	49.2% yes
	41.0% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=17*) would use it more if more infrastructure were available		
Web/Stakeholder	3.22	15.9%	32.4% yes

(n=207) times

57.6% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=33) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Major Stakeholders

- No individual participants

Facility Operators

- Operator comments that the preservation and animation of the historic buildings is key, as well as the ability to host special events, which is consistent with destination facilities.

#17 Indoor Ice Surfaces

Research Mode	Avg. # visits Per Year	% Who Rated in Top 5	Would you pay additional tax dollars for more infrastructure?
General Population (n=103)	34.6 times	46.3%	57.1% yes
			54.0% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=45) would use it more if more infrastructure were available
Web/Stakeholder (n=198)	30.4 times	49.0%	53.0% yes

70.1% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=97) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Major Stakeholders

- Ice users are currently over capacity and have to procure ice time from outside the City
- Population growth works, generally, as metric, except for changes in “no-hit rules” for hockey
- Important to differentiate between professional athletic development versus regular practice time

Facility Operators

- The facilities are significantly over capacity in prime time months

#18 Field Houses/Indoor Sports Field

Research Mode	Avg. # visits Per Year	% Who Rated in Top 5	Would you pay additional tax dollars for more infrastructure?
General Population (n=142)	18.4 times	30.7%	39.1% yes

25.1% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=47) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Web/Stakeholder (n=278)	31.7 times	49.3%	48.6% yes
-------------------------	------------	-------	-----------

63.5% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=137) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Major Stakeholders

- No individual participants

Facility Operators

- The fields are at capacity in prime time, mid October to mid-March with soccer programs and summer sports

#19 Indoor Swimming Pools and Water Parks

Research Mode	Avg. # visits Per Year	% Who Rated in Top 5	Would you pay additional tax dollars for more infrastructure?
General Population (n=236)	23.2 times	58.2%	61.3% yes

38.5% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=147) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Web/Stakeholder (n=398)	26.4 times	72.9%	56.0% yes
-------------------------	------------	-------	-----------

51.4% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=290) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Major Stakeholders

- Organizations are currently at capacity and have waiting lists, and are unable to book more pool time
- Population growth is impacted as a metric by the popularity of the triathlon

Facility Operators

- Both Fountain Park and Landrex Water Play Park are reaching capacity
- The operator identified the north end as a location for the next pool...

#20 Libraries

Research Mode	Avg. # visits Per Year	% Who Rated in Top 5	Would you pay additional tax dollars for more infrastructure?
General Population (n=266)	26.1 times	68.0%	73.8% yes
	36.5% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=176) would use it more if more infrastructure were available		
Web/Stakeholder (n=404)	43.7 times	74.3%	68.6% yes

56.7% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=300) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Major Stakeholders

- No individual participants

Facility Operators

- Stated that they have been overcapacity since 2000, this is based upon 0.5 ft²/1,000 population, the ALA (1966) published a guideline of 0.6 ft²/1,000 population
- Noted collection size is another indicator...

#21 Museums

Research Mode	Avg. # visits Per Year	% Who Rated in Top 5	Would you pay additional tax dollars for more infrastructure?
General Population (n=99)	5.15 times	20.7%	58.9% yes

60.8% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=21*) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Web/Stakeholder (n=190)	6.61 times	16.8%	34.7% yes
-------------------------	------------	-------	-----------

56.2% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=32) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Major Stakeholders

- No individual participants

Facility Operators

- The collection is at risk due to substandard storage conditions

#22 Outdoor City Wide Sports Field

Research Mode	Avg. # visits Per Year	% Who Rated in Top 5	Would you pay additional tax dollars for more infrastructure?
General Population (n=49)	6.71 times	24.8%	56.1% yes

23.6% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=11*) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Web/Stakeholder (n=164)	13.4 times	32.9%	47.0% yes
-------------------------	------------	-------	-----------

70.4% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=54) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Major Stakeholders

- No individual participants

Facility Operators

- The operator noted that with the planned construction of the amenity building capacity will increase for events, and tournaments, as well as increase overall utilization

#23 Outdoor Aquatic Park

Research Mode	Avg. # visits Per Year	% Who Rated in Top 5	Would you pay additional tax dollars for more infrastructure?
General Population (n=142)	6.88 times	50.0%	63.5% yes
	37.7% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=71) would use it more if more infrastructure were available		
Web/Stakeholder (n=290)	6.97 times	34.1%	40.7% yes

49.5% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=99) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Major Stakeholders

- No individual participants

Facility Operators

- operator noted that the City is underserved in relation to outdoor aquatic parks

#24 Performing Arts Facilities

Research Mode	Avg. # visits Per Year	% Who Rated in Top 5	Would you pay additional tax dollars for more infrastructure?
General Population (n=241)	3.84 times	49.7%	60.9% yes

38.1% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=121) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Web/Stakeholder (n=323)	7.56 times	47.4%	41.2% yes
-------------------------	------------	-------	-----------

41.8% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=153) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Major Stakeholders

- Groups have difficulty booking the Arden for ideal times
- Population growth is a suitable metric, but City brand and citizen interests need to be accounted for

Facility Operators

- The Arden Theatre is a regional venue, and are not able to accommodate the varied requests for bookings that they receive

#25 Outdoor Special Event Ground

Research Mode	Avg. # visits Per Year	% Who Rated in Top 5	Would you pay additional tax dollars for more infrastructure?
General Population (n=123)	1.63 times	10.9%	16.0% yes

52.6% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=12*) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Web/Stakeholder (n=136)	2.44 times	4.4%	7.4% yes
-------------------------	------------	------	----------

16.7% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=6*) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Major Stakeholders

- No individual participants

Facility Operators

- The operator noted that they are pursuing other activities to animate the grounds more frequently

#26 Specialty Bike Parks

Research Mode	Avg. # visits Per Year	% Who Rated in Top 5	Would you pay additional tax dollars for more infrastructure?
General Population (n=45)	25.9 times	25.0%	60.3% yes
	82.6% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=10*) would use it more if more infrastructure were available		
Web/Stakeholder (n=125)	12.9 times	25.6%	37.6% yes

71.9% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=32) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Major Stakeholders

- Facilities are currently not at capacity
- Population growth is a suitable metric for measuring demand

Facility Operators

- This sport has a range of activities, with focused specialities in each of the City's parks
- There is not a capacity issue at this time, because of the introduction of the Bike Skills Park, planned for construction in 2016

#27 Track & Field Parks

Research Mode	Avg. # visits Per Year	% Who Rated in Top 5	Would you pay additional tax dollars for more infrastructure?
General Population (n=56)	10.6 times	15.1%	54.0% yes
20.4% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=8*) would use it more if more infrastructure were available			
Web/Stakeholder (n=148)	6.70 times	16.9%	27.7% yes

24.0% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=25*) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Major Stakeholders

- Schools are currently at capacity for use, other users are not
- Indoor training for track and field is over capacity
- Population growth is a suitable metric for demand

Facility Operators

- This facility has a short prime time season in the spring, there is capacity

#28 Bookable Spaces

Research Mode	Avg. # visits Per Year	% Who Rated in Top 5	Would you pay additional tax dollars for more infrastructure?
General Population (n=80)	4.80 times	11.3%	30.8% yes
0.0% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=7*) would use it more if more infrastructure were available			
Web/Stakeholder (n=124)	11.3 times	14.5%	23.4% yes

61.1% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=18*) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Major Stakeholders

- Organizations had difficulty finding suitable, affordable event space
- Overall, organizations were not at capacity
- Organizations felt that population growth was an appropriate metric

Facility Operators

- New spaces are typically built as part of a multipurpose/campus site of compatible services

#30 Fitness Centres

Research Mode	Avg. # visits Per Year	% Who Rated in Top 5	Would you pay additional tax dollars for more infrastructure?
General Population (n=164)	47.7 times	71.0%	53.1% yes
	36.0% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=113) would use it more if more infrastructure were available		
Web/Stakeholder (n=351)	44.4 times	57.3%	43.6% yes

59.2% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=201) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Major Stakeholders

- No individual participants

Facility Operators

- This is part of the Servus Place expansion plan, based upon significant feedback from participants and best practice analysis

#31 City Wide Garden and Amenities

Research Mode	Avg. # visits Per Year	% Who Rated in Top 5	Would you pay additional tax dollars for more infrastructure?
General Population (n=203)	5.77 times	38.1%	53.1% yes

27.9% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=74) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Web/Stakeholder (n=248)	8.22 times	32.3%	29.8% yes
-------------------------	------------	-------	-----------

38.7% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=80) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Major Stakeholders

- No individual participants

Facility Operators

- N/C

#32 Artist Studio Space

Research Mode	Avg. # visits Per Year	% Who Rated in Top 5	Would you pay additional tax dollars for more infrastructure?
General Population (n=59)	4.66 times	18.2%	29.4% yes

6.0% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=9*) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Web/Stakeholder (n=135)	10.2 times	25.2%	34.8% yes
-------------------------	------------	-------	-----------

61.8% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=34) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Major Stakeholders

- No individual participants

Facility Operators

- Waitlist for artist studios
- Unable to provide additional art making for other art disciplines

#33 Recreational Vehicle Parks

<i>Research Mode</i>	<i>Avg. # visits Per Year</i>	<i>% Who Rated in Top 5</i>	<i>Would you pay additional tax dollars for more infrastructure?</i>
General Population (n=21)	3.09 times	10.8%	26.2% yes
	0.0% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=3*) would use it more if more infrastructure were available		
Web/Stakeholder (n=26*)	17.0 times	11.5%	7.7% yes

33.3% of those who rated it in their top 5 (n=3*) would use it more if more infrastructure were available

Major Stakeholders

- No individual participants

Facility Operators

- This facility is fully utilized and successful

4. Outcomes of Model

This engagement process highlighted a major distinction between the infrastructure types, those that are public services, these are viewed as fundamental services that are essential to provide a healthy and safe City, from the community service facilities, which are those that enhance the quality of life for the citizens.

Because of this distinction, this report distinguishes between the two groups of infrastructure categories.

The first step in this process was to update the Model inputs to include the 2014 Municipal Affairs Population figures that became available in the late spring. This adjusted the outputs (see Appendix 2).

Then, in order to apply the responses and information received, Administration began with Councils service level preference chosen on April 29, 2015. Through the Engagement Process, if any of the target audiences provided tangible evidence to indicate that the infrastructure was over capacity, either in terms of utilization or ability to meet legislation, industry standards, or Council direction, the capacity was reset to the projected date that overcapacity was hit.

Applying this input, lead to the following list of infrastructure types that were identified as required to be adjusted.

Table #1 New Facility Predictive Model: Capacity Adjustments

	Validation Factors	Model Adjustment
Public Service Infrastructure Types		
1] Policing Services	C-PS-02, Long Term Dept. Plan	Capacity set to 100%, then set to operator solution
2] Fire Services	C-PS-01	Capacity set to 100%, then set to operator solution
3] Public works facilities/garage	C-IS-06, Long Term Dept. Plan	Capacity set to 100%, then set to operator solution
4] Snow storage facilities	C-IS-06, Long Term Dept. Plan	Capacity set to 100%, then set to operator solution
5] Civic staff office space	City of St. Albert Strategic Plan	Capacity set to 100%, then set to operator solution
6] Compost yard	C-IS-06, Long Term Dept. Plan	Capacity set to 100%, then set to operator solution
7] Recycling stations	C-IS-07, Long Term Dept. Plan	Capacity set to 100%, then set to operator solution
8] Major transit locations	C-TS-01, Long Term Department Plan	Capacity set to 100%, then set to operator solution

9] Transit office and garage	C-TS-01, Long Term Department Plan	Capacity set to 100%, then set to operator solution
17] Indoor ice surfaces	Significant overcapacity issues stated by the operator, and four major stakeholders. Significant purchases of ice time outside of the City	Capacity remains at 125% but reset to 2010, the year that the capacity trigger is predicted to have hit
21] Museums	The collection is at physical risk of damage due to substandard storage conditions, the space allocation is 40% of the average	Capacity remains at 125% but reset to 2010, the year that the capacity trigger is predicted to have hit

These adjustments have been made to the overall model, and the table below illustrate the impacts to the 2016-2025 Growth Projects that will be presented to Council later in October, as part of the 2016-2015 Budget Process.

**Table 2: New Facility Predictive Model:
Recommended Adjustments to the 2016-2025 Capital Plan**

Public Service Infrastructure		2016-2025 Capital Plan Impacts	Predicted Year	Predicted Cost
Police - TBD	Beaudry Place Retrofit	<i>New Project: this is phase 1, phase 2, projected to be \$2.5M is beyond this plan</i>	2024	\$2,550,000
COUN-021	New Civic Building	<i>Minor Adjustment: added 3 Year Planning Cycle, on hold pending internal study</i>	2022	\$50,300,000
FIRE-005	Fire Station #4	<i>Minor Adjustment: added 3 Year Planning Cycle</i>	2020	\$10,049,000
PW-018	PW Satellite Shop	<i>Minor Adjustment: moved to 2020</i>	2020	\$3,179,999
PW-016	PW Snow Storage	<i>No Change: on hold pending Badger future</i>	2019	\$4,050,000
TRAN-007	North Transit Centre Park & Ride	<i>No Change: Transit Locations, as planned</i>	2018	\$18,650,000
TRAN-024	Transit Garage Expansion	<i>No Change:</i>	2016, 2019-20	\$6,710,000
Sub-total				\$95,488,999

Community Service Infrastructure				
CULTR-002	La Banque d'Hochelaga	<i>Adjustment: moved from 2016 to 2028</i>	2028	\$0
CULTR-019	Museum Expansion	<i>Minor Adjustment: added 3 Year Planning Cycle</i>	2016	\$2,553,600
DARP-003	Civic Square - DARP	<i>Adjustment: moved from 2021 to 2029</i>	2029	\$0
DARP-004	Cultural and Market Buildings	<i>New Project: Artist Studio Space</i>	2021	\$5,369,152
OA-005	Community Branch Library	<i>Adjustment: moved to 2021, added 3 Year Planning Cycle, and adjusted project cost</i>	2021	\$7,220,575
RECR-037	Water Spray Park	<i>Adjustment: Outdoor Aquatics: moved from 2020 to 2016</i>	2016	\$3,733,340
RECR-TBD	Field House/Indoor Sports Field	<i>New Project</i>	2022	\$13,371,500
RECR-TBD	Indoor Pool/Water Park	<i>New Project</i>	2023	\$16,610,000
SERV-004	6th Arena Ice Surface	<i>Adjustment: moved from 2020 to 2018</i>	2018	\$19,535,400
SERV-007	Servus Place Expansion	<i>Removed</i>		\$0
RECR-TBD	City Wide Baseball Park	<i>New Project</i>	2022	\$3,723,057
RECR-TBD	City Wide Tennis Park	<i>New Project</i>	2024	1,622,029
Sub-total				\$73,738,653
TOTAL				\$169,227,652

Final Remarks

The results of the Community Engagement Plan and subsequent adjustment are contained within this plan.

This model predicts the need for new facilities as the community grows. This critical step of the project, the engagement with various audiences, was the validation piece; it tested the model design, challenged assumptions, and ultimately strengthened the Model.

The Administrative recommendations that have emerged from an analysis of all of the inputs, is the first step. If Council were to approve all of the recommendations contained within this report, the first year of the three year planning cycle, would need to confirm the need, analyze the program, ensure appropriately land is secured, servicing is in place. etc. When successfully completed, then the project moves into year two of the planning phase, design. When design is complete, then construction begins.

And, as stewards of public money, there are a number of checks and balances along the way, to ensure rigor in analysis and decision making.

This is the first public introduction of the Model. The plan for this model is that it will go through minor updates annually, and more significant calibrations every three years.