



TIMELINE OF THE SPRUNG FACILITIES DECISION

Compiled and updated by Ian Chadwick

Contents

Introduction	3
2004:	4
2011:	4
2012:	6
2013:	17
2014:	18
Addendum 1: Questions to Marta Proctor and her responses re: the Central Park SC report:	19
Addendum 2: Draft media release Aug. 28, 2012:.....	23
Addendum: 3 Email from Coun. Kevin Lloyd to resident.....	25
Addendum 4: email from Dale West to minor hockey member	26
Addendum 5: Email from Brian Saunderson to supporters.....	27
Personal statement.....	27

Introduction

Our second big challenge was to deal with a long-term deficit in recreational facilities. Simply put, we hadn't had enough space or time to accommodate all the young hockey players, skaters and swimmers in our community for decades. Both kids and adults had to drive out of town every week to play hockey or participate in a swim meet.

What made this so pressing was that for the previous twenty years, residents and sports associations had been complaining about the problem to the councils of the day. Studies had been done, reports prepared, public meetings held, and proposals made, but no satisfactory solution the taxpayers could afford had been found in all that time. For many years, the community was divided between those who wanted new facilities and those who wanted the town to fund the YMCA's expansion.

The previous council was presented with yet another proposal in early 2012: a \$35 million project that most of us on council agreed was too expensive, and few at the table saw as a benefit to the town. It would have taken four to five years to complete, and when finished would have turned over the facility taxpayers had paid for to a private corporation. But we wanted to be the council that finally addressed the ongoing problem, that found a solution that didn't break the taxpayers' backs, and in a shorter time.

So again, we turned to staff for advice. We asked them to research an alternative: a fabric-covered structure. Most of us on council had seen images of these structures displayed at the annual municipal conferences we attended. Aside from a glossy brochure or photographs, we really didn't know much about them. But staff came back and said, sure, they could work, that they're as good as or even better than a standard building and would be operational in a year or so. Plus, we had the money from the sale of the Collus share so we wouldn't have to raise taxes to build them and we could legally and ethically sole-source them.

So, we said yes, let's do it. Let's be proactive and solve the problem. We had had public discussions, public presentations, and even protests in front of town hall. But the hockey teams and swimming club cheered when council made its decision.

Now I realize that this wasn't a popular decision with everyone. The supporters of the YMCA who wanted their facility rebuilt at taxpayer expense were angry. We received some nasty emails afterwards and protests were held in front of town hall. But politicians can't please everyone. Councils make decisions that not every resident agrees with. That's the nature of democracy.

Like with the sale of a share in Collus, council depended on the advice of and research done by staff. They assured us our choice was good, the structures sustainable, that the process was appropriate and the price affordable. But in the end, the choice was council's. Eight of nine members agreed.

And I think if you drive around town and look at those facilities today, if you go inside and see how they're made and how well they've stood up for the past five years, when you see them full of people enjoying the facility, you'll agree they're pretty nice.

When you examine this process, the presentations and the staff reports, the steps we took to come to this decision, and the media coverage from those years, I believe you'll also agree that we did everything openly and properly with this decision.

Although the events themselves are six and seven years old already, there are still people in the community who are angry about those decisions. The previous council had three years to request an inquiry, yet this was called for (with a 5-4 vote) just a few weeks before nominations opened for the municipal election. Doing it then was *clearly* politically motivated.

Subsequent comments in the media this year by Coun. Bob Madigan on The Peak FM, Mayor Brian Saunderson to the CBC, and former mayor Chris Carrier to CollingwoodToday.ca underscore the political machinations behind this inquiry.

2004:

Feb. 25, 2004: The recently-elected (sworn in Dec. 2003) Collingwood Council [overturned an earlier decision](#) of the previous council to construct a new \$28 million multi-use recreation centre containing an arena, soccer fields and therapeutic pool on the 10th line. The project had been the culmination of three years of planning, public meetings, reports and council debate. It was eligible for Super Build funding. The facility had been a hot topic in the previous (fall, 2003) municipal election. However, new councillors questioned costs, unreported expenses, infrastructure, etc.¹

2011:

March 28 2011: PRC director Marta Proctor and Tom Coone of the Simcoe-Muskoka YMCA made a [presentation to council](#) recommending a joint partnership between the town and YMCA to develop Central Park. Council approved creating a committee (later named Central Park Steering Committee) to **examine collaborative opportunities for building additional recreational facilities and explore funding opportunities**. Positions were advertised, and the committee members selected by staff.² Names were announced to council [May 2, 2011](#).³

May 2, 2011: Council [approved creating a steering committee](#) after receiving staff report PRC 2011-07. **Their mandate was to explore a “partnership” with the YMCA.**⁴

Parks, Recreation and Culture director, Marta Proctor and staff selected members for the volunteer committee, naming her former boss from Toronto, Claire Tucker-Reid and local real estate lawyer Brian Saunderson, to co-chair the committee.

Tucker-Reid was Manager Toronto PRC, until 2010 while Proctor was Recreation & Facility Supervisor (until 2002) and Program Manager (2003-07). When Proctor was on the Steering Committee for Town of Milton Activity Plan, Tucker-Reid was the consultant. Other members were added by her to the committee including Robert Armstrong, CEO of the local YMCA district (VP for YMCA Toronto while Tucker-Reid worked there, and who served with Tucker-Reid and Proctor on the Parks Recreation Ontario board), and former Collingwood mayor Terry Geddes, a representative of Ameresco, a company that builds and finances municipal facilities, and former Collingwood mayor.

The two council members appointed to the town’s PRC committee (Councillors Keith Hull and Dale West) declined to participate or attend the steering committee’s meetings (a bone of contention later). The minutes of the committee meetings were never shared with council. In her staff report, Proctor

¹ <http://www.collingwoodliving.com/plans-for-multi-use-facility-fall-apart/>

² http://www.collingwood.ca/files/March%2028_11%20Council%20Mnts.pdf

³ <http://www.collingwood.ca/node/4476>

⁴ <http://www.collingwood.ca/node/4476>

wrote, "All communication in terms of reports, outcomes and decision making will be coordinated through the Committee Chair. This Chair will report directly to designated Town and YMCA staff."

The original commitment for the committee as approved by council was limited to **four months only**. However, it would continue for almost another year.

June 27, 2011: [Council approved](#) received its first update from the Central Park Steering Committee and approved hiring an architect to develop concept drawings for the Central Park proposal. RFPs were sent out.⁵

Aug. 29, 2011: [Council approved](#) hiring WGD Architects to create a "...Central Park feasibility assessment and preliminary design" for \$26,490. Councillor Chadwick's motion to defer the awarding of the contract "... until the (Steering) Committee makes a presentation to Council" was defeated.⁶

Sept. 2, 2011: The Central Park Steering Committee was told by Rob Armstrong of the YMCA that it would **not be receiving any government funding**. It would therefore move ahead with planned renovations to its locker rooms and put the pool renovations on hold. This meant the proposed recplex pool would NOT be large enough to meet standards for hosting swim meets and competitions (25m, six lanes min) and would not have required space for audience seating (min 250). This information was not conveyed to council (see committee minutes). (This date may be a misreading of Sept. 2 instead of 7)

Sept. 7, 2011. At the meeting of the Central Park Steering Committee, the YMCA told committee members it would not be receiving any government funding for its pool upgrades and therefore the Y "...cannot delay moving forward with the renovation of the locker rooms and is planning on notifying the donors of the decision." [The minutes](#) also noted:

The budget for this aspect of the overall pool renovation project will be approximately 1.5 million with approximately 700,000 dollars coming from the pledges. The Committee believes that it is essential to allow WGD Architects Inc. the opportunity to provide their input with respect to the design of the pool, especially since the reconstruction of the pools is now on hold until other funding opportunities arise.⁷

Sept. 10, 2012: WGD Architects [submitted an invoice](#) to the town for \$22,600 (inc. HST) for an "arena feasibility study."⁸

Oct. 5, 2011: WGD Architects Inc. submitted an invoice to the town for design, reports, costing, meetings for a total of \$30,018.81 (inc. HST). A second invoice was submitted Nov. 4, 2011 for \$249.49.

Oct. 19, 2011: The town's PRC committee was frustrated over lack of communication from the Central Park Steering Committee and [demanded to be informed beforehand](#) of any presentations to council (p.59).⁹

⁵ <http://www.collingwood.ca/node/4651>

⁶ <http://www.collingwood.ca/node/4789>

⁷ <http://ianchadwick.com/blog/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Central-Park-notes-OCR.pdf>

⁸ *ibid*

⁹ http://www.collingwood.ca/files/Nov%2028_11%20Council%20Agenda%20Pkg.pdf

Nov. 2011: The Central Park Steering Committee was again informed the YMCA will **not be contributing any funds to the proposed multi-use recreational facility**, although they had committed to financial participation earlier. Council would not be informed of this until March, 2012.

Nov. 14, 2011: Council received [an update](#) from Marta Proctor, PRC director, about the Central Park Steering committee's progress. At no time in this presentation was the YMCA's change in financial commitment mentioned. However, she did include the estimated cost of the facility at \$34 million (p. 15 and p. 19).¹⁰

Nov. 27, 2011: Open house for the Central Park Steering Committee at which the initial plans are revealed to the public.

2012:

Jan. 30, 2012: In an update to the Central Park Steering Committee agenda, it noted that Rob Armstrong, CEO of the YMCA, was drafting a [memorandum of understanding](#)¹¹ to "*outline the working relationship between the Y and the Town with respect to governance and administration at the newly-constructed community centre and park.*"

Not only was council unaware of this document, but the municipality was not invited to draw up this document or participate in the Y's draft. A comment (later deleted) by Brian Saunderson "*recommended that he and Mr. Armstrong follow up on a separate basis to further revise the document.*" However, a draft memorandum for this purpose dated June 2011 has been provided to Coun. Lloyd, suggesting this was in progress much earlier.

In the committee's agenda package for the Jan. 30 meeting, there was a copy of a promotional brochure created by the YMCA of Simcoe/Muskoka that announced "*the YMCA is moving forward in coordination with the Town of Collingwood with the Phase II of construction... The final phase of construction will depend on the decision the town makes in March after the recommendations for central park are presented to council.*"

In another comment deleted from the final minutes, Saunderson noted that the KPMG presentation to examine recreational opportunities in the town noted, "*...Central Park is not the ideal partnership for that location.*"

The [meeting summary notes](#) also showed the committee intended to go past its original mandate of four months:

*The report recommendations will ask Council to approve the project in principle subject to funding. It is anticipated that we need more time to firm up the funding options and subsequent recommendation to Council; this could take until the end of March.*¹²

Feb. 8, 2012: Collingwood BIA chair Joe Saunders wrote a letter to council expressing concern that the proposed Central Park plan "*contemplates the decommissioning of the Eddie Bush Memorial Arena.*"

¹⁰ <http://www.collingwood.ca/node/4934>

¹¹ <http://ianchadwick.com/blog/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Central-Park-notes-OCR.pdf>

¹² <http://ianchadwick.com/blog/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Central-Park-notes-OCR.pdf>

And added *“The arena continues to be a major anchor for our downtown and the impact of its loss would be significant for our downtown business community.”*

March 5, 2012: The Central Park Steering Committee presents council and the public with [its final report¹³](#) for a proposed **\$35.3 million** (p.37) recreational facility, to be paid by taxpayers and handed over to the YMCA when built. In addition, **the town was expected to pay the YMCA’s operating deficit estimated at \$250,000-\$300,000 annually for a minimum five years** (p.44). There was no mention of any partnership as the committee’s mandate had required. The report noted incorrectly its assumption that, (p.4)

The research conducted by the Steering Committee supports the premise that the Town of Collingwood is currently unable to provide the necessary pool and arena facilities and programs needed to meet the recreation needs of the community. This gap in service provision will continue into the foreseeable future as the Town’s population increases.

It added (p.4.) that the Y would manage and operate the facilities without the town’s involvement or oversight, but even though taxpayers were expected to pay for the facility, the report made no mention of working within town policies or protocols, established membership or admission fees, or established policies for working with local recreational associations:

...it is the Committee’s recommendation that Council initiate the development of a service provision agreement between the Town and YMCA that will cover the operating, management, and services provided at the proposed multi-use recreation facility.

Staff report PRC 2012-05 noted, *“The attached Central Park Redevelopment Project Report concludes the work of the Steering Committee.”* It recommended approving a *“funding strategy”* and for the town to *“develop timelines for all other recommendations as outlined in the ... final report.”* In other words, to rubber stamp the report and start financing the handout.

The *“funding strategy”* (4.1, p.46) consisted of:

Thoroughly examining and identifying realistic options from all available sources will be a primary goal to inform next steps and define the project work plan and timetables.

In other words: there was no concrete proposal for funding provided or even considered by the committee, and any pretense of a *“partnership”* had long been abandoned. The proposal did *not* include costing for several necessary items, including cost to provide new refrigeration unit for the relocated outdoor ice pad, cost for projection equipment for the proposed outdoor theatre, cost for seating and staffing of same, or licensing fees for movies, cost of street upgrades to handle increased traffic, revised stormwater management for site, etc.

March 19, 2012: Council approved *“in principle”* the recommendations of the Central Park Steering Committee report, but asked staff to first *“...develop actions and timelines for all other recommendations as outlined in the Steering Committee final report to be presented within 6 months.”*

13

http://www.collingwood.ca/files/Central%20Park%20Redevelopment%20Project_FINAL%20REPORT%20March%2005%202012.pdf

BIA chair Joe Saunders sent a second letter to the town with the BIA's concerns that the Central Park project "*contemplates the decommissioning of the Eddie Bush Memorial Arena.*" The two BIA letters were again presented to council for its Aug. 27, 2012, meeting.

Mar. 23, 2012: Patrick Mills emailed Brian Saunderson and asked to meet with him and Brian Iggulden of Sprung, and to buy Saunderson lunch. Mills told Saunderson, "*I am very excited about Sprung and believe Sprung building will be a great match for your project.*" He also sent Saunderson considerable material and details about Sprung structures.

March 27, 2012: Pat Mills emailed Brian Saunderson asking again to meet to discuss the rec facilities "*...The intent will be to listen to preliminary needs... I understand that we are at the very early stages but the project seems to fit Sprung's ability to deliver based on 12,000 buildings built in 95 countries. We can built long lasting, functional and aesthetically pleasing buildings that will save you money and time. The more detail the better!*" Brian Saunderson emailed Clair Tucker-Reid and Marta Proctor saying he had a "*...call from an old high school teacher - Turns out he now is a front man for a Canadian company, Sprung that builds arenas and rec centres (Anyone else have a sense of deja vu?). Seems he has heard about the Central Park Steering Committee, saw my name and thought he would give me a call to catch up. Now he is anxious to meet and discuss the project.*"

Saunderson cavalierly dismissed the Sprung structures with a response that showed he clearly did not understand their construction, saying to Tucker-Reid, "*I had a look at some of the info he sent me and don't believe these "tent-type" buildings would be a good fit.*"

Saunderson responded to Mills suggesting he check the committee's website and "*The Steering Committee's final report is available on the blogspot which will give you an in depth look at the process and the recommendations the Town is pursuing.*" None of this correspondence was shared with council.

Apr. 13, 2012: Patrick Mills, representative of Sprung Structures, [dropped by town hall unannounced](#)¹⁴ to see newly-appointed Acting CAO, Ed Houghton, Houghton wasn't there. On **Apr. 16**, Mills sent Houghton an email introducing himself and his company and asking for a meeting. They met but Houghton later suggested Mills meet with the Central Park development team to offer them the alternative structures.

May 3, 2012: Patrick Mills of Sprung wrote to Acting CAO Houghton saying he had toured the potential sites (on his own initiative) and said again he wanted to meet with the Central Park development team, adding, "*Our team would welcome an opportunity to present.*"

June, 2012 (letter undated): Rob Armstrong, CEO YMCA of Simcoe/Muskoka, [wrote to Acting CAO Houghton](#) advising the town that the Y's funding application had been denied:

In the spring of 2012 the YMCA of Simcoe/Muskoka received word that its application for 3 million dollars of funding from Accessibility Ontario was denied. Effectively this money, combined with the Town's commitment of 1.5 million was the funding formulae for an expanded pool for the community.¹⁵

¹⁴ <http://ianchadwick.com/blog/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/2012-staff-emails-OCR.pdf>

¹⁵ <http://ianchadwick.com/blog/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Central-Park-notes-OCR.pdf>

However, this was previously noted in the **Sept. 7, 2011** minutes of the Central Park Steering Committee meeting, but council was never informed at that time. This effectively dissolved the mandated “partnership” and turned the subsequent proposal into a handout from tax dollars.

June 11, 2012: [Council held an open discussion](#) titled “Central Park Strategic Planning Session,” which also discussed the town’s recreational needs and available options, which were presented in a 10-page report. One of the bullet points in the agenda noted, “\$35M is too much / \$35M is needed to provide needed service.” Another asked, “Should funds be given to the YMCA”? At this meeting, a brochure from Sprung Structures was circulated by the Deputy Mayor. In the next few days, there was email correspondence asking for a quotation from Sprung.¹⁶

The options for alternate strategies (p.10) and facilities offered 10 selectable choices for council to discuss and vote on. Only numbers 1 (Construct a Single Pad Arena, that could be phased into a double pad) and 8 (Enclose the Outdoor Pool with a Fabric Building) were approved by council, with instructions to staff to bring back a report no later than Aug. 27. To be clear: these were COUNCIL discussions, and choices, not staff’s.

June 12, 2012: Deputy Mayor Lloyd, who had returned from the FCM convention in Saskatoon (June 1-4) where he had seen the Sprung display, [sent an email](#) to the Executive Management Team, PRC Director Proctor and cc’ed to council asking for staff to research:

a price for a building that would enclose the complete Centennial Pool. A building structure that I would be interested in is the building produced by Sprung Building Products.¹⁷

June 13, 2012: Pat Mills, of Sprung Structures, [emailed Acting CAO Houghton](#) to “...set up a meeting with the Central Park Redevelopment team.” In his letter he wrote,

It is understood that discussions are still ongoing. Although the final decision\ direction has not been determined it seems appropriate to find out how Sprung Buildings might be a "Better Way to Build." Our hockey arenas are endorsed by Hockey Canada and we have constructed 12,000 buildings in 95 countries. Budget will be a key consideration and it will be wonderful if your community will be able to build a fabulous facility and still come in under the initial budget. We will be able to help!¹⁸

In his response, Houghton emailed back:

I have been asked by a member of Council to get a "rough" estimate for the installation of two fabric buildings. Can we discuss this?

June 14, 2012: Deputy Mayor Lloyd sent an email to Acting CAO Houghton, and copied to all councillors, the Executive Management Team (EMT) and Marta Proctor, asking for, “...a price for a building that would enclose the complete Centennial Pool. A building structure that I would be interested in is the building produced by Sprung Building Products. I know that they have representatives in Ontario and they would come and price a structure. As well would recommend to get a price as well for one of their

¹⁶ <http://www.collingwood.ca/node/5723>

¹⁷ <http://ianchadwick.com/blog/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Aug-2012-emails2-OCR.pdf>

¹⁸ <http://ianchadwick.com/blog/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/2012-staff-emails-OCR.pdf>

structures to cover the Outdoor Rink.” Coun. Keith Hull responded by providing the website address for Sprung.

Proctor replied, “We’ve done some preliminary work in this area for the ice rink, their [sic] are some limitations. Will expand for the pool and I’ll provide you with an update once we’ve compiled the info.” She also wrote to Dennis Seymour, a PRC facility manager, “Saw this one coming can you please confirm some approx pricing and what specifically it would/could include for both.” How she “saw it coming” was not explained.

June 19, 2012: Dennis Seymour met with Sprung representatives (and possibly other staff?)

June 29, 2012: A planned meeting between town staff and Sprung representatives was cancelled.

July 9, 2012: Dave McNalty, procurement manager, emailed David MacNeil at Sprung and asked, “Do you have any information that you can share with us yet on covering the outdoor ice surface and Centennial Pool in Collingwood?”

July 11, 2012: Mayor Sandra Cooper, Dep. Mayor Rick Lloyd, plus Dave McNalty, and Ed Houghton planned to meet with Tom Lloyd, David MacNeil and Pat Mills of Sprung to discuss their products. Meeting was again postponed.

July 12, 2012: The YMCA wrote the town (letter included in [the council consent agenda](#)) reiterating that the YMCA would **not be helping fund any Central Park redevelopment** and the **town would have to cover all the costs to expand the pool, plus pay the Y’s operating deficits of \$60,000-\$100,000 a year.** The CPS committee had known about this since at least the previous September, but not informed council until their final report in March, 2012.¹⁹

July 16, 2012: The Central Park Steering Committee made [another presentation to council](#), although they should have been disbanded since they no longer served their mandate. Penny Skelton, the chair of the PRC committee also made a presentation at the same meeting. She evidenced some concerns over conflicts between the PRC and CPS committees over authority:

Penny Skelton, Chair of the Parks, Recreation and Culture Advisory Committee addressed Council on behalf of the Committee to outline the role the committee has and continues to play with the maintenance and development of recreational facilities in Collingwood. The committee is concerned with the alternates being discussed as there are no operational or budget allocations attached to the discussion at this time and believe that Council needs to set a clear direction for recreation in Collingwood.

Brian Saunderson and Clair Tucker-Reid, Co-chairs of the former Phase 1 Steering Committee, addressed Council providing key messages, issues and next steps for Council to consider. Consideration of capital and operating costs was also a concern, requesting Council continue to pursue the recommendations of the Steering Committee.²⁰

¹⁹ http://www.collingwood.ca/files/Jul%2016_12%20CouncilAgendaPkg_r.pdf

²⁰ <http://www.collingwood.ca/node/5783>

Council discussed ten options for new rec facilities and approved a motion to ask staff to look at alternative (and less expensive) ideas for recreational facilities, including a fabric-covered building and a single-pad arena. Council passed resolution no. 330 directing staff to:

Pursue the following recommended options: enclose the outdoor pool with a fabric building; construct a single pad arena that could be phased into a double pad.

(Members of council attending both AMO and FCM annual conferences had seen Sprung structures advertised in the trade shows and brought back information and brochures about them for staff over the past several years. This year, Deputy Mayor Lloyd returned from FCM with a document from Sprung Structures and gave it to staff.)

July 27, 2012: After a meeting with town officials, [Dave MacNeil of Sprung emails Acting CAO Houghton](#) to thank him for meeting and send a link to online documents presented to town staff at the meeting.²¹

July 30, 2012: Council approved a motion (after staff report PRC2012-14) to apply for \$1 million Community Infrastructure Improvement Funds (CIIF) to **upgrade the Eddie Bush Memorial Arena**. This committed the town to keeping and enhancing the downtown arena, even though the Central Park proposal suggested closing it.

Aug. 7, 2012: Fabric-covered structures were discussed in the town's [department heads' meeting](#). Acting CAO Houghton advised the department heads that:

*Sprung buildings can attain equivalent to LEEDS 'Silver Standard' certification, but will not be certified as the process and attributed costs cannot be justified.*²²

Aug. 13, 2012: On the consent agenda were letters from Claire Tucker-Reid, Brian Saunderson and Rob Armstrong in support of their Central Park-YMCA proposal (the \$35 million handout and closing the Eddie Bush Arena) and opposing the standalone Sprung structures.

Aug. 18, 2012: Resident Ray Porter [sent an email to council](#) questioning the costs of the \$35 million Central park project. On **Aug. 20**, Councillor Chadwick responded, writing:

*I think you'll find little interest at council to spend \$35 million on a project when we have no money and at this point no private sector funding and no government funding.*²³

Aug. 21, 2012: Acting CAO Ed Houghton [sent an email](#) to the Executive Management Team about his recent conversations with Sprung and BLT, noting:

*I have asked for a price for the (wo buildings which would include the mezzanine in the arena but an option price for one in the pool. I have asked for a price for the non-building items that are the same for all applications such as zamboni, drop down score board, big screen tv's etc. I have then asked for a total turn key price for both buildings and the nonbuilding items.
I have no clue what the price is because I didn't want them to tell me until it is in the form we want.*

²¹ <http://ianchadwick.com/blog/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/2012-staff-emails-OCR.pdf>

²² <http://ianchadwick.com/blog/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Aug-2012-emails2-OCR.pdf>

²³ <http://ianchadwick.com/blog/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Aug-2012-Chadwick-email-OCR.pdf>

Finally, I have asked them to prepare a presentation for Monday night that will take place after the other delegations are complete.²⁴

Aug. 21, 2012: BLT provided [two estimates to the town](#), one for the new arena, one for Centennial Pool. The total for the pool is \$3,734,113.12 and for the arena \$ 7,896,303.82 (\$11,630,416.94 total).²⁵ Those estimates also included options for the pool such as a second floor mezzanine with stairs and elevator (these were not built), and the arena options included two Zambonis, scoreboard, hockey nets, but neither included servicing costs.

The subsequent staff report would estimate pool costs at \$3,225,000 plus \$200,000 servicing (\$3,425,000 total) and \$7,476,000 for the arena, plus “accessories such as Zamboni & Score Board” - \$ 316,000 and “site servicing allowance” - \$ 500,000 (\$8,292,000 total). The EMC report total (provided on Aug. 27) was \$11,717,000, a difference of \$86,583.06 more (approx. 0.74%).

August 24, 2012: Treasurer Marjory Leonard [sent an email](#) to the Executive Management Team stating sole sourcing was appropriate for this purchase:

In terms of our procurement process, staff have exercised due diligence in the research of potential forms of construction and feel that there would be no additional advantage to be gained from a further tender process for the following reasons: Element of competition was included in the gathering of estimates: the manufacturers of the Architectural Membrane structure knew that they were in competition with the more traditional forms of construction; WGD Architects knew that they were in competition with the Architectural Membrane structure when producing estimates.

Cost effectiveness and benefit to the Town: through the investigative process, it has been determined that the Architectural Membrane structure would provide the most cost effective and all inclusive solution to our needs.

Sole Source: again, through our research, it has been determined that there is only one supplier that can meet the specifications staff developed for the facilities.

If one of the more traditional forms of construction had been determined to provide the most cost effective solution there would have been a further need to issue an RFP for construction since there are many companies capable of providing this service.²⁶

That same day (**Aug. 24**), Acting CAO sent the EMT an email with this note:

I have been reviewing the Central Park Redevelopment Project Report and it states the following:

The permit fees and design fees are stated in the report at \$2,504,000.

The contract administration fees are estimated at \$1,878,000

The relocation of ball diamonds is stated in the report at \$1,200,000.

The land for the relocation of ball diamonds is estimated at \$800,000.

The project contingency is stated in the report at \$5,507,000.

The total is \$11,889,000. The total of what we are proposing is \$11,600,00. Almost

²⁴ <http://ianchadwick.com/blog/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Aug-2012-staff-emails-OCR.pdf>

²⁵ <http://ianchadwick.com/blog/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/BLT-estimate-OCR.pdf>

²⁶ <http://ianchadwick.com/blog/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Aug-2012-staff-emails-OCR.pdf>

\$300,000 less.

Wow!

Prior to the weekend, councillors received a package of information from staff on the Sprung structures in preparation for the upcoming Aug. 27 meeting.

Aug. 24, 2012: Robert Armstrong, CEO of the YMCA and member of the Central Park Steering Committee, [sent an email to committee members](#) as well as to all YMCA members and donors, recommending they **lobby councillors for a decision that favoured the YMCA proposal**. He called the Sprung structures “temporary facilities” and inaccurately described them as a “fabric bubble.” He also **recommended members join Saunderson’s “Friends of Central Park” lobbying group** and to attend the Aug. 27 council meeting.²⁷

In response, on Aug. 26, committee member [Don “Doc” Paul emailed Armstrong](#) and said Armstrong “made a number of statements which could be interpreted as misleading” and said Armstrong’s description of the structures as fabric bubbles was inaccurate and he could “only assume that you haven’t looked into them very closely.” Paul further accused the YMCA of lobbying former councils to kill a proposed recplex on the 10th line some years earlier (see earlier entries: at that time, Collingwood returned funding it had received for the facility to the province).²⁸

August 27, 2012: Frank Micelli, of Ameresco, made [a presentation to council](#) recommending the town use his company and their plans to build and finance a new recplex at Central Park. The CPS committee member, Terry Geddes, was working for Ameresco at the time, but this was not made public. A conceptual plan for this alternate version was presented by Mark Palmer, of Greenland Consulting. Both co-chairs of the CPS committee had letters in the consent agenda protesting, and demanding council not consider any alternatives other than their own plan.²⁹

Staff report [EMC-2012-01](#) (created by the Executive Management Committee) was presented to council with recommendations for a new arena and covering the arena and pool with a fabric structure (“insulated architectural membrane structure”) from Sprung Structures (from Alberta). In that staff report (p. 67), it noted:

*We are only aware of one (1) supplier of the type of Insulated Architectural Membrane structure that would allow for satisfactory year round swimming pool use. In the future, it would be possible to relocate or repurpose the Insulated Architectural Membrane structure at another location, adapt it to another use, or otherwise re-commission it to a new owner within this expanding market.*³⁰

That report also noted:

If the Community approves the use of funds as described then there is no tax implications to Collingwood residents. The Insulated Architectural Membrane structure may be delivered, constructed and operational, depending on permitting, approvals, weather conditions and staff utilization, within a four (4) to six (6) month time frame. The YMCA has recently

²⁷ <http://ianchadwick.com/blog/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Central-Park-notes-OCR.pdf>

²⁸ *ibid*

²⁹ <http://www.collingwood.ca/node/5792>

³⁰ http://www.collingwood.ca/files/Aug%2027_12CouncilAgendaPkg.pdf

stated that they are not currently in a financial position to proceed with another expansion to the existing facility in Collingwood. The procurement of an Insulated Fabric Membrane building to enclose the existing Outdoor Pool will meet the immediate aquatic needs of the community while still providing options for the future.

Acting CAO Ed Houghton [made the major presentation](#) in public about the structures, their safety, and their Canadian manufacture. Houghton's presentation handout noted:

The significant advantage, apart from the lower cost, of the membrane building is the time to construct. The estimated construction time is 22 weeks vs. typical construction is 64 to 72 weeks.³¹

His notes also included:

It would be difficult to build the 6 lane 25m pool complete with observation deck at the YMCA site when considering the requirements for parking (70 spaces)

He concluded:

Both proposals are "turnkey" - just add swimmers and skaters!

Houghton's report estimated a possible "\$250,000 annual net operating costs" for the pool and "\$90,000 - \$100,000 annual net operating costs" for the new arena. He also added that "*These costs are comparable to the operation of the former municipally-owned Contact Fitness Centre which also housed a public warm water therapy pool*" (the Centre was [closed in 2010](#) and the property sold to a private developer³²). And he also indicated:

Through research it was determined that there is only one supplier of this leading edge technology.

Following him, Treasurer Marjory Leonard (re the procurement process) and Sprung representative Tom Lloyd also made presentations.

The treasurer explained **publicly** these structures could be sole-sourced because they were **the only company in Canada to make these buildings** and discussed possible financing options. Houghton explained they were the only company in North America building similar structures **not to have suffered a collapse in the past 25 years**. The estimated cost of both structures was \$12 million.

Council voted 8-1 to build the new arena in Central Park covered with a fabric structure (Coun. Hull opposed because he favoured the YMCA proposal) and 8-1 to cover the pool with the same type of structure (Coun. Gardhouse opposed) (p.4 of the minutes). The motion initially read:

*THAT Council receive staff report EMC 2012-01,
AND FURTHER THAT Council direct staff to proceed with the purchase and construction of an Insulated Architectural Membrane facility for a year-round single pad ice arena at Central Park, maintaining 2 ball diamonds, the outdoor ice rink, the*

³¹ <http://ianchadwick.com/blog/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Aug-27-presentation-OCR.pdf>

³² <https://www.simcoe.com/news-story/2003453-public-lauds-new-development-proposal/>

lawn bowling facility, and additional green space - while keeping the option to twin the new arena at a future date;

AND FURTHER THAT Council direct staff to proceed with the purchase and construction of an Insulated Architectural Membrane structure over the existing Outdoor Pool including the removal and reconstruction of the existing building, in order to provide a year-round pool to meet the community's aquatic and competitive swimming needs.

Also, in the agenda package was a letter from BIA manager Sue Nicholson, along with copies of two previous letters from the BIA chair Joe Saunders, reiterating “...the importance of the Eddie Bush Memorial Arena as an anchor to the downtown and critical to the economic health of our downtown business community.”

After the decision, in a town-produced [information brochure](#), Mayor Cooper wrote:

This summer, council and staff assessed what might be possible: intense study, discussion and analysis took place for about 45 days. When all of the analysis was done, the current proposal was presented to council and approved as the best options for our community.³³

Aug. 30 (?) 2012: The town signed an agreement with BLT Construction, Ontario contractor for Sprung, to build the new arena and cover the existing pool. Later, council would add other options and upgrades to the plan.³⁴

Sept. 6, 2012: YMCA supporters, organized by Brian Saunderson, calling themselves “The Friends of the Central Park” [staged a protest in front of town hall](#), expressing their displeasure over council’s decision to go forward with the Sprung buildings instead of the more expensive Central Park proposal. They would go on to criticize council on social media and prominent members of the group would do so more virulently on their personal blogs. The Connection’s report on the protest also included comments of support for the decision from the Collingwood Clippers Swim Club:

*The Collingwood Clippers Swim Club showed their support for the Centennial Pool project.
"After a motion put forth to the Clipper Executive to support the town's decision to cover the outdoor pool, the majority of the Executive, on behalf of the general membership, voted in favour of supporting the town's decision to cover the outdoor pool. This decision upholds our club's mission statement," wrote president Sharon McFarlane. "I am aware that this position is not reflective of all members, as Collingwood taxpayers, but this is the position of our club. The executive has considered this decision carefully and the majority of the executive feel that covering the outdoor pool is in the best interest of all our members."³⁵*

And support from the Collingwood Minor Hockey Association:

"Collingwood Minor Hockey Associations Board of Directors has decided to move forward and support town council's decision on improved recreational facilities in the

³³ http://www.collingwoodliving.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Rec-Facilities_newsletter_why-Sprung.pdf

³⁴ Date from OPP police affidavit, released by CBC.

³⁵ <https://www.simcoe.com/news-story/2042193-residents-protest-collingwood-council-decision/>

Town of Collingwood. The board feels this solution is a viable alternative and will finally solve the acute shortage of ice time in our community. At the same time we wish to thank the Central Park Steering Committee for all their tireless efforts and hard work."

The article also quoted Treasurer Marjory Leonard on the sole-sourcing:

Treasurer Marjory Leonard said the section 6.7 reads: "Circumstances may arise where competitive tendering is undesirable and proposed procurement excluded from the requirement to obtain competitive bids or where direct negotiations are appropriate. Provided that such measures are taken for avoiding competition, discrimination against any supplier or circumventing any requirement of this bylaw." Leonard said staff did a lot of research and came to the conclusion that Sprung is the only company with a patent on this type of structure.

"In this particular case, we looked at all of those other fabric buildings that are out there," Leonard. "A lot of the other ones were not insulated and a lot of them used a steel infrastructure. From all of the literature we reviewed, they (Sprung) were the only ones who could do it, that's why we opted to go with them."

Sept 10, 2012: In an article about the demonstration and the decision, the Collingwood Connection (author unattributed, retrieved from Simcoe.com) wrote:

Council chose to move ahead with the two location option instead of moving forward with the Central Park project, which had a price tag of \$35 million and would have been a partnership with the YMCA.

It's estimated that the operating costs for the two facilities would be about \$350,000 a year...

The Friends of the Central Park project has launched an online petition asking council to reconsider and take more time to make their decision... Jason Henry - who serves as President of Collingwood Minor Hockey - has launched a petition of his own supporting council's decision...

The Collingwood Clippers Swim Club showed their support for the Centennial Pool project. The CMHA board of directors also endorsed council's decision in a statement.

The article went on to describe the sole-sourcing:

Mayor Sandra Cooper said staff is allowed, through section 6.7 of its procurement bylaw, to sole-source projects. "We did follow our process," she said.

Treasurer Marjory Leonard said the section 6.7 reads: "Circumstances may arise where competitive tendering is undesirable and proposed procurement excluded from the requirement to obtain competitive bids or where direct negotiations are appropriate. Provided that such measures are taken for avoiding competition, discrimination against any supplier or circumventing any requirement of this bylaw." Leonard said staff did a lot of research and came to the conclusion that Sprung is the only company with a patent on this type of structure.

"In this particular case, we looked at all of those other fabric buildings that are out there," Leonard. "A lot of the other ones were not insulated and a lot of them used a steel infrastructure. From all of the literature we reviewed, they (Sprung) were the only ones who could do it, that's why we opted to go with them."

Cooper said council is not required to hold public meetings when making a decision on the facilities. She said it's similar to the \$5 million fire hall - council did not hold a public meeting prior to making that decision.

Oct. 15, 2012: Council [approved upgrades](#) to the soon-to-be covered Centennial pool at Heritage Park, including \$550,000 for a warm-water/therapy pool.³⁶

Dec. 1, 2012 Council held [a public meeting](#) to get ideas and suggestions from ratepayers and local organizations about how to spend the remaining money received from the sale of the Collus share. It opened:

*Mayor Cooper welcomed those in attendance, introduced the Public Meeting format and explained that the purpose of the meeting was to seek input from the public with respect to the use and allocation of the COLLUS/PowerStream Strategic Partnership Funds. Mayor Cooper explained that the meeting was scheduled for Saturday to permit all residents and taxpayers the opportunity to provide input.*³⁷

2013:

Early 2013: Brian Saunderson created “Better Together Collingwood” group, with [websites](#)³⁸ and [Facebook](#)³⁹ pages, to criticize council’s decisions to go ahead with the Sprung structures, and to promote his agenda. Saunderson is listed as [the group’s only contact person](#)⁴⁰. He also set up a [Twitter account](#)⁴¹. The group conducted a campaign of criticism and complaint until the 2014 municipal election. No indication who paid for the website or other online activities.

Mar. 10, 2013: Local blogger Steve Berman (now on council), who worked for the YMCA, whose wife works for the YMCA, who is a close friend with Brian Saunderson, and who had been involved in similar pro-YMCA protests and campaigns with Saunderson to get council to vote for the Central Park project, planned another town-hall protest about the OPP investigation. He told [The Beach radio](#) he has “...offered police whatever help he can in providing research he's done for his blog and Freedom of Information requests he's filed on various matters involving Collingwood council.”⁴²

Apr. 8, 2013: PRC director Proctor presented council with [staff report PRC2013-08](#)⁴³ with an update on the condition of the Eddie Bush memorial Arena. In it she noted:

Over time, it has been clearly expressed that the arena has historical significance as well as a spectrum of current and potential economic impacts for downtown Collingwood... Staff have proposed a 3 year phase in plan for upgrades totaling approximately \$3 million.

³⁶ http://www.collingwood.ca/files/Oct%2015_12%20SP%20Council%20Mnts.pdf

³⁷ <http://www.collingwood.ca/node/6475>

³⁸ <https://bettertogethercollingwood.weebly.com/index.html>

³⁹ https://www.facebook.com/pg/bettertogethercollingwood/about/?ref=page_internal

⁴⁰ <https://bettertogethercollingwood.weebly.com/news--media>

⁴¹ <https://twitter.com/forcollingwood>

⁴² http://977thebeach.ca/news_item.php?NewsID=55341

⁴³ <http://ianchadwick.com/blog/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Central-Park-notes-OCR.pdf>

June 10, 2013: [The staff report T2013-04](#) was again presented to council, with updates and amendments for a vote. As reported in the local media (Enterprise Bulletin story, paper now defunct), Council decided to use a portion of the funds received to build its new recreational facilities, with the remaining portion to be used to upgrade and widen Hume Street.⁴⁴

June 10, 2013: [Council voted 8-1](#)⁴⁵ (Coun. Hull opposing) to use the funds to pay for the new recreational facilities (approx. \$9.8 M) and **voted 8-1** put the rest into a reserve to upgrade Hume Street (Coun. Edwards opposing). Discussions on options about how to use the money included [paying down town debt](#)⁴⁶.

Jun. 21, 2013: Brian Saunderson's special interest lobbying group, Better Together Collingwood, criticized the delayed opening of the new Centennial Pool, due to unforeseen circumstances. [On his website, Saunderson claimed](#), "...the fact the opening of the pool has been delayed a month or more demonstrates a lack of planning on the part of municipal officials." The site did note,

*Aside from the changes approved by council — last fall to add the therapeutic pool and in February to upgrade the existing tank — an additional \$93,000 has been spent handling 'unknowns' at both the pool and arena sites, which the contractor has cited as reasons for the delay in getting the two facilities open. Colder weather than anticipated this past winter also held up construction.*⁴⁷

August 26, 2013: Council voted to name the new pool as "Centennial Aquatic Centre". The naming of the new arena as "Central Park Arena" was deferred until Sept. 16, 2013, when it was passed.

August 27th, 2013. The newly finished Centennial Aquatic Centre was [officially opened](#).⁴⁸

October 17th, 2013. The newly finished Central Park Arena was [officially opened](#).⁴⁹

2014:

Feb. 3, 2014: Council received [staff report PRC2014-01](#) with an update on the "Sprung Shield" and other security options for the new facilities.⁵⁰

⁴⁴ http://www.collingwood.ca/files/June_10_13_CouncilAgendapkg.pdf

⁴⁵ http://www.collingwood.ca/files/June%2017_13_CouncilAgendaPkg.pdf

⁴⁶ <http://ianchadwick.com/blog/its-all-about-the-money/>

⁴⁷ <https://bettertogethercollingwood.weebly.com/news--media/june-21st-2013>

⁴⁸ <http://www.collingwoodliving.com/collingwood-centennial-aquatic-centre-opens/>

⁴⁹ <https://www.simcoe.com/news-story/4160534-new-arena-open/>

⁵⁰ http://www.collingwood.ca/files/Feb_3_2014CouncilAgendaPkg.pdf

Addendum 1: Questions to Marta Proctor and her responses re: the Central Park SC report:

From: Ian Chadwick

Sent: Monday, March 12, 2012 10:28 AM

To: Marta Proctor

Cc: .Town - Councillors; Kim Wingrove

Subject: Questions re: proposed Central Park development

Marta:

Here are some of the questions I would like to have answered at our next discussion about the proposed Central Park recreational facility. I don't expect any answers now, but would like to raise them during the public discussion:

1. Recommendation to "invest the necessary resources to complete the design development." Does this mean staff time, money, studies? What amount of each and what costs are involved? [This is part of the work to be developed and presented to Council within the next 6 months.](#)

2. Recommendation to "Commit the resources to determine community recreation program needs..." Same question: what costs, what staff time, etc. are required to determine these needs. [Response provided below as part of Question 3](#)

3. Same recommendation: "respond to service gaps." What sort of response and what costs, facility usage or staff time requirements are associated with this? Can you please define what is meant by "respond" and what it commits council and the town to doing? [As outlined in the report, the Steering Committee completed a comparative analysis of other communities in terms of infrastructure and as well how other departments operate. They matched what the community was asking for with recommended actions with respect to the proposed facility and also how the Parks, Recreation and Culture Department could best meet the recreational needs of the community. They found a gap which was also previously identified in the 2008 Leisure Services Master Plan and has since then, been partially addressed in the new structure of the Department. The committee wanted to make certain that the department is set up to better respond to the recreational needs of Collingwood in the future. Historically, no one organization or department was responsible for;](#)

- [identifying what the overall recreational needs are of the community](#)
- [ensuring that that there is a wide and varied choice of activities for everyone](#)

[The Steering Committee is recommending that the Town be responsible to ensure that there are sports, cultural and recreational activities for every age group and gender regardless of background or ability. Seeing as needs and demographics change, to be responsive, the Town must continually study trends and build community capacity to assist in offering a well rounded program. As an example, one of the comments was that there is no exclusive girl's hockey program; in other communities whatever ice time available is shared to ensure that both genders have equal opportunities to the facilities that are available. The Steering Committee feels that the following work falls under the Town's mandate and wants Councils approval to;](#)

a) [Develop a policy that highlights the benefits of recreation, that recreation is for all residents regardless of age, gender, ability and background and identify the Town's role in the delivery of recreation services](#)

- b) Complete an analysis of what exists for all age groups regardless of gender, backgrounds and abilities
- c) Create of a data base of all of the opportunities and promote these opportunities regardless if they are operated by private or not for profit operators. The responsibility to share the provision of programs and services is shared and should continue to be shared
- d) Determine the gaps and work with community organizations to offer these opportunities as a first line of response. If there is no capacity within the community, the Steering Committee is recommending that the Town addresses the gaps on an overall cost recovery basis (except for any needed equipment).

It is anticipated that at this time no additional resources or staff are required as there are staff resources allocated to address this kind of work under our new PRC structure. There may be additional resources spent in the future on programming service gaps or these gaps may be programmed on a cost recovery basis. This would be a decision brought to Council.

4. Re-purposing the Eddie Bush arena. I have seen some cost estimates for upgrades, but I have not seen any justification for not continuing to use the arena for skating or hockey, even if only on a seasonal basis. Can you please provide whatever documentation we have about that?
The rationale for repurposing Eddie Bush was outlined in the report based on financial benefits associated with operational efficiencies gained through the new facility as well as avoiding costs associated with renovations and regulatory upgrade requirements.
5. Can we still use the arena for ice in winter? Can we use it for indoor sports like soccer, lacrosse and tennis at other times? If so, what sort of costs would be involved in getting artificial turf, etc.?
These questions are outside the parameters of the steering committees work and may be considered in the next phase of work which would explore repurposing the facility.
6. Has anyone considered using the existing curling club for a smaller ice pad and moving the curling club to the Eddie Bush arena where it would have much more space?
No, a retrofit would need to occur at both ice surfaces and this would be extremely expensive and we would lose the benefits of combining uses at Central Park
7. Has the BIA been asked to contribute comments about the arena? Has there been an economic analysis of the impact of 're-purposing' or even closing the arena on the downtown?
There have been discussions with the BIA and they have expressed interest in being involved in studying future uses. The viability of alternate uses and an economic impact study on the downtown core should be included in the next phase.
8. If we close the current outdoor rink, will another facility or ice surfaces will be made available for pick up hockey games, open/free public skating? Are these centrally located or on our current transportation lines?
The report proposes that the relocation of an artificial ice surface be put on hold for future consideration in later year park development plans. The report further outlines that public skate times can be provided through the use of the new twin pad arena as well as expanding opportunities through the natural ice rink program.
9. Is the \$1.2 million the full cost to move the baseball diamonds AND purchase property if necessary? Or just relocation costs?
The report outlines projected amounts for relocation costs only.

10. Is the cost for the recommendation to “develop a plan for relocating the existing ball diamonds” included in the \$1.2 million or is that an additional cost? If so, how much will the plan cost to develop and what staff time, resources, etc. are needed?
The majority of resources will be staff time, however once a location is selected, there will be some costs associated with drawings as we do not have internal resources with these skills. These costs would be included in the projected ball diamond relocation budget.
11. What are the potential locations for new diamonds? If we have to buy property, what are the estimated costs for acquisition?
This is part of the work to be developed within the next 6 months and the options will be presented to Council for consideration. The options being explored are looking at town owned land and/or partnership opportunities, thus no projections for acquisition have been recommended.
12. If we partner with a school board for the diamonds, will we be able to protect the right of residents to use the space for non-scheduled/pick-up games?
Yes, that can be incorporated as part of an agreement.
13. What cost will be associated with partnering with a school? Will there be space rental costs? Who will pay for the equipment, upgrades, maintenance, etc.? Will the schools be able to schedule games/activities on those diamonds? Who will arbitrate if a school activity conflicts with a scheduled team activity?
These questions would be addressed in the next phase of work should this option be pursued. Typically there are no costs to partner with a school board other than legal fees to draft the agreement. A reciprocal agreement takes into account what each party brings to the table and determines who is responsible for capital costs, maintenance and facility booking procedures.
14. Is there an impact on our insurance if we use a school property for a ball diamond?
There are no additional insurance costs other than the standard coverage that the municipality and board has in place.
15. Will we be able to use ball diamonds on school grounds as alternate off-leash dog parks in the winter as we do with two existing ball diamonds?
These questions would be addressed in the next phase of work should this option be pursued. This may be difficult to accommodate as children would typically have access to the space during the winter months. There is a dog park included in the Central Park.
16. Will the new “dog park” in the proposed redesign be an off-leash park? If so, are the costs of fencing and gates included in the estimates?
These details have not been worked out at this point, however the projected furnishings and equipment budget includes an allocation for these types of costs.
17. Has Clearview Township been contacted re: the suggestion of using Nottawa schools for Collingwood’s ball diamonds? What was the response? What about other neighbouring municipalities – were they also contacted?
Preliminary discussions have occurred with staff from all neighbouring municipalities to include; Clearview, Town of Blue Mountains and Wasaga Beach. Initial responses have been positive about exploring current or future shared infrastructure uses. Further discussions on options will be part of the next phase of work.

18. What would an out-of-town facility do to our operating/maintenance costs? Liability issues? Insurance?

These issues would be discussed as part of developing a reciprocal agreement. The principle objective would be to mitigate operating costs for both parties. Regarding insurance, every municipality operates under the same regulatory and liability regime. In many instances our insurance is based on participation in a pool with other municipalities.

18. Given that the town has adopted an active transportation/walkability policy, how can we justify putting any ball diamond outside our transportation network, and outside reasonable bicycling/walking range?

Ball diamond options will be presented and the raised considerations can be discussed at that time.

19. If we partner with the Y in a capital fundraising program, will we later partner with other community organizations for their fundraising campaigns? To be fair to all of our community organizations, I would expect we would have to at least consider other such partnerships in future.

The steering committee report recommends a coordinated fundraising campaign that is inclusive and integrates the efforts of all stakeholder groups.

20. Can we see samples of similar joint fundraising contracts that have been made in other municipalities?

Examples of similar joint fundraising contracts can be collected and presented in the next phase of work.

22. If we enter into a joint fundraising agreement, who controls the money? What happens to the money if some future council or Y executive cancels the contract, or the project fails to develop? Does the town get to approve designs, etc. as part of the agreement?

The Town has worked with the YMCA from the outset as a partners and has included the thoughts and preferences of all stakeholder groups in its decision making. This approach will continue. An agreement will need to be established detailing what happens to funding that has been raised should the project fail to proceed.

23. Why does the proposal show the town paying the Y's projected operating deficit? Why are taxpayers expected to pay operating costs of a for-profit corporation?

According to the Y's own website (<http://www.ymca.ca/en/who-we-are/impact.aspx>) it has a LOT of money— more than \$30 million has been made available for financial assistance alone. Their 2010 financial statement (<http://www.canadasymca.ca/dollars.html>) shows more than \$2.6 million in cash and short-term investments, plus another \$15 million in long-term investments and receivables. The chart on page 43 also shows the local Y getting \$1.55-\$1.83 in revenue from this project over five years. Why is this operating deficit not part of the Y's contribution to the project?

The rationale for the proposed operational cost sharing is outlined in the report and based on an operating framework that expands municipal like program offerings in response to community identified interests. As such, the report outlines that the projected operating deficit is far less than should the municipality operate these facilities independently. It has also been demonstrated in other YMCA and Municipal partnerships, that there are realistic opportunities to avoid this deficit completely with a successful combined membership/pay as you go model.

24. If we pay the operating costs of one local recreational business, how can we argue against paying the operating costs for other similar businesses such as private exercise clubs and gyms? [The Town currently offsets costs to many groups by subsidizing the costs of facilities and operating costs. This would be an example of a similar Council approved circumstance in the form of an operating partnership agreement.](#)
25. Are there 400 or 500 seats proposed for the new arena? Are either of these sufficient for hosting tournaments and leagues? [The recommended scenario in the report proposes 500 seats in one arena and 150 bench seats in the second. Yes this is sufficient for hosting local tournaments and leagues.](#)
26. Will either of the new ice surfaces be available for other uses, as the Eddie Bush surface is? (i.e. concerts). [Yes](#)
27. If we spend \$5.46 million on the Y expansion, will this guarantee residents any right to use the pool without having to join the Y? [Yes, the report proposes developing a partnership agreement that will provide residents with expanded non member based program registration and drop in options typical of those found in most municipal facilities.](#)
28. Will residents be able to use the pool for the same costs as they pay for the outdoor pool? Will the Y pool be available for community (but non-member) events like swim meets, etc.? [Admission fees have not been determined at this point and the pool however, the intent of the partnership agreement will be to provide affordable access for a variety of community uses.](#)
29. Will the new ice surfaces run year round? If so, what does that mean to the curling club? Will it still be ice free from spring-winter and available for other uses (such as the Mother of All yard Sales)? [The report recommends that only one ice surface will be operationally year round, the other areas would be available for various uses in the off season.](#)
30. Two recommendations about the Y involve developing a plan and a joint agreement. Is there any cost or staff time involved in these developments? Are the costs included in the total project estimates or are they additional? If so, what are the costs, staff time, resources, etc.? [Staff are utilizing other agreements to inform the agreement and once drafted, will require review and revision by our solicitor. There are no additional staff costs anticipated.](#)

Thanks. I apologize if I am questioning something that's already in the report. I'll keep reading it and try to answer my own questions.

Cheers

Ian

(NB: as you can see, these questions and answers were all shared with the rest of council and with the former CAO, and as such were also available to anyone in the public who requested this document).

Addendum 2: Draft media release Aug. 28, 2012:

Tuesday, August 28, 2012

For Immediate Release

EXPANDED RECREATION FACILITIES APPROVED FOR COLLINGWOOD

Collingwood, ON – The construction of a new ice arena at Central Park and an enclosure over Centennial Pool were approved at the August 27th meeting of Town Council. The decision addresses two long-standing recreational needs of the community: expanded ice and aquatic facilities. The single-pad arena will be constructed from an insulated architectural membrane, with the option of being twinned in the future. Centennial Pool will be enclosed by a similar structure, allowing for year-round use of the 6-lane, 25m pool, plus deck space to accommodate 250 people.

This type of structure is cost-effective and energy efficient. It can be LEED Silver Certified, has lower greenhouse gas emissions, and is constructed in a fraction of the time of a pre-engineered steel building.

“These two very exciting projects will expand ice and aquatic programming in our town. Healthy, active lifestyles are imperative to the overall health and well-being of our community, and we feel that these expanded facilities can further this,” remarks Mayor Sandra Cooper. “Council listened to what our residents said were recreational priorities, and we responded.”

Community clubs and organizations eager for more time and space for their activities include the Collingwood Clippers Swim Club, Collingwood Skating Club, and Collingwood Minor Hockey. Collingwood Minor Hockey Association (CMHA) President, Jason Henry, notes that “Collingwood Minor Hockey Association is extremely pleased that council has voted to go forward and build a new rink at Central Park. This will enable CMHA to provide enhanced programs for our youth as early as next year, as well, service other user groups who wish to use ice in the Town of Collingwood.”

Clippers quote and Collingwood Skating Club quote here...

The Eddie Bush Memorial Arena is expected to maintain its operations while upgrades are being reviewed. Existing recreation uses at both Central Park and Heritage Park are not expected to be impacted. Municipal staff continues to work on the logistics of these projects and the timelines for completion. Further details will be issued as available throughout the process.

-30-

For more information, contact:

Mandy Long

Administrative Assistant, PRC Department

705-444-2500 x3236

mlong@collingwood.ca

Addendum: 3 Email from Coun. Kevin Lloyd to resident

From: Kevin Lloyd

Sent: Thursday, August 23, 2012 10:20 AM

To: '___'

Cc: Sandra Cooper; Ed Houghton; Sara Almas; Marjory Leonard; Larry Irwin; .Town – Councillors

Subject: RE: Concern regarding Central Park

Dear--_..

Thank you for your email.

First, let me assure you, nothing we are pursuing is li subpar li and quite frankly I am dismayed at the inference from a group who should know better than to disseminate inaccurate information to the public. The public has been waiting over two decades for ice and water. They have made it perfectly clear what the priorities are in numerous open sessions.

The steering committee most recently, once again, confirmed those priorities.

Here are the facts:

The steering committee provided a document that professionally delineated the priorities.

Central Park was identified as the right location.

The report gave us one recommendation at 35 million, with no alternative to weigh.

Council approved the report in "Principle".

The YMCA informed Council in June that they were not proceeding with our partnership in the 25 meter pool due to financing. We had in reserve 1.5 million for the project, as our commitment. Yet, they have proceeded with a 1.2 million dollar renovation right on the proposed location for the pool.

Council in a special meeting, openly discussed alternatives to the report. Phasing was discussed among other viable means to achieve the vision.

Working with Staff, alternatives were reviewed.

A report will be presented on Monday that enables us to proceed with the vision, constructing an affordable, high quality, state of the art (Silver Leeds) ice pad at Central Park. There is nothing substandard or temporary about the building.

We will retain the outdoor rink and two ball parks as many citizens have made clear, they want.

Central Park will be on its way to being a "community center". It will include a YMCA (with water), curling, 1.5 ice pads, lawn bowling and baseball.

Covering Heritage pool makes sense. A great deal of money has been spent on the pool in the last few years. It is 6 lanes and 25 meters. Again, a state-of-the-art enclosure, with sky lights, open doors to outdoor decking, new change rooms, decking with seating for approximately 200 to 250 spectators will by no means be, a "band aid".

The Eddie Bush will be upgraded. A concrete floor will be installed, change rooms, accessibility improved to transform it from ice in the winter to multi use in the offseason. Not only providing a second ice surface but helping to revitalize our downtown. Eddie Bush can seat up to 1200 people.

The public speaks to me and the other Councillors every day. I listen, they listen. We have a deep responsibility to the public, which I for one take very seriously. This issue has been a burning one for over twenty years and it's time to act.

On Monday night Staff is presenting a report that is affordable, viable, and attainable and I urge you to attend. The public has spoken and they want Ice and Water.

We are doing this "Right", with a budget one third the size, and it's turnkey. Alternative sources of funding are, and will be, vigorously sought after in order to offset costs.

..... everyone at Council and among Staff are "Friends Of Central Park", and for anyone to suggest otherwise is, quite frankly, insulting.

We appreciate all the hard work and dedication of the steering committee and are acted upon many of its recommendations, but, we also have to look at the overall picture and what we can and cannot do within the budget constraints of the real world.

I hope this helps clarify some doubts you may have as a result of the emails you are receiving.

Sometimes a little information is a bad thing.

Thank you again and please attend Monday, I would like to meet you and answer any further concerns you may have.

Sincerely,

Kevin

Addendum 4: email from Dale West to minor hockey member

From: Dale West dwest@collingwood.ca

Date: Wed, 22 Aug 2012 18:04:38

To

Subject: RE:

Hi Jay

Thanks

Its been a bit frustrating seeing comments like sub par and triple the operating costs being presented as fact by people trying to advance an agenda.

I think folks should make an attempt to be on hand Monday to see the "Sprung" idea that is being called "subpar" and a band aid etc without ever being seen.

I understand Ameresco is also going to make a presentation about their ideas.

I am actually concerned that we are closer to the 2003 conclusion as opposed to actually moving forward ...

The part of the campaign that says there is no urgency of course defies what everyone knows as an immediate concern.

I was going to get in touch with you and ask for a letter from minor hockey focussing on the "need" if it is going to take awhile to make the concept of the steering committee report a full reality, we do need to do something if you could write a letter focussing on the urgency it might help.

Dale West

Councillor

Town of Collingwood

dwest@collingwood.ca

Addendum 5: Email from Brian Saunderson to supporters

FYI Subject: FRIENDS OF CENTRAL PARK COLLINGWOOD - DO IT ONCE AND DO IT RIGHT!

A message from Brian Saunderson

Now is the time to get engaged in the process if you are concerned about the current state of recreation facilities in Collingwood. The Town Council is currently looking at alternatives to the central community recreation facility including covering the outdoor Centennial Pool (a 45 year old pool) for year round use and competing with the YMCA as a service provider. The estimated capital costs are between \$10 and \$15 million or essentially 1/3 to 1/2 the capital costs of the Central Park project Council claims is too expensive. More importantly, the operating costs will be approximately \$1 million annually which is over 4 times the projected operating costs for the Central Park project and 3 times the current operating costs for the Eddie Bush and outdoor rink. Council may be voting to proceed with these alternative measures as early as August 27.

Now is the time to get involved and let Council know where you stand.

Brian

DO IT ONCE AND DO IT RIGHT!

Personal statement

At no time during either process for the sale of the share of Collus or the decision to build the fabric (architectural membrane) structures was I lobbied by anyone on behalf of any company. I do not know of any member of council the Collus board or staff who was lobbied this way.

Although Tom Lloyd of Sprung has noted in his interview with police that he had conversations with several members of council and staff, including myself, it was after council had requested staff explore the possibility of using Sprung Structures, and thus likely after his public presentation to council in August (and after council's vote to move forward with fabric structures). I expect it was a telephone call solely to answer questions for clarification and information about a process already begun. If it happened, I do not recall any details of that conversation nor any effort by him to lobby me during that conversation.

Prior to the decision to use Sprung Structures, I and several other members of council had spoken with representatives of the company at various municipal conventions (AMO and FCM) and brought back literature from their displays for staff. I gave Peter Dunbar, former PRC director, such literature two or more years before council made its decision. I did not have and am not aware of anyone else having contacts with Sprung staff or their representatives outside these conventions.

Prior to the request for staff to explore fabric structures, I do not recall any discussions among councillors or staff about their use as municipal facilities in Collingwood and never heard the name Sprung used in any discussions about our recreational facilities. As far as I am aware, the request for a staff report on these structures was the first time the municipality seriously explored their use, and the first time anyone here contacted Sprung.

At no time during either process was I offered any benefit, money or position to vote any way. I am not aware of any member of staff or council being offered any benefit, money or position for either process, and do not believe any such offer was ever made or taken. I firmly believe in the integrity of all the members of former council and staff in this matter. We were, however, loudly and angrily pressured several times by YMCA supporters (at protests, in phone calls and via emails) to vote in favour of the YMCA-Central Park proposal, and the YMCA itself mounted a campaign among its members to lobby council.

I believe Acting CAO Ed Houghton did his best in trying to guide council and his team through the decision and fulfill council's request as fully and as accurately as possible.

During our term (2010-2014), councillors and staff did their utmost to provide open, accountable government in the service of the people of Collingwood. The decisions made were done in the best interests of the community, with the best information at hand and not for private or personal gain.

We collectively wanted to be decisive and proactive on pressing issues, and to be the first council to deal with a well-known and troublesome deficit in recreational facilities that had been the topic of studies, public meetings, community demands, user group presentations and reports for almost two decades. There was a general feeling at the table (expressed in public discussions and emails) that the proposed Central Park facility was too expensive or suffered from other issues (i.e. traffic, the heritage building, footprint, the eventual ownership). Some of us on council wanted to find an alternate, affordable solution quickly and not be yet another council that deferred the decision for a future council to deal with.

There have been concerns expressed over Mr. Bonwick's involvement (through Greenleaf) as a consultant for BLT, the Ontario representative and contractor for Sprung. At the time, I was unaware of his relationship with Greenleaf or even of Greenleaf's involvement. I am not aware of anyone on council who was aware of it, either. I do not know what they did, individually or corporately, how they were involved, when they became involved, or what they were paid to do, even after reading the OPP's affidavit.⁵¹ But it does not appear their involvement was either illegal or affected the final price.

Had I known Mr. Bonwick was involved, I would have declared a conflict of interest as I had done previously. I can only assume it was an oversight on Mr. Bonwick's part not to inform me; but even if he had the votes would have been 7-1 instead of 8-1 for the Sprung facilities. However I was the only member of council or staff who might have had a conflict according to the Municipal Conflict of Interest Act (the provincial law that defines conflicts in towns and cities).

It is not the normal process for either staff or council members to be involved with or even aware of subcontractors. That is the business of the contractor. Council does not and should not micromanage or politicize contractors. We as politicians did not know who was sub-contracted to remove the fill, to paint the change rooms, to supply the lockers or install the rubber flooring. Not should we. We approved a price for a finished, turnkey system.

All of council's processes, discussions and votes about the recreational facilities took place in the public. This is all documented in the timeline, above.

I supported our choices last term, I supported our decisions in both the Collus sale and the building of the Sprung structures. They were good decisions, made with the best information and open deliberation, for the benefit of the town. We are proud of what we accomplished for the greater good.

I believe this inquiry, like the OPP investigation before it, was politically motivated, intended as a springboard for some candidates' election campaigns, and to further personal agendas against individuals for making choices the instigators disapproved of. The timing of the motion to demand the inquiry underscores its political nature, as do subsequent comments in the media by Coun. Madigan, Mayor Saunderson and former mayor Carrier.

Attached: Analysis of various options for Collingwood's rec facilities including Sprung and Central park proposal, prepared by Dave McNalty.

⁵¹ <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/4517622-OPP-Anti-Rackets-Branch-Collingwood-Production.html>

Proposed Central Park Redevelopment Project Component(s) (as presented)	Initial Phase of Single Pad Arena, necessary park improvements with future option to combine into overall redevelopment concept	Standalone Single Pad Arena with potential to twin in the future, minimal park improvements, no automatic path to proposed concept	Upgrade of the Eddie Bush Memorial Arena (EMA) beyond ten (10) years and expand utilization
<p>Description</p> <p>Complete Community Recreation Centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Twin pad arena • New six lane 25m pool • Adapt existing pool for therapeutic and warm water programs • Curling club upgrades • Integrated common space • Family oriented park uses • Integration of Lawn bowling • Park and Site Development • Rec development of 5 ball diamonds 	<p>New year round Ice Arena in Central Park that may be phased into the broader concept. Options may include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First phase of proposed Recreation Centre • Fabric Membrane over a new Ice Arena (Sprung, or equivalent) • Either allowable structure over a new Ice Arena • Moderate spectator seating <p>The placement of the Ice Arena may enable retention of the existing outdoor arena pending further development</p> <p>Identify displaced amenities and costs associated with redevelopment</p> <p>Engineering costs may be delayed to some extent until future phases</p> <p>Park and Site development shall be on an as needed basis in conjunction with the various phases</p>	<p>New year round Ice Arena in Central Park that minimizes the disruption to the existing amenities. Options may include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fabric Membrane over a new Ice Arena (Sprung, or equivalent) • Other affordable structure over a new Ice Arena • Moderate spectator seating <p>The placement of a new Ice Arena would enable retention of the existing outdoor arena</p> <p>Alternatively, the existing outdoor arena may be covered to provide for year round use. Design would allow for dressing rooms, washrooms, etc. Options may include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fabric Membrane (Sprung, or equivalent) • Other affordable structure • Minimal spectator seating <p>Identify displaced amenities and costs associated with redevelopment</p> <p>Park and Site development shall be on an as needed basis minimizing displacement of existing amenities</p>	<p>Upgrade of the existing Eddie Bush Memorial Arena for continued use as a community Ice Area as well as improvements to encourage and develop alternative uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace dasher boards. • Dressing room and lobby ventilation system • Improve emergency egress • Upgrade refrigeration room • Replace chiller • Upgrade electrical distribution • Renew mechanical systems • Upgrade ammonia alarm system • Replace roof • Lighting replacements and improvements • Replace exterior doors and frames • Change room upgrades • New concrete floor • Washroom upgrades • Accessibility issues • Improvements to accommodate special events (concerts, trade shows...) • Upgrade seating • May require additional lands

Potential Implications/Benefits			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Displaced ball diamonds require new location Allows complete repurposing of the EBMA community priorities at one time, with a long-term strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides additional space to accommodate ice demand in a shorter time frame with less capital investment required Displaced ball diamonds require new location Does not address indoor pool requirement at this time Delays Curling Club upgrades Delays YMCA partnership Ensures the continuance of the EBMA as a winter Ice Arena Fabric Membrane structure may be repurposed in the future May increase operating costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides additional space to accommodate ice demand in a shorter time frame with less capital investment required Displaced ball diamonds require new location Does not address indoor pool requirement at this time Does not address Curling Club upgrades Fabric Membrane structure over a new Ice Arena or the existing outdoor arena may be repurposed in the future May increase operating costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extending economic life of the facility Improved access for persons with disabilities Improved energy efficiency Decreased operational or maintenance costs Increased staff and public safety for the facility Increases utilization of Central Park facility Improves facility use for regional tourism events