

South Campus Consultation Group

Tuesday, October 27, 2015

7:00pm to 8:30pm

Agri-Food Discovery Place

DRAFT

University of Alberta: Anastasia Lim (Chair), Emily Ball, Pat Jansen, Don Hickey, Mary Paul

Special guests from UAPTI: Ralph Young, Kim Krushell

Community members: Frank Weichman (McKernan), Stephen Dobson (Lendrum), Bernie Schwartz (Lansdowne), Bob Kamp (Belgravia), Anish Neupane (Grandview), Wiggert Hessels (McKernan), Ed Hudson (Parkallen)

Commenced: 7:00pm

The minutes from the May 27, 2015 meeting were accepted though A. Neupane indicated that he had questions that he believed would be answered during the meeting.

Update on University of Alberta Properties Trust Inc. (UAPTI) – D. Hickey

D. Hickey thanked R. Young and K. Krushell for attending the meeting. He informed the group that since he last met with the SCCG members in May, 2015 the UAPTI had been approved by the Board of Governors (BOG) and an Order in Council (OIC) had been approved by the Government of Alberta (GOA). D. Hickey circulated documents listing the Trustees of the UAPTI and a recent update from the QUAD (U of A on line newsletter). He told the group that he and members of the UAPTI met with the University of Calgary Trust and its CEO and planned similar meetings with the land trusts for the University of British Columbia (UBC) and Simon Fraser University (SFU). With each meeting there will be a discussion about best practices and education on lessons the U of A can learn from the activities of each land trust organization. D. Hickey added that there has been one meeting with the UAPTI where they reviewed the trust deed and the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) and there has also been one meeting with the Planning, Development and Stakeholder Relations Sub-Committee.

D. Hickey indicated that going forward the U of A has been conducting a complete review of all its land assets with an aim to understand which parcels of land would become part of an omnibus listing of land assets that would go to the BOG for approval late November. He added that if the BOG approved the omnibus it would then go forward as an OIC to the GOA. He added that the U of A hoped that the omnibus would be through U of A governance during the November cycle. He told the group that the U of A continues to meet with the City of Edmonton (CEO) to update them on the progress of the UAPTI though the recent changes in senior management have made that a bit challenging. D. Hickey then told the group that when the OIC is approved by the GOA the U of A will seek BOG approval for a specific piece of land under the omnibus for transfer to the UAPTI.

A. Neupane asked for clarification of the process. He wanted confirmation that once the OIC is approved that allows the U of A to transfer land to the UAPTI and then the UA will go to the BOG with an actual piece of land they want to transfer to the UAPTI.

D. Hickey said that was correct and that more discussion about what land to transfer to the UAPTI will take place. He added that there was no sense in transferring land to the UAPTI that the trust does not think it can work with. The land transfer will be land that the UAPTI can develop successfully.

South Campus Consultation Group

Wednesday, May 27, 2015

7:00 to 8:30 pm

AgriFood Discovery Place

F. Weichman asked if the U of A has rules as to what the trust can do with the land once transferred.

D. Hickey responded that once a piece of land is transferred to the UAPTI – the rules around how that land can be developed will fall under the municipality.

F. Weichman asked what the role of the COE will take.

D. Hickey responded that the COE will not play a role in deciding what land will be transferred to the UAPTI. He added that the U of A has been meeting with the COE to gain a better understanding of how the LRDP will be used. He also added that the U of A is trying to give more status to the LRDP with the COE.

B. Schwartz asked what vehicles are in place for discussion with neighbours and how neighbours will be engaged.

D. Hickey responded that the first move towards engaging neighbours is introducing two members of the UAPTI at the meeting this evening. He added that having members of the UAPTI meet with neighbours in the very early stages of the process is a start.

R. Young entered the conversation by adding that he and his trust colleague K. Krushell are here to introduce themselves to the group and to listen to their initial comments and answer questions. He added that the UAPTI is beginning the process of building its governance process but wanted to meet with neighbours as early as possible.

B. Schwartz added that a lot of thought has obviously gone into what the trust will do but he asked if there will be as much thought given to community engagement.

K. Krushell reiterated that the UAPTI is at the very preliminary stages of developing its governance and Terms of Reference but that community engagement is a top priority hence R. Young and she wanting to meet with community representatives early in the process.

B. Schwartz added that community engagement is a very long standing issue with Lansdowne and that whatever the UAPTI does the community has to live with it.

R. Young responded that the UAPTI has been an actual board for only a few months and its first step is to understand the roles of the trust members, review what other land trusts are doing, visit U of C, UBC and SFU with a goal to understanding how those land trusts function. He knows that the functions of the UAPTI will be unique but before he could answer questions about how the community will be engaged there is a lot of background work that has to take place.

B. Kamp asked if D. Hickey had said the UAPTI land will be subject to the LRDP?

D. Hickey responded that he did not say that. He added that what he did say was that the U of A wants the land developed in alignment of the LRDP and the U of A's intention is for it to be in alignment with the LRDP.

A. Neupane thanked the UAPTI guests for attending and added that there is a considerable amount of local knowledge on how the land on South Campus is used and he asked the UAPTI Trust members to consider using the

South Campus Consultation Group

Wednesday, May 27, 2015

7:00 to 8:30 pm

AgriFood Discovery Place

SCCG when planning for development in that they could offer first-hand knowledge of how people use the space. He encouraged the UAPTI Trust members to use the community networks that the SCCG has.

K. Krushell commented that she along with members of the UAPTI felt is very important to meet with the community reps of the SCCG as soon as possible.

R. Young added that he was part of the LRDP process when it was developed in 2002. He assured the group that he understood the background of the LRDP and will be working with the COE closely. He added that a significant amount of work will need to take place with all stakeholders but that he did understand how neighbours would be impacted.

W. Hessels commented that he assumed that South Campus land were not the only lands that were being transferred.

D. Hickey responded yes and that the group will see some land on the North Campus identified as well. He also pointed out that the UAPTI has a subcommittee for planning, development and stakeholder relations.

Meet the Board Chair of the UAPTI and member of the UAPTI Planning and Engagement Subcommittee

A. Lim introduced next agenda item and asked R. Young to speak.

R. Young thanked the group for the opportunity to meet with them. He told the group that the UAPTI was set up for specific reasons one being that the U of A has to protect its charitable status and that the UAPTI has a fiduciary responsibility to act in the best interest of the U of A. He went on to say that trust members will work at the pleasure of the U of A and are all volunteers and community members with deep experience in development and business but most importantly committed to developing land for the community. He added that the UAPTI is responsible for creating sustainable revenue for the U of A to meet its goal to be the best university in Canada. He commented that universities throughout the world are experiencing challenges with a decrease in funding giving the example that some US public universities only receive 15-30% from the State and/or Federal funding bodies. The U of A has to cap enrollments along with pressure to find resources for research and compete with high quality universities around the world. He added that all but one member of the UAPTI are alumni of the U of A and all are dedicated to seeing the U of A succeed.

R. Young then reviewed all members of the UAPTI with the group. He add that all members of the UAPTI are passionate about the U of A and committed to building a community that they themselves would want to live in with their families. He went on to say that the UAPTI already understands that community members have many concerns and that the UAPTI will listen to these concerns and suggestions and do their best to work with the community.

A. Neupane commented that the community as a whole and in particular the local community has to live with the impacts of development. He encouraged the members of the UAPTI to set up a process for working with local community members of land developed by the trust so that they will know what matters most to the people living next to or near the development.

South Campus Consultation Group

Wednesday, May 27, 2015

7:00 to 8:30 pm

Agrifood Discovery Place

S. Dobson commented that it is desirable to live around a campus. However, the objective of the UAPTI is to raise money and the LRDP is about developing a campus. He offered that the two objectives do not co-exist – a campus is desirable, development is not desirable. He added that he understands the UAPTI board is community minded but that it is obligated to make money. He went on to say that people coming in and out of the developed land will lead to a significant increase in traffic. He will be interested in seeing how the UAPTI will deal with COE when it comes to how UAPTI development will impact COE road infrastructure.

K. Krushell responded that she understands traffic impacts and that the UAPTI will look at all issues.

F. Weichman added three points to the discussion:

1. There are a lot of run down houses that are not owner occupied in McKernan.
2. McKernan is within a few blocks of the U of A, the hospital, CCI and it would be nice if it could be used by senior administration as a place to live. We could use your help with this.
3. What is the operating cost per students right now?

R. Young responded that it is approximately \$25,000 per student at this time.

B. Kamp commented that the conflict he sees is the U of A needs profit to help solve its revenue issue but in order to make the biggest return there will be a significant increase in traffic for surrounding communities. He asked if the UAPTI will provide assistance to the community that would help them to provide input. He asked if development will be piecemeal and if it is will the UAPTI put forth plans for what it will all look like when it is complete.

R. Young responded that the LRDP contains broad guidelines and so does the COE Area Redevelopment Plans; these are ways to provide context for development. He added that the UAPTI will do its best to show the community what development will look in the long term. He added that there may be conflict between profit and development but that the UAPTI cannot go forward with plans that do not make sense to the U of A and the COE. The UAPTI will be looking for balance.

A. Neupane commented that there is an imbalance between community members and the U of A and added that if the UAPTI provides resources to the community there will be a higher quality of engagement. He added that the community feels that they do not understand all of the information so cannot make thoughtful comments.

K. Krushell responded that the UAPTI cannot develop alone and that they are in the process of getting up to speed with structuring themselves at this time. She added that tonight was the first step to finding the balance that was mentioned earlier. She further indicated that the COE often provides the assistance in interpreting development plans at engagement sessions. **(I recall her saying this.)**

Agenda item was concluded – R. Young, K. Krushell, D. Hickey and M. Paul left the meeting.

Update on priority projects

a. 63 Ave project – final updates: P. Jansen told the group that there is another year of warranty on the project and that the landscaping is basically completed. A. Neupane commented that the bike path is cracking past the cross walk and is wondering if that is because there is a culvert underneath. P. Jansen responded that given the climate all concrete cracks at some point in Edmonton. A. Neupane asked to have

South Campus Consultation Group

Wednesday, May 27, 2015

7:00 to 8:30 pm

Agrifood Discovery Place

snow removal shove snow to the north side because when it melts it will be a hazard if not on the north side.

b. East LRT overflow (temporary) parking re-location – final updates: P. Jansen informed the group that the parking lot is now operational and all U of A permit holders from Saville lot have been moved to the site. This will allow better parking enforcement on the Saville lot. He added that the new lot has not been used for overflow parking as of yet but they are monitoring it for traffic and ETS movement; to date it is going well.

c. Twin arena status: P. Jansen told the group the MOU between the U of A and COE to begin discussions about the proposed project has now gone to City Council but have not received an official response from the COE yet. The U of A has to date had no discussions about the project proceeding. E. Ball informed the group that Councilor Anderson was recently quoted for saying he believes the project could be bigger – perhaps a 6 plex. The U of A has not been part of any discussion regarding Councilor Anderson's comments.

d. Foote Field - bubble and turf updates: P. Jansen informed the group that the turf replacement has been completed that the product used is synthetic. He added that the temporary bubble is being revisited with a strong possibility that the proposed bubble may go forward and if it does proceed there will be preliminary work done in the spring of 2016 with the installation to take place in the fall of 2016.

e. Research and Collection Resource Facility: P. Jansen informed the group that the RCRF project was moving forward with the site being established and the U of A is working with a design/build team. He added that the facility is scheduled to be occupied fall of 2017. He added that he will bring information about storm water management and wet pond to the next meeting. E. Ball told the group that a second open house will take place on November 24, 2015 at the Agrifood Discovery Place from 5- 8 pm. She will also be asking members of the SCCG to attend a meeting the week of November 16, 2015 to review draft material to be presented at the November 24 open house.

Sharing items

- a. **Planning for 4 year term of MOU:** A. Lim told the group that she had met with A. Neupane over the summer to inquire about the renewal of the MOU. It was the desire to have a renewed MOU. She requested the SCNC choose two members to work with herself and P. Jansen with the plan to have a draft new MOU for early spring 2016. A. Neupane told the group that C. Doll and the new yet to be determined Chair of the SCNC will be the two members to work with A. Lim and P. Jansen.

Adjournment/Next steps

A. Lim adjourned the meeting at 8:25 pm.