

**South Campus Consultation Group**

Monday, September 29, 2014

7:00pm to 8:30pm

Agri-Food Discovery Place

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

Community members: Frank Weichman (McKernan), Stephen Dobson (Lendrum), Bernie Schwartz (Lansdowne), Paul Greenwood (Lansdowne), Bob Kamp (Belgravia), Anish Neupane (Grandview), Gail Faurschou (Grandview), Wiggert Kessels (McKernan), Noga Vaisblat (Malmo).

Commenced: 7:00pm

The minutes from May 21, 2014 meeting were accepted with no changes. Chair asked everyone around the table to introduce themselves.

Chair (A. Lim) asked D. Hickey to provide update regarding U of A land trust and an update to his presentation from May 21, 2014 meeting. D. Hickey told the group that the process for establishing a U of A land trust continues. The next significant meeting taking place is on October 24, 2014 where the U of A Board of Governors will decide on the structure of the trust and approve the initial slate of board members. If the Board of Governors approves these two items, the U of A will request an Order in Council (OIC) which could take 90 days to eight months. After the OIC the board of the U of A land trust will meet and to review the mandate and operations of the land trust and begin the process of hiring a CEO and other staff members. It is anticipated that once staff are in place the U of A will confirm which lands could be transferred; the lands recommended will need to be approved by the U of A Board of Governors and go forward for an OIC to approve the transfer of assets to the land trust. The U of A land trust will develop a strategy for securing funding and initiate development of the assigned land.

D. Hickey addressed each of the five points raised in the September 7, 2014 SCNC letter to the U of A.

- 1.1 – In the land trust deed there is a mandate statement which indicates that development will align with the existing LRDP which may be amended from time to time. The trust will oversee development of projects that are non-academic.
- 1.2 – The U of A will be responsible for developing buildings used by the U of A though the university may still develop some residences. This has yet to be decided.
- 2 It is the U of A's intention to have the land trust develop lands in alignment with the LRDP though it is important to note that no lands have been identified yet. D. Hickey indicated that if he were to guess what lands might be transferred to the land trust, examples include Michener Park, part of Sector 14 and partner lands, with some possibility of land on Sector 12, though residences in Sector 12 may go to the land trust for development. He added that there may also be locations on North Campus and other campuses, such as opportunities at Augustana Campus that could be considered.
- 3 The role of the SCCG as documented on the MOU will continue when it is a U of A development project on South Campus. When it comes to the land trust projects both the SCNC and the U of A will be stakeholders and both groups will be part of a consultation process.
- 4 D. Hickey told the group that the U of A has always maintained a dialogue with City of Edmonton (COE) during all planning activities including the LRDP. He told the group that with regards to traffic and parking

**South Campus Consultation Group**

Monday, September 29, 2014

7:00 to 8:30 pm

Agrifood Discovery Place

the COE and the U of A completed a joint study in 2007. The COE indicates the study is relevant and current. Parking requirements are developed by the City; enforcement is also a COE responsibility.

- 5 The U of A distributed the business case and speaking notes from the May 21, 2014 Board meeting to the SCCG for information. D. Hickey summarized the governance structure of the land trust board: the land trust board will not be greater than 11 members in total with no more than 4 members with formal ties to the U of A, and will report back (perhaps annually) to the Board of Governors. D. Hickey stressed that the land trust board must remain independent of the U of A and free of conflict. This is critical to maintain and keep the U of A's charitable status under the *Canada Revenue Act*.

D. Hickey asked the group if they had any further questions and he responded to each question.

Representative from Lansdowne commented that he was concerned about the governance model in that he wondered how truly independent the board will be and feels that it will be filled with people who are friends of the U of A.

There has been a significant amount of research done with regards to possible members for the land trust board. D. Hickey added that the U of A endeavors to have people with expertise in the areas of real estate, finance and land development to have a balanced board.

Representative from Grandview asked how the candidates for the land trust board were chosen and asked why only real estate and developers and not urban planners.

The U of A has spent significant time and resources with the LRDP to set land use as its first priority rather than the other way around. Development now needs to fit into a land use plan.

Representative from Belgravia asked who developed the slate of candidates for the land trust board.

The U of A administration, with the assistance of an external executive search firm, developed the slate of candidates, based on specific criteria. The slate was prepared for presentation to the Board Human Resources and Compensation Committee who then makes final recommendations to the Board of Governors. The next Board of Governors meeting is on October 24, 2014, where the Board may approve the governance structure of the trust and approve the full or a partial slate of proposed members.

Representative from McKernan commented that he was not clear about the land trust before, but now understands that the trust is independent of the U of A with the land trust generating revenue for the U of A.

D. Hickey responded that the land trust will have a mandate but nowhere does it indicate that highest generation of revenue is the main priority.

Representative from Grandview brought the attention of the group to the last paragraph of the September 7, 2014 letter from the SCNC to the U of A where the SCNC asks the U of A for a community representative on the land trust board and asked if community would be involved through a consultation process.

**South Campus Consultation Group**

Monday, September 29, 2014

7:00 to 8:30 pm

Agrifood Discovery Place

D. Hickey replied that community would be involved during a consultation process.

Representative from Grandview asked what would happen with non-academic buildings.

If the development falls under the COE commercial use zoning it would fall under the *Municipal Government Act* (MGA) process.

Representative from Grandview asked given the model for the land trust what percentage of a building has to be academic for it to fall to the U of A for development.

D. Hickey responded that would depend on the use of the building and gave the example that the U of A might have a partnership with a company like HP and build a HP Research Centre - this would be considered an academic building, given the partnership arrangement.

Representative from Grandview commented that the Saville Centre was exempt from the MGA yet it appears that very little of it is used by the U of A. He asked what the balance for U of A use to partners is.

D. Hickey responded that a significant portion of the Saville Centre is currently for the U of A.

Representative from Lansdowne asked when it came to a piece of land like Sector 14 would commercial use be on the border and U of A use on the inside.

D. Hickey replied that it could take many different scenarios and that this would be for the land trust of decide. However, the intent is to be in alignment with the LRDP, as amended from time to time.

Representative from Belgravia asked what part of available land assets are going to go forward for revenue generation and what part for pure academic use.

D. Hickey responded that it was hard for him to comment on a plan that is for 30 years exactly what is going to happen.

Representative from Lansdowne inquired why Mr. Hickey was not using the term revenue generation and asked how high of a priority revenue generation is.

The business case for the land trust does talk about turning U of A long term assets into funds for an endowment. It is important to note that revenue generated will not go into capital projects but rather to an endowment.

Representative from Grandview asked why there are so many people on the land trust board and asked how topics about how projects informed by aging populations and social policy will be discussed since these are topics crucial for any land developer to consider.

**South Campus Consultation Group**

Monday, September 29, 2014

7:00 to 8:30 pm

Agrifood Discovery Place

D. Hickey responded that all members of the land trust board are volunteers and will not be paid; however, they have consultants in these areas that the Grandview representative refers to.

Representative from Grandview asked if the SCCG group would see the criteria used to select the slate for the land trust board.

D. Hickey replied that yes this would be possible after the October 24, 2014 Board of Governors meeting. He added that it is important to note that the U of A is a patient developer in that it has owned the land for decades and does not need to develop immediately to realize revenues. The U of A can take time to ensure that all developments fit its specific needs.

Representative from McKernan commented that the issue of how College Plaza was handled under PSLA or MGA continues to be topic for community members.

D. Hickey responded that he wanted to be clear that with regards to College Plaza any development of that property went through and would continue to meet all requirements of the MGA. This topic has been addressed numerous times in the past and he and the representative from McKernan will have to agree to disagree on how deliberations were carried out.

As there were no further questions, A. Lim thanked D. Hickey for his time and moved to the next agenda item.

E. Ball asked that before the group goes on with the meeting that P. Jansen explain to the group his new role within the Facilities and Operations (F&O) portfolio.

P. Jansen said that upon B. Becker's departure from the U of A, the portfolio reviewed various positions and decided to reclassify the four existing Executive Directors to Associate Vice Presidents, and removing one full-time position, the original overarching AVP position. P. Jansen is now the AVP, Planning and Project Delivery and deals with all capital projects – anything that deals with the LRDP, sector plans and capital projects.

Chair of the SCNC asked if the SCCG MOU should be amended to reflect this.

E. Ball told the group that she would review the MOU and see if this was necessary. We would consult with legal counsel as necessary.

### **Status of the South Campus LRDP Amendment**

A. Lim informed the group that the South Campus LRDP had been approved by the Minister that she had sent the approval letter to the Chair of the SCNC for distribution.

### **Status of 63 Avenue Project**

P. Jansen reported that 122 Street was opened on September 2, 2014 as promised and but still needed some clean-up work. The focus of the work over the summer was on 122 Street to ensure it opened on schedule

**South Campus Consultation Group**

Monday, September 29, 2014

7:00 to 8:30 pm

Agrifood Discovery Place

which took away time needed for 63 Avenue, hence the lights and multiuse trail is now scheduled to open mid to late October.

P. Jansen indicated that a landscape design charrette took place the last week of August with interested community members. The charrette went very well and the U of A received many good ideas. All of these ideas are being sent to the consultant and the U of A has asked for a revised plan. Given that the U of A has a strong desire to enhance this entry to South Campus there will be more time allocated to developing the landscape plan. This will mean that a majority of the landscaping will now be done in the spring of 2015.

Signage for the area is being discussed and developed; the U of A will update the SCCG group on this aspect of the project at the next meeting.

Representative from Lendrum asked if it is status quo on the five entrances planned for South Campus.

P. Jansen replied yes, it is status quo on the five entrances. The U of A needs to see how the new 63 Avenue road works before seeing if any additional changes need to be made to the site.

A brief discussion between all members of the group took place regarding possible short cutting routes. The U of A will monitor over the next months.

#### **Bubble Over Foote Field**

P. Jansen said that the U of A is seeking funding opportunities and this is ongoing. He added that there is some discussion about replacing the turf.

#### **Overflow Parking (temporary) location**

P. Jansen indicated that the U of A is looking at temporary parking solutions for South Campus and one option is the residual lands east of the LRT. The U of A is exploring the potential of adding up to 250 temporary parking spots with the entrance being off of 113 Street.

Representative from Grandview asked if this will be park and ride.

P. Jansen responded no, that it would be for U of A staff who will pay for permits to park.

#### **BARD – Book and Record Depository**

P. Jansen described what a BARD is and added that the U of A is currently leasing the current BARD space with a lease expiring in two years. F&O has been directed to look at possible new facilities and one option is to develop something on South Campus. If a new building is to be considered on South Campus it would align with the LRDP.

Representative from Lansdowne asked what the square footage would be for a possible new facility.

**South Campus Consultation Group**

Monday, September 29, 2014

7:00 to 8:30 pm

Agrifood Discovery Place

B. Louie responded that the U of A is in the very early stage of this potential project and are working on scenarios for square footage. His office will be looking for a significant amount of input from the academic group on campus and evaluate the possibilities and benefits of each scenario.

### **Partnership Buildings on Sector 12**

A. Lim introduced the agenda item by clearly stating that with regards to a possible twin arena project the university is actively seeking partners, including the COE. A draft concept of what a twin arena facility could look like was developed and is currently being used by U of A staffs who meet with possible partners and donors to consider this project. The project is not a done deal and what will be presented to the group is conceptual only for the purposes of discussion and building partnership interest.

B. Louie gave a brief presentation of six slides to the group showing conceptual site plans and drawings of a possible twin arena and parkade.

Representative from Grandview added that when the SCNC met with the COE on this project the COE indicated that the arenas would be open to the community. What is the U of A's objective when looking for additional partners?

P. Jansen replied that the U of A continues to develop an MOU with COE to look for collaborative opportunities. The draft concepts presented were done to understand the scale and budget of the project but added that more partners will be needed to make the project viable.

Representative from Grandview added that in addition to the sporting facilities the plan should include a dedicated reading room for people to donate reading material to. She added that there is a deficiency of multi-use spaces where more community internally and externally can enjoy together.

Representative from McKernan asked about the parking garage and A. Lim reiterated to the group to remember that what was shown was conceptual only. More details can be developed once there is an actual project in place.

### **Michener Park – next steps**

P. Jansen told the group that the Sector Plan for Michener Park will go to Facilities Development Committee (FDC) as information and that the U of A continues to review/look at the business case for options. There are no current plans to implement any re-development in the area and when/if re-development takes place it will be in a phased manner.

A. Lim adjourned the meeting at 8:10 p.m.