



CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT

Agenda - Final

Municipal Hall
1229 Esquimalt Road
Esquimalt, B.C. V9A 3P1

Special Committee of the Whole

Monday, March 25, 2019

7:00 PM

Esquimalt Council Chambers

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **LATE ITEMS**
3. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**
4. **PUBLIC INPUT (On items listed on the Agenda)**
Excluding items which are or have been the subject of a Public Hearing.
5. **STAFF REPORTS**

Parks and Recreation

- 1) [19-140](#) McLoughlin Amenity Funds - application of selection criteria and initial evaluation of identified projects, Staff Report P&R-19-005

Recommendation:

That the Committee of the Whole:

- (1) Receive Staff Report No. P&R-19-005 for information, provide any additional direction to staff as the COTW considers advisable, and direct staff to prepare a report for Council's consideration, and;
- (2) Direct staff to begin initial concept design plans, develop preliminary budgets, operational business cases and cost-benefit analysis for the top scoring projects.

Attachments: [MAF Selection Criteria](#)
[MAF Project Evaluation Results](#)

6. **PUBLIC QUESTION AND COMMENT PERIOD**
Excluding items which are or have been the subject of a Public Hearing.
Limit of two minutes per speaker.
7. **ADJOURNMENT**



CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT

Municipal Hall
1229 Esquimalt Road
Esquimalt, B.C. V9A 3P1

Staff Report

File #:19-140

REQUEST FOR DIRECTION

DATE: March 20, 2019

Report No. P&R-19-005

TO: Laurie Hurst, Chief Administrative Officer

FROM: Scott Hartman, Director of Parks and Recreation Services

SUBJECT:

McLoughlin Amenity Funds - application of selection criteria and initial evaluation of identified projects

ESSENTIAL QUESTION:

- 1- Is Council comfortable with the application of the selection criteria to the identified projects?
- 2- Does Council wish to add, remove or elevate any potential projects?
- 3- Is Council comfortable with proceeding with next steps as outlined: concept design plan; preliminary budgets; operational business cases; and, cost-benefit analysis?

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Committee of the Whole:

- (1) Receive Staff Report No. P&R-19-005 for information, provide any additional direction to staff as the COTW considers advisable, and direct staff to prepare a report for Council's consideration, and;
- (2) Direct staff to begin initial concept design plans, develop preliminary budgets, operational business cases and cost-benefit analysis for the top scoring projects.

BACKGROUND:

In January 2017, the CRD and the Township agreed on an amenity funding package associated with locating the wastewater treatment plant at McLoughlin Point. A one-time CRD contribution of \$17 million - the McLoughlin Point Amenity Reserve Funds - will be used for capital projects in: (1) Waterfront parks \$7 million; (2) Downtown recreation facilities \$5 million; and, (3) Downtown emergency services and public safety facilities \$5 million.

Two rounds of public engagement were undertaken by the Township to inform the use of the funds. On January 23, 2019 Council approved selection criteria for the evaluation and scoring of the multiple projects identified during the two rounds of public engagement for the McLoughlin Amenity Funds (the approved selection criteria is attached). A staff working committee has applied Council's selection criteria to the projects (the results of the project scoring is attached) and has identified the top projects that will require more detailed work and analysis before projects can be approved.

ISSUES:

The McLoughlin Amenity Fund engagement project has been underway since January 2018. To ensure that the Township meets the established funding deadlines, formal project scope needs to be identified, project budgets established and construction contracts implemented. The funding requirements for both Waterfront Park projects and Public Safety projects involve construction commitments being underway by December 2020. The Downtown Recreation Facilities projects need to be committed and underway by September 2023.

Council's approved selection criteria (excluding the cost-benefit analysis score) have been applied to the results of the public engagement process. The cost-benefit calculation cannot properly be assessed until further design details and project scope have been confirmed. The top scoring projects (without the cost-benefit calculation) in each of the three categories are as follows:

Waterfront Parks:

- 1) Multi-purpose Venue at Saxe Point Park
- 2) Multi-purpose Venue at Esquimalt Gorge Park
- 3) Third ranked projects (tied)
 - Japanese Teahouse at Esquimalt Gorge Park
 - Performance Stage at Saxe Point Park
- 4) Fourth ranked projects (tied)
 - Child/Youth Play Area at Saxe Point Park
 - Washrooms at Saxe Point Park
- 5) Fifth ranked projects (tied)
 - Boardwalks at Saxe Point Park
 - Enhanced Lookout Areas at Macaulay Point Park
 - Child/Youth Play Area at Macaulay Point Park
 - Performance Stage at Esquimalt Gorge Park
 - Boardwalks at Macaulay Point Park
- 6) Sixth ranked projects (tied)
 - Child/Youth Play Areas at Esquimalt Gorge Park
 - Picnic Facilities at Saxe Point Park
 - Enhanced Lookout Areas at Saxe Point Park
 - Picnic Facilities at Esquimalt Gorge Park

Downtown Recreational Facilities:

- 1) Existing Field Upgrades - lighting etc.
- 2) Second ranked projects (tied)
 - Indoor Courts at the Sports Centre
 - Washrooms at Bullen Park
- 3) Third ranked projects (tied)
 - Outdoor Track
 - Artificial Turf Field
 - Additional Multi-purpose Spaces at the Recreation Centre
- 4) Arts/Culture Studio/Gallery

- 5) Fifth ranked projects (tied)
 - Aquatic Centre Enhancements
 - Fieldhouse/Changerooms at Bullen Park
 - Picnic Facilities
- 6) Sixth ranked projects (tied)
 - Climbing Wall at the Sports Centre
 - Climbing Wall at the Recreation Centre
 - Youth Centre Enhancements
 - Sport Courts at Bullen Park
 - Changeroom enhancements at the Recreation Centre
 - Community Garden at Bullen Park
 - Running Track at the Recreation Centre

Downtown Emergency Services and Public Safety Facilities:

- 1) Emergency Community Coordination Centre
- 2) Arts & Culture Space
- 3) Community Garden
- 4) Fourth ranked projects (tied)
 - Childcare Space
 - Public Meeting Rooms
- 5) Housing

In order to further develop those identified projects, initial concept design plans, preliminary budgets, operational business plans and cost-benefit analysis need to be completed.

Staff propose that the next step include the procurement of services for the development of initial concept designs in each of the park areas (Saxe, Gorge and Macaulay), the Public Safety Building and the Recreation Facilities. By focusing on individual areas versus individual projects, possible project connections can be further identified. This could result in further opportunities to link individual projects and could result in increased efficiencies, operational advantages and improved cost-benefit analysis.

This concept design work will facilitate further analysis and allow for the development of preliminary budget estimates, more accurate cost-benefit analysis and operational business cases for each of the top scored projects.

It is estimated that this work can be undertaken this Spring and findings reported to Council in early Fall.

ALTERNATIVES:

1. That the Committee of the Whole:

File #:19-140

(1) Receive Staff Report No. P&R-19-005 for information, provide any additional direction to staff as the COTW considers advisable, and direct staff to prepare a report for Council's consideration, and;

(2) Direct staff to begin initial concept design plans, develop preliminary budgets, operational business cases and cost-benefit analysis for the top scoring projects.

2. That the COTW provide alternative direction to staff.
3. That the COTW request further information from staff.

MAF Selection Criteria – Waterfront Parks

The criteria below will be used by staff to evaluate the top projects identified through the MAF Round 2 engagement process. The results will form the basis of staff's recommendations to Council for allocation of the funding.

Criteria	Project A	
	Score	Notes
1. Strategic alignment <i>Score: 0=contributes to 0% of the priorities, 1=20%, 2=40%, 3=60%, 4=80% , 5=100%</i> Aligned with the Township's Strategic Priorities (draft 2019-2022)		
2. Addresses diverse community needs now and into the future <i>Score: 0=not at all, 5=completely</i> Benefits the entire community (i.e. all ages, abilities, incomes, ethnicities, etc.), meets diverse community needs or achieves multiple purposes and uses (i.e. enables a mix of cultural, recreation, sport, ecosystem, commemoration and aesthetic benefits)		
3. Environmental impact <i>Score: 0= significant negative impact, 5= no negative impact</i> Environmental impacts could include alterations or emissions to land, air or water habitat/resources, resulting in negative impacts to human, ecosystem and/or wildlife health.		
4. Project connections/efficiencies <i>Score: 0=does not 'dovetails' with other projects, 5= 'dovetails' with 5 other projects</i> Can incorporate at least one other improvement project that received high votes in the Round 2 engagement report		
5. Cost-Benefit analysis <i>Score: 0=high cost/low benefit, 5=low cost/high benefit</i> Projects that deliver high benefits for lower costs are ideal and will help the MAF funds go further and deliver more benefit to the community. Note: Potential operational cost implications – where an initial rough estimate or explanation is possible – are included in the notes column.		
6. Public support (resident votes only) <i>Score (1=0-25 votes, 2=26-50,3=51-75,4=76-100,5=greater than 101)</i> Number of votes received through round 2 engagement from Esquimalt residents		
7. Funding implications <i>Score: 5= 100% eligible for funding, 4=80%, 3=60%, 2=40%, 1=20%+, 0=0% of the project is eligible for funding</i> Eligible for funding according to the Community Impact Agreement (February 2017), meeting all three requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achievable within remaining spending timeframe • Costs less than the spending limit for the category • Is not a commercial space/venture 		
Total	0	

MAF Selection Criteria – Downtown Recreational Facilities

The criteria below will be used by staff to evaluate the top projects identified through the MAF Round 2 engagement process. The results will form the basis of staff's recommendations to Council for allocation of the funding.

Criteria	Project A	
	Score	Notes
1. Strategic alignment <i>Score: 0=contributes to 0% of the priorities, 1=20%, 2=40%, 3=60%, 4=80% , 5=100%</i> Aligned with the Township's Strategic Priorities (draft 2019-2022)		
2. Addresses diverse community needs now and into the future <i>Score: 0=not at all, 5=completely</i> Benefits the entire community (i.e. all ages, abilities, incomes, ethnicities, etc.), meets diverse community needs or achieves multiple purposes and uses (i.e. enables a mix of cultural, recreation, sport, ecosystem, commemoration and aesthetic benefits)		
3. Environmental impact <i>Score: 0= significant negative impact, 5= no negative impact</i> Environmental impacts could include alterations or emissions to land, air or water habitat/resources, resulting in negative impacts to human, ecosystem and/or wildlife health.		
4. Project connections/efficiencies <i>Score: 0=does not 'dovetails' with other projects, 5= 'dovetails' with 5 other projects</i> Can incorporate at least one other improvement project that received high votes in the Round 2 engagement report		
5. Cost-Benefit analysis <i>Score: 0=high cost/low benefit, 5=low cost/high benefit</i> Projects that deliver high benefits for lower costs are ideal and will help the MAF funds go further and deliver more benefit to the community. Note: Potential operational cost implications – where an initial rough estimate or explanation is possible – are included in the notes column.		
6. Public support (resident votes only) <i>Score (1=0-60 votes, 2=61-120,3=121-180,4=181-240,5=greater than 241)</i> Number of votes received through round 2 engagement from Esquimalt residents		
7. Funding implications <i>Score: 5= 100% eligible for funding, 4=80%, 3=60%, 2=40%, 1=20%+, 0=0% of the project is eligible for funding</i> Eligible for funding according to the Community Impact Agreement (February 2017), meeting all three requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achievable within remaining spending timeframe • Costs less than the spending limit for the category • Is not a commercial space/venture 		
Total	0	

MAF Selection Criteria – Downtown Emergency Services and Public Safety Facilities

The criteria below will be used by staff to evaluate the top projects identified through the MAF Round 2 engagement process. The results will form the basis of staff's recommendations to Council for allocation of the funding.

Criteria	Project A	
	Score	Notes
1. Strategic alignment <i>Score: 0=contributes to 0% of the priorities, 1=20%, 2=40%, 3=60%, 4=80% , 5=100%</i> Aligned with the Township's Strategic Priorities (draft 2019-2022)		
2. Addresses diverse community needs now and into the future <i>Score: 0=not at all, 5=completely</i> Benefits the entire community (i.e. all ages, abilities, incomes, ethnicities, etc.), meets diverse community needs or achieves multiple purposes and uses (i.e. enables a mix of cultural, recreation, sport, ecosystem, commemoration and aesthetic benefits)		
3. Environmental impact <i>Score: 0= significant negative impact, 5= no negative impact</i> Environmental impacts could include alterations or emissions to land, air or water habitat/resources, resulting in negative impacts to human, ecosystem and/or wildlife health.		
4. Project connections/efficiencies <i>Score: 0=does not 'dovetails' with other projects, 5= 'dovetails' with 5 other projects</i> Can incorporate at least one other improvement project that received high votes in the Round 2 engagement report		
5. Cost-Benefit analysis <i>Score: 0=high cost/low benefit, 5=low cost/high benefit</i> Projects that deliver high benefits for lower costs are ideal and will help the MAF funds go further and deliver more benefit to the community. Note: Potential operational cost implications – where an initial rough estimate or explanation is possible – are included in the notes column.		
6. Public support (resident votes only) <i>Score (1=0-75 votes, 2=76-150,3=151-225,4=225-300,5=greater than 301)</i> Number of votes received through round 2 engagement from Esquimalt residents		
7. Funding implications <i>Score: 5= 100% eligible for funding, 4=80%, 3=60%, 2=40%, 1=20%+, 0=0% of the project is eligible for funding</i> Eligible for funding according to the Community Impact Agreement (February 2017), meeting all three requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achievable within remaining spending timeframe • Costs less than the spending limit for the category • Is not a commercial space/venture 		
Total	0	

Waterfront Parks

Rank	Project	Waterfront Park	Strategic Alignment	Addresses Diverse Community Needs	Environmental Impact	Project Connections/ Efficiencies	Cost Benefit Analysis	Public Support	Funding Implications	Total
1	Multi Purpose Venue	Saxe Point	5	4	5	5		4	5	28
2	Multi Purpose Venue	Esquimalt Gorge	5	4	5	5		3	5	27
3	Japanese Teahouse	Esquimalt Gorge	5	5	5	5		5	1	26
3	Performance Stage	Saxe Point	5	3	5	5		3	5	26
4	Children/Youth Play Area	Saxe Point	5	3	5	2		4	5	24
4	Washrooms	Saxe Point	3	3	5	5		3	5	24
5	Boardwalks	Saxe Point	5	4	4	2		3	5	23
5	Enhanced Lookout Areas	Macaulay Point	4	4	5	2		3	5	23
5	Children/Youth Play Area	Macaulay Point	5	3	5	2		3	5	23
5	Performance Stage	Esquimalt Gorge	5	3	5	2		3	5	23
5	Boardwalks	Macaulay Point	5	4	4	2		3	5	23
6	Children/Youth Play Area	Esquimalt Gorge	3	3	5	2		4	5	22
6	Picnic Facilities	Saxe Point	3	4	5	2		3	5	22
6	Enhanced Lookout Areas	Saxe Point	3	4	5	2		3	5	22
6	Picnic Facilities	Esquimalt Gorge	3	4	5	2		3	5	22
7	Outdoor Pool	Esquimalt Gorge	5	3	3	1		4	5	21

Project Scoring

Rank	Project	Waterfront Park	Strategic Alignment	Addresses Diverse Community Needs	Environmental Impact	Project Connections/ Efficiencies	Cost Benefit Analysis	Public Support	Funding Implications	Total
7	Community Garden	Esquimalt Gorge	3	3	5	2		3	5	21
8	Washrooms	Macaulay Point	3	3	5	1		3	5	20
9	Dog related Enhancements	Macaulay Point	3	2	4	1		3	5	18
10	Climbing Wall	Macaulay Point	3	1	4	1		3	5	17
10	Boathouse Storage	Esquimalt Gorge	5	2	5	1		3	1	17
11	Food and Beverage Facilities	Saxe Point	0	2	5	5		3	1	16
12	Food and Beverage Facilities	Esquimalt Gorge	0	2	5	1		4	1	13
-	No Changes Please	Saxe Point			Did not score			2		
-	Picnic Facilities	Macaulay Point			Did not score			2		
-	Disc Golf	Esquimalt Gorge			Did not score			2		
-	Wharf/Dock	Esquimalt Gorge			Did not score			2		
-	Outdoor Pool	Macaulay Point			Did not score			2		
-	Outdoor Pool	Saxe Point			Did not score			2		
-	Boardwalks	Esquimalt Gorge			Did not score			2		
-	Washrooms	Esquimalt Gorge			Did not score			2		

Project Scoring

Rank	Project	Waterfront Park	Strategic Alignment	Addresses Diverse Community Needs	Environmental Impact	Project Connections/ Efficiencies	Cost Benefit Analysis	Public Support	Funding Implications	Total
-	Climbing Wall	Esquimalt Gorge			Did not score			2		
-	Dog related Enhancements	Esquimalt Gorge			Did not score			2		
-	No Changes Please	Macaulay Point			Did not score			2		
-	Interpretive Centre	Macaulay Point			Did not score			2		
-	Trails	Macaulay Point			Did not score			2		
-	Dog related Enhancements	Saxe Point			Did not score			2		
-	Disc Golf	Saxe Point			Did not score			2		
-	Multi Purpose Venue	Macaulay Point			Did not score			2		
-	Disc Golf	Macaulay Point			Did not score			2		
-	Public Art	Macaulay Point			Did not score			2		
-	Wharf/Dock	Saxe Point			Did not score			2		

Downtown Recreation Facilities

Rank	Project	Recreational Facility	Strategic Alignment	Addresses Diverse Community Needs	Environmental Impact	Project Connections/ Efficiencies	Cost Benefit Analysis	Public Support	Funding Implications	Total
1	Existing Field Upgrades- lighting etc	Bullen Park	3	4	5	4		4	5	25
2	Indoor Courts	ABSC	5	3	5	1		5	5	24
2	Washrooms	Bullen Park	3	3	5	4		4	5	24
3	Outdoor Track	Bullen Park	5	3	4	3		3	5	23
3	Artificial Turf Field	Bullen Park	3	4	5	3		3	5	23
3	Additional Multi-purpose space	ERC	5	4	4	2		3	5	23
4	Arts/cultural studio, gallery	ERC	5	2	5	2		3	5	22
5	Aquatic Centre Enhancements	ERC	3	3	5	1		4	5	21
5	Fieldhouse, Changerooms	Bullen Park	2	3	4	4		3	5	21
5	Picnic Facilities	Bullen Park	2	4	5	2		3	5	21
6	Climbing Wall	ABSC	4	1	5	1		4	5	20
6	Climbing Wall	ERC	4	1	5	1		4	5	20
6	Youth Centre Enhancements	ERC	3	1	5	2		4	5	20
6	Courts	Bullen Park	4	2	5	1		3	5	20
6	Changerooms	ERC	3	3	5	1		3	5	20
6	Community Garden	Bullen Park	3	3	5	1		3	5	20
6	Running Track	ERC	3	3	5	1		3	5	20
7	Food and Beverage Facility	ERC	0	2	5	2		3	1	13
8	Food and Beverage Facility	ABSC	0	2	5	1		3	1	12

Project Scoring

Rank	Project	Recreational Facility	Strategic Alignment	Addresses Diverse Community Needs	Environmental Impact	Project Connections/ Efficiencies	Cost Benefit Analysis	Public Support	Funding Implications	Total
9	Energy Efficiency Retrofits	ABSC			Does not meeting funding criteria			4		9
-	Weight Room	ERC			Did not score			2		
-	Performance facility	Bullen Park			Did not score			2		
-	Don't Know	ABSC			Did not score			2		
-	Parking Lot, electric vehicle charging station	ERC			Did not score			2		
-	Fitness facility	ABSC			Did not score			2		
-	Second sheet of ice	ABSC			Did not score			2		
-	Child care space	ERC			Did not score			2		
-	Kids play area	ABSC			Did not score			2		
-	Arena seating	ABSC			Did not score			2		
-	Food and Beverage Facility	Bullen Park			Did not score			2		
-	Roller rink	ABSC			Did not score			2		
-	Gymnasium	ERC			Did not score			2		

Downtown Emergency Services & Public Safety Facility

Item #	Project	Total Votes	Strategic Alignment	Addresses Diverse Community Needs	Environmental Impact	Project Connections/ Efficiencies	Cost Benefit Analysis	Public Support	Funding Implications	Total
1	Emergency Coordination Centre	332	5	5	4	5		5	5	29
2	Arts & Culture Space	302	5	3	4	5		5	5	27
3	Community Garden	282	3	1	5	5		4	5	23
4	Childcare space	278	2	2	4	5		4	4	21
4	Public Meeting Rooms	218	0	4	4	5		3	5	21
5*	Housing		5	4	4	5			1	19
6	Safe injection site	129	0	1	4	5		2	3	15
6	Needle exchange	76	0	1	4	5		2	3	15
7	Disaster Sirens/Supplies	224		Does not meeting funding criteria					3	3

*The addition of housing as a component of the public safety facility was a direction of Council. It was not a component of the public engagement process.