Dockside Lands

Before…
Project Background

• 1989 purchase
• Sept. 2001 Environmental Study
• Sept. 2002 Business Case Report
• Jan. – April 2003 Public Consultation
• May – Sept. 2003 Market Risk Analysis & Design Guidelines
• Sept. 2003 – May 2004 Development Concept
• June 2004-October 2004 Request for Expressions of Interest and Request for Proposals
• November to December, 2004 Proposal Evaluation
• January to July, 2005 Negotiation and Rezoning Process
What were the main challenges?

The need for due diligence:
• Previous failed attempts to market the property
• Brownfield site

Building trust:
• Lack of trust between the City and Community
• Lack of trust between varying City departments
How did this inform the process?

• It had to satisfy the need to determine a realistic “value” of the site for the City
• There was a need to establish a strategy for overcoming environmental concerns
• There was the need to gain the community trust by considering social concerns
• There was a need to have an inclusive process (to address political, technical, social and financial concerns)
How did we incorporate the balanced TBL philosophy into the process?

• Developed a list of criteria
• Developed a method of measuring the provision of each criteria
• Established which criteria were “pass/fail”
• For remaining criteria established maximum/minimum score
• Set a minimum score level for each of the TBL categories
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Questions</th>
<th>Points Scored</th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Source of Info</th>
<th>Point Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Proposed Site Remediation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>.1 Consistency with Development Concept with regard to remediation and risk management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the City's opinion, will the proposed remediation plan meet the current requirements set out by the BC Environmental Management Act and Contaminated Sites Regulation? (RFP section 5.2.1, DC page 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>pass/fail</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>pass-yes fail-no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the costs associated with the proposed remediation plan meet the City's goal of break-even? (RFP section 5.2.1, section 4 of these criteria, DC page 7, 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>pass/fail</td>
<td>Design concept, Dockside Business Case</td>
<td>pass-yes fail-no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What risks for remediation are assumed by the Proponent? (RFP section 5.2.1, DC page 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>15-proponent assumes all risk Shared risk - varies with extent 0-city assumes all risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Proposed Land Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>.1 Consistency with Development Concept with regard to mix of uses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the residential portion of the development provide a mix that satisfies the needs of a broad range of ages and stages of life, as well as income brackets and rental/ownership units? (RFP section 5.2.2, DC page 16/17)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>10-consistent with the DC 2 to 7-somewhat consistent with DC (varies with extent) 0-single use or not consistent at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much employment (post construction) will be generated in the industrial, commercial and retail uses on Dockside once all four lots are developed? (calculated based on proposed area of each use multiplied by average number of employees per square foot for this type of use). (RFP section 5.2.2, Appendix E, DC page 15)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Questionnaire, Design concept</td>
<td>5-provides a mix of residential units 3 or 4-provides some mix of residential units 1 to 2-provides poor mix of residential units 0-provides no mix of residential units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the mix of uses provided such that environmental concerns such as noise and air pollution are considered through design (both on and off site)? (RFP section 5.2.3, DC page 22)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>5-proposal creating the most employment, sliding scale to 0.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Site Area = 505,447 sq ft
Commercial Area = 71,044 sq ft
Office Area = 75,350 sq ft
Hotel Area = 44,133 sq ft
Residential Area = 671,926 sq ft
Seniors Res. Area = 54,897 sq ft
Social Housing = 48,331 sq ft
Industrial
Total Business Area = 101,089 sq ft
Site FSR = 2.0 FSR
Amenity Area = 9,149 sq ft
Parking = 1,285 Spaces
After...