



JBRSEC Information Session(s) – Questions Posed & Answers Developed: April 30, 2019

Section 1.0 - Questions Related to the Current/Existing Proposal:

Q 1.1: Are the present towns for or against the proposal to develop a second ice surface for the Jack Byrne Regional Sports & Entertainment Centre?

Answer: A decision was made by Councils to not proceed with the last proposal made to the Towns (Torbay and PCSP.) A new concept has not since been proposed to the Towns for consideration for a second ice pad for the Jack Byrne Regional Sports & Entertainment Centre (JBRSEC.) The original estimate for the second ice pad came in at approximately \$14 million and was considered by all parties to be a very high cost. A scaled-down version of the second ice pad is currently being reviewed by the JBRSEC Board of Directors (BOD) and once this process is complete the BOD will review the revised budget and prepare a report that will subsequently be presented to all owner towns, including: Logy Bay–Middle Cove-Outer Cove; Torbay; Flatrock; Pouch Cove; as well as to the towns of Bauline and Portugal Cove – St. Philips.

Q 1.2: What is the estimated cost of a new second ice pad (a bare bones version)?

Answer: The target estimated cost to construct a second ice pad at the JBRSEC is anticipated to be in the \$9.0 million range. However, it is important to note that at this time (April 12, 2019) that the revised estimates have not yet been received from the engineering consultants. The expected date of the cost update is the last week of April or early in May 2019.

Q 1.3: Is the second surface that is being proposed a bare bones proposal or a high end proposal – like the current surface/facility?

Answer: Given that the initial construction estimates for the second ice pad for the JBRSEC were generally considered to be prohibitive, the BOD has asked the firms involved in the development of the original cost estimate to develop a revised estimate that is based on a scaled-back version of the original development plan for the second ice pad at the JBRSEC. The proposed second ice pad will essentially be a stand-alone second building that is to be located approximately 6 meters or 20 feet from the existing building. It is to have its own referees' room, dressing rooms, warm room, and its own refrigeration plant, as well as additional parking spaces to the north east of Kennedy's Brook, near the proposed building.

Q 1.4: The JBRSEC books out time and space for non-ice rentals (trade shows etc.) to help stay financially sound and to eliminate the need for owner Towns to subsidize the JBRSEC. If a new pad is added, how will the arena intend to stay financially sound with two rinks operating?

Answer: The current Grant Thornton Business Plan (for the second ice pad expansion) has noted, as one of its assumptions, that approximately 30 percent of total revenue will be generated by non-ice rental income. This is consistent with past revenue generation, in that in recent years the JBRSEC has achieved non-ice related revenue levels that are approximately 30 percent of total revenue. In the most recent fiscal year (ending Dec 31, 2018) non-ice related revenue was \$334,000 or 38 percent of total revenue. Having a second ice pad operational will also mean that when such events as The Christmas Craft Fair are going on in the main facility, hockey will be able to proceed on the second ice surface, thereby increasing the utilization of the second facility. In addition the JBRSEC has all of its own audio-visual and electronic equipment as well as chairs and tables – all of which is rented on a per use basis – adding significantly to the profitability of such rental agreements. Finally during events such as The Christmas Craft Fair attendance typically exceeds 17,500 people. As such it is a unique and added benefit associated with living in the region. Without these additional revenue generating events, the owner Towns would be required to make up the difference as an annual subsidy to the JBRSEC operations.

Section 2.0 – Questions related to Building Infrastructure:

Q 2.1: Can someone explain or update the situation with respect to water supply and the potential impact on Pine Ridge Road area?

Two studies have been completed in relation to this question and in support of subsequent decisions regarding the future development of the JBRSEC. At this time there appear to be no water issues for adjacent residential neighbourhoods in relation to the future development of a second ice pad for the JBRSEC.

A 2016 study by Stantec concluded that there is insufficient water supply to support a swimming pool; however, a follow-up study dated May 8th, 2017 also completed by Stantec concluded that there was sufficient water supply to support a second ice pad and proposed future developments.

Answer: The initial study regarding the development of a swimming pool for the area (to potentially be housed adjacent to the current JBRSEC) is a discussion and decision that is, for all intents and purposes, outside the current mandate of the BOD.

The BOD is primarily a management board – one that oversees the day-to-day and year-over-year operation of the facility - as opposed to making the long term strategic decisions associated with future developments at the JBRSEC. While one of the responsibilities or roles of the current BOD is to consider the infrastructure that might be required to support the long-term recreational and entertainment needs of the residents in its current or future catchment area. Its role in such matters is to gather, synthesize, and share information with the Towns that own the current facility. In the original Constitution of the JBRSEC (Article 2.1) the Board has been directed to:

Make decisions and to manage and direct the business and affairs of the Board in accordance with the by-laws approved for such purposes . . .

Final decisions with respect to the development of additional infrastructure are to be made by the Town Councils of the ‘supporting’ Towns.

Q 2.2: Can we afford to address our waste water and ground water issues? Have these things/issues been addressed? (If we can’t address these issues, then we should not proceed with a second ice pad).

Answer: Any decision with respect to the addition of a second ice surface for the JBRSEC will be made by the owner towns, as part of their individual town budgeting processes. Such decisions are not within the current scope (mandate) of the BOD of the JBRSEC.

Q 2.3: Torbay ‘may not’ be able to afford to pay its share of a second arena and a second arena is not in Torbay’s strategic plan presently (it also may not be in the plans of other contributing towns;

Answer: It is important to note that the Towns that are the current owners of the JBRSEC facility, as well as any Towns interested in becoming owners of the current or proposed (expanded) facility, will each be given a detailed proposal of the scaled-back, less costly, version of the second ice pad facility once completed. It will be the decision of each Town Council what they choose to do. It is correct to say that the Town of Torbay has rejected the original, more expensive, expansion proposal for the JBRSEC facility and it is not in their current strategic plan.

Q 2.4: What role does/will concert revenue play in supporting one or two rinks?

Answer: In a typical year revenues from concerts and other forms of non-ice related building rentals account for approximately 35 percent of total revenue. This is also the percentage that Grant Thornton used in their Business Plan in support of the new expanded facility (that is, the existing and new ice surfaces). This figure is consistent with past performance and (arguably) conservative. It is also worth noting in this discussion that the NEMHA has a defined program for all minor hockey players. This includes a certain number of games and practices each year. The ability of the NEMHA to deliver these games is not impacted by the non-ice rental agreements that the JBRSEC has in place each year (during the hockey season)

Q 2.5: What sort of provision has been made to address incremental parking needs? Today JBRSEC has ample parking; there is a hope that there will be a proportionate increase in parking space so as to accommodate a second ice surface. What assumptions have been made re parking for the second facility?

Answer: Provisions have been made in the expansion proposal to acquire the land adjacent to the current parking lot and to also acquire a parcel of land on the northeast side of Kennedy’s Brook. The current BOD is aware that additional parking spaces will be required and has included this in the information gathering and planning process. A proportionate increase in the number of required parking spaces in a manner that is consistent with the current operational capacity is considered in a new concept.

Q 2.6: Consideration should also be given to the restoration of walking trails in Torbay and other supporting communities. These are accessible at all times and are a good use of municipal funding.

Answer: This type of decision is for each Town Council to decide on in its own annual planning and budgeting process and is beyond the scope (mandate) of the JBRSEC BOD.

Section 3.0 – Questions Related to Building Operations:

Q 3.1: Why is there a recreational skate scheduled in prime time (Sunday evening)? There are not supposed to be any recreational skates scheduled before 9:00 p.m.

Answer: The recreation skate that is referred to in this instance has had a Sunday time slot since the facility opened. At the beginning of the 2018-2019 season they were moved from 7:30pm to a 9:00pm start to accommodate the Junior Eagles in moving from an afternoon game slot to an evening slot. At the request of the Junior Eagles to improve game attendance by having at 7:30pm start time that would also require the 9:00 – 10:00pm slot, the Rec skate agreed to swap the earlier time.

Q 3.2: Why are the showers not cleaned routinely?

Answer: Arena management and staff have reviewed the usage and cleanliness of the showers in all dressing rooms and have estimated that the showers in each dressing room are used 40 - 60 men per night, with the Friday to Sunday night period seeing the highest frequency of shower usage. It was concluded after a period of nightly examination that the showers could be cleaned effectively and at a reasonable cost by a third party cleaning company. As a result, a contract has been awarded for the regular cleaning of all dressing rooms prior to the start of the weekend period and at the conclusion of the weekend period. At the conclusion of the current hockey season the effectiveness of this contract will be examined. Any required adjustments will be considered at that time.

Q 3.3: There is a perception amongst some users that the level of ongoing maintenance and cleaning at the JBRSEC has declined in recent years?

Answer: The JBRSEC has a generous maintenance budget and all repairs are made as soon as problems arise and are identified. In addition, contingency funds have been set aside (each year) to cover the cost of unanticipated and potentially expensive repairs to large scale equipment such as those associated with ice making and refrigeration (condensing) units.

Q 3.4: Can someone explain what is happening with regard to the build-up of snow and ice above the smaller roof above the main entrance to the building?

Answer: Under certain winter weather conditions the roof over the main entrance to the JBRSEC is prone to ice build-up. While this does not happen after every snowfall and is more prevalent during some winter seasons relative to others, management and the Board have decided to install heating coils in the portion of the JBRSEC roof that is above the entrance to the building. This work will be completed during the summer of 2019.

Q 3.5: Will we be getting a new electronic sign for the arena?

Answer: The current building sign (on Torbay Road at the intersection of Kennedy's Road and Torbay Road is relatively new (2014). It was funded by ACOA as part of a broader marketing communications effort. It has a useful life of 10 plus years and as such will not be replaced in the near future. There is no plan at present to install an electronic sign on the building.

Q 3.6 What is happening with the warm room? It does not appear to be in use for the general public and there is a perception that: 1) we should be allowing its use; and 2) not allowing its use is a deterrent to some people who would like to come to the building.

Answer: There is no warm room at the JBRSEC. What many call “the warm room” is actually designed as a Community Room for meetings and a wide range of other uses (by all members of the community). The sight lines for this room are such that it can’t really operate as a warm room for hockey. At the present time a wide variety of community groups make use of the JBRSEC Community Room. These include activities such as: Fitness and Yoga classes, birthday parties, and a host of community meetings: Note: In 2018, revenue from the rental of the JBRSEC totalled \$27,000. As such it is an important revenue source for the JBRSEC. Moving the Community Room closer to the ice surface to make it into a warm room is cost prohibitive and not really practical, as it would negatively affect the walking track.

Q 3.7 Why do we have two reserved parking spaces located close to the building? There is a perception that these are for staff?

Answer: The two reserved parking spaces near the entrance are indeed for the Arena manager and staff. These have been allocated so as to allow the Arena Manager and Staff to leave and enter the facility in an efficient manner, particularly during peak occupancy, when parking is limited and when the Manager and Staff may have to leave the building (on an emergency basis) to pick up equipment or supplies for an ongoing or scheduled event.

Q 3.8 Avalon East Recreational League has had its ice time pushed back. Why, as the second biggest facility user, shouldn’t it get a higher priority?

Answer: The Avalon East Recreational League is the fifth or perhaps sixth ‘biggest’ facility user. Ice time priority has been dealt with by the BOD as it is a governance issue and deemed to be within the mandate of the Management Board of the JBRSEC. The Board now has a new policy on ice time rentals that has been agreed upon by the Board and by the Owner Towns.

Q 3.9 There is a perception that the level of maintenance around the building has dropped off or declined.

Answer: See Q 3.2 and Q 3.3 above. The Arena Manager has recently reviewed the building maintenance protocols and capacity and recommended a number of changes.

Q 3.10 What is the Boards’ view on the membership of teams in the Avalon East Senior Recreational Hockey League?

Answer: At the present time there are a number of players (on a number of teams in this League) that are not residents of the JBRSEC Owner Towns. It is our understanding that since its inception certain teams in this League have been required to add players from ‘outside’ the boundaries of the Owner Towns in order to be able to ice a team in the League. As this has been common practice in this League for quite some time. The current practice allows community members to play hockey in their local rink, when they may not otherwise be able to do so.

Q 3.11: Pricing question re minor hockey, public rentals, and minor hockey hours. There was a general comment that at the present time minor hockey is expensive. Also, early evening time slots are expensive.

Answer: Because of the present shortage of ice time at the JBRSEC, at the present time the NEMHA has to secure additional ice time (15 hours per week) at other ice rinks. These hours are invariably more expensive (+\$40/hour, on average) than the price which the NEMHA pays for ice time at the JBRSEC. This serves to drive the cost of minor hockey higher and also makes the cost of playing minor hockey in the region higher. In some cases the only time slots that are available in these situations are the slots that internal users do not want – primarily because the times are inconvenient. The BOD appreciates that these early morning and evening time slots are challenging. This is, in part, why it is examining the potential for adding a second ice rink to our existing facility.

Q 3.12: It appears as though the February 6th session has turned into a session designed specifically to deal with the second rink proposal, this meeting should also address other issues related to building operations and scheduling: ice time availability; ice time scheduling; user group priorities. Also at least one resident seems to think that a second rink is not a good idea and has already been voted down.

Answer: The reader will note that the process of examining the feasibility of facility expansion has also contemplated all aspects of the operation of the existing facility – as is evidenced by the number of questions that have been posed and subsequently answered in this document and in the broader community consultation process. Also, the session moderator repeatedly asked for alternate positions during the meeting, and none were raised during the meeting.

Section 4.0 Questions Related to JBRSEC programming:

Q 4.1 There seems to be insufficient capacity to add children (from within the supporting communities) to the Can Skate or Can Power Skate programs – a second ice surface would help in this regard.

Answer: This is indeed the situation presently. At the February 6th presentation the President of the Prince of Wales Skating Club and the president of the NEMHA both commented on the need for additional ice time in support of ongoing and new programs. Collectively, they suggested that they could make use of at least 30 additional hours of ice time (each week) during the regular fall and winter programming season and again in the summer (in the case of the figure and power skaters).