



Design Options for the Port Lands Sports Centre Stakeholder Workshop



Workshop Summary Report

July 8, 2010

Prepared by Lura Consulting
July 2010

This summary report was prepared by Lura Consulting. Lura provided third-party consultation management services as part of this City of Toronto project. This summary captures the key comments raised during the July 8th Stakeholders Workshop. It is not intended to be a verbatim transcript. If you have any questions or comments regarding the summary, please contact:

Irene Bauer
Project Manager
Waterfront Secretariat
City of Toronto
416-397-4816

Kurtis Elton
Lura Consulting
416-847-0314
kelton@lura.ca



Contents

1	CONTEXT	3
2	WELCOME / AGENDA REVIEW / INTRODUCTIONS.....	3
3	CITY COUNCILLOR WELCOME.....	3
4	OVERVIEW OF THE PORT LANDS SPORTS CENTRE PROJECT.....	4
5	DESIGN OPTIONS FOR THE PORT LANDS SPORTS CENTRE	4
6	QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	5
7	WORKING SESSION	5
7.1	WHAT ARE THE PROS AND CONS OF EACH DESIGN OPTION?.....	5
7.1.1	<i>Icescraper Pros</i>	<i>5</i>
7.1.2	<i>Icescraper Cons.....</i>	<i>5</i>
7.1.3	<i>Snowflake Pros</i>	<i>6</i>
7.1.4	<i>Snowflake Cons</i>	<i>6</i>
7.2	WHAT ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTORS OR CRITERIA TO BE CONSIDERED WHEN SELECTING A PREFERRED DESIGN OPTION?.....	7
7.2.1	<i>Multi-Use Considerations.....</i>	<i>7</i>
7.2.2	<i>Parking.....</i>	<i>7</i>
7.2.3	<i>Olympic-Sized Pad</i>	<i>8</i>
7.2.4	<i>Design Considerations</i>	<i>8</i>
7.2.5	<i>Pan Am Games</i>	<i>8</i>
7.2.6	<i>Land Use</i>	<i>8</i>
7.2.7	<i>Conformity to Surrounding Area and Vision.....</i>	<i>9</i>
7.2.8	<i>Technical</i>	<i>9</i>
7.2.9	<i>Accessibility</i>	<i>9</i>
7.2.10	<i>Cost.....</i>	<i>9</i>
7.2.11	<i>Environmental Issues</i>	<i>9</i>
7.2.12	<i>Transit.....</i>	<i>9</i>
7.2.13	<i>Safety</i>	<i>9</i>
7.2.14	<i>Other</i>	<i>10</i>
7.3	OTHER FEEDBACK?.....	10
7.3.1	<i>Two-by-Two (2x2) Pads.....</i>	<i>10</i>
7.3.2	<i>Area Context.....</i>	<i>10</i>
7.3.3	<i>Technical</i>	<i>11</i>
7.3.4	<i>Other</i>	<i>11</i>
8	CLOSING REMARKS AND NEXT STEPS	11
Appendix A – Stakeholder and Project Team Attendance		
Appendix B – Compilation of Questions and Answers		

1 Context

The City of Toronto is examining the feasibility of developing the Port Lands Sport Centre (PLSC), a multiple ice pad facility to be built in the Port Lands, in the area south of Commissioners Street and west of the Don Roadway (85 and 95 Commissioners Street).

On July 8th, 2010, the City's Waterfront Secretariat hosted a stakeholder workshop to provide participants with an overview of the PLSC project status as well as to obtain stakeholder feedback on design options for the project and related considerations. The workshop took place at Metro Hall, 55 John Street, Toronto.

2 Welcome / Agenda Review / Introductions

David Dilks of Lura Consulting introduced himself as facilitator, welcomed attendees and thanked them for participating at the stakeholder workshop. He explained that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss design options for the Port Lands Sports Centre. David explained that Lura's role is to facilitate stakeholder feedback on the PLSC design options, and to summarize the feedback in a report to be made available online. The decision on how to move forward with this project will be made by City Council with advice from City staff, the design team, and stakeholders.

David reviewed the materials for the evening's meeting, which included the agenda and a worksheet. The agenda indicated that presentations would be made by Gwen McIntosh from the City of Toronto's Waterfront Secretariat, and Bob Goyeche from rdh architects inc. A question and answer session would follow the presentations, after which the two discussion questions listed on the worksheet would be discussed in small groups. A representative from each group would then report on the findings from their discussion. David noted that the small groups were mixed so as to ensure representation of different stakeholder groups (e.g., sports, community, business, etc.) at each table.

Along with the group worksheets, attendees were encouraged to fill out individual worksheets and return them at the workshop or by Monday, July 12th to Lura Consulting.

Attendees introduced themselves (the participant list can be found in Appendix A), and David commented that the workshop had been successful in bringing together a great mix of groups from a variety of sectors to discuss design options for the PLSC.

3 City Councillor Welcome

Paula Fletcher, City Councillor (Ward 30, Toronto-Danforth) expressed her gratitude at being able to have a conversation about the PLSC with various stakeholder groups. Councillor Fletcher announced that the City Council had just that week overwhelmingly passed the Lower Don Lands (LDL) Plan, to which many people in the room had contributed. Another important plan the City has is to increase ice pad availability within the central part of Toronto, especially as girls' hockey grows in popularity. Given that \$34 million has been

allocated from the federal government to the City of Toronto to build ice pads, Councillor Fletcher explained that it is necessary to have thoughtful conversation on the design of the facility, to have good public consultation, and to build consensus. The PLSC project has guiding principles that were developed in a previous Community Development and Recreation Committee Meeting, including the need for design excellence and to conform with the LDL vision and plan. Councillor Fletcher encouraged those gathered at the workshop to work together to create a beautiful arena on the waterfront.

4 Overview of the Port Lands Sports Centre Project

Following Councillor Fletcher's welcome, Gwen McIntosh, Acting Director of the City of Toronto Waterfront Secretariat, presented background information about the PLSC project. Gwen explained that the City has \$34 million in the Waterfront Revitalization Capital Budget committed to a regional sports facility in the waterfront. City Council has directed staff to investigate the feasibility of developing a facility with multiple ice pads and supporting amenities at 85 and 95 Commissioners Street in the Port Lands. Gwen spoke about the Port Lands, indicating that the area is approximately 400 hectares. The sports facility would sit on the eastern edge of what is known as the Lower Don Lands, which is approximately 125 hectares, and would bring clarity to the waterfront vision and help tie the Port Lands to the rest of Toronto. The project has a number of "givens", which include location (85 and 95 Commissioners Street), fitting in with the Lower Don Lands vision, operational viability and affordability, LEED Gold certification, design excellence, four pads, and the establishment of a Community Sports Reference Group to provide advice during the detail design of the facility. Finally, the project has a number of guiding principles which were formulated by the Community Development and Recreation Committee on April 23, 2010.

5 Design Options for the Port Lands Sports Centre

Following Gwen's presentation, Bob Goyeche, Principal Architect at rdh architects inc., presented two design options for the PLSC. The PowerPoint slides from this presentation can be found online at <http://www.toronto.ca/waterfront/port-lands-sports-centre.htm>. He noted that what was being shown in the presentation are schematics only. Bob explained that rdh had partnered with 3LHD, a Croatian architectural firm that has designed many award-winning sports complexes around the world. Bob noted that one of the main challenges in designing the PLSC is that the facility must be functional and appropriate now, as well as in the future when the Port Lands will be a very different place. With that in mind, he presented rdh's two design options: a ground-based option (dubbed "Snowflake"), and a stacked option (dubbed "Icescraper" or "Iceberg"). Parking in the short-term for each option would include 200 spots, which would be expanded in the long-term. Both options would be designed for a LEED Gold rating.

6 Questions and Answers

Stakeholders were invited to ask questions to the PLSC project team prior to the working session. Please see Appendix B for a compilation of the questions and answers.

7 Working Session

Following the Question and Answer period, stakeholders were asked to discuss the following two questions in small groups:

1. What are the pros and cons of each design option?
2. What are the most important factors or criteria to be considered when selecting a preferred design option?

The following provides a summary of the feedback received. The comments are grouped by question and topic. One asterisk (*) illustrates comments mentioned between 2 – 4 times in the small group reports and on individual comment forms. Two asterisks (**) illustrates comments mentioned between than 5 – 9 times. Three asterisks (***) illustrates comments mentioned 10 or more times.

7.1 What are the pros and cons of each design option?

7.1.1 Icescraper Pros

- It makes efficient use of the land through its smaller footprint. **
- The design is unique and offers spectacular aesthetics. *
- It gives more opportunity to blend the project in with the surrounding area. *
- It fits in better with the Lower Don Lands Plan than the Snowflake design. *
- Its design may stimulate other good design in the area. *
- It is more environmentally friendly than the Snowflake design. *
- It does not intrude on the natural processes in the area.
- If a plaza is not built, there is the potential to accommodate other sports on site.
- Parking could be contained on one spot as opposed to being spread out.
- It may take advantage of economies of scale.
- Its design is “walkable”.
- It is an innovative design.
- Levels can be added or subtracted, making the design flexible.
- It keeps Basin Street intact.
- Its plaza may accommodate multi-purpose, cultural, and creative applications.

7.1.2 Icescraper Cons

- Its prodigious use of sunlight may make for poor ice quality. *
- Its design and use of elevators may hinder the flow of people. *
- Its design could hinder accessibility, especially for sledge hockey players. *

- Its design could pose a hazard for birds, especially since it sits in a North American songbird migratory flyway. *
- It may be susceptible to mechanical breakdowns (e.g., ice resurfacers, elevators). *
- Its cost could be exorbitant.
- It feels more disjointed.
- Two hundred parking spots are not enough.
- Its design offers less flexibility for future modification.
- Its single-use design is not optimal.
- Is the height appropriate for the area?
- Its design is visually “boxy”.
- Its design offers greater potential for family members to become separated or lost from parents and guardians.
- It currently does not incorporate an Olympic-sized rink.

7.1.3 Snowflake Pros

- Its design eases the flow of people. **
- It is more accessible. *
- It may have less visual impact from the park and other buildings compared to the Icescraper. *
- The roof could be more accessible for use. *
- It is more conducive to ancillary services (e.g., medical services). *
- It is more adaptable to future growth. *
- Its design may more easily accommodate tournaments.
- It offers a better "community space".
- It offers a more traditional layout for multipad complex.
- It offers more accessibility for special needs groups and players.

7.1.4 Snowflake Cons

- It does not fit in with the Lower Don Lands Plan. **
- It makes inefficient use of the land. **
- Its design is unimaginative. *
- It is financially less viable because of the loss of developable land. *
- It is aesthetically unappealing.
- It disrupts the streetscape.
- Its prodigious use of sunlight may make for poor ice quality.
- Two hundred parking spots are not enough.
- Its single-use design is not optimal.
- It closes off Basin Street.
- It probably could not meet the sustainability standards (LEED Gold) aimed for.
- The design sets a bad precedent for the kind of development hoped for in the Port Lands.

- It is less of a visual landmark than the Icescraper.
- It currently does not incorporate an Olympic-sized rink.

7.2 What are the most important factors or criteria to be considered when selecting a preferred design option?

7.2.1 Multi-Use Considerations

- The facility should accommodate multiple uses besides hockey (e.g., speed skating, figure skating, non-contact hockey, inline skating, indoor soccer, indoor cricket, lacrosse, tennis, running, community centre, etc.). ***
- The pads could be used for non-ice-based activities in the summer. *
- There is an opportunity for dry land training areas over the change rooms.
- A multi-use facility would accommodate multicultural needs.
- It would perhaps be better to use the plaza space for hard surface sports such as tennis, basketball, or soccer with artificial turf.
- A multi-use facility would help produce revenue from rents.

Question:

- Can a running track and patio be placed on the roof?

7.2.2 Parking

- There should be more than 200 parking spots. *
- Ultimately, all parking should be underground. *
- Parking is an important factor to consider.
- Consider the fact that a major event could have 2000 people arriving or leaving at once.
- It will be necessary to have multiple entrances and exits from parking facilities on different streets.
- The number of parking spots should be kept to a minimum.
- Parking should be close to the building.
- There should be two levels of parking.
- Surface parking must only be a very short-term and should be replaced with underground parking ASAP.

Questions:

- Can parking go deep underground considering the water table?
- Can parking be stacked?
- How was the parking # calculated?

7.2.3 Olympic-Sized Pad

- At least one Olympic-sized pad should be included in the design. **
- With consideration to hockey injuries, an Olympic ice surface will decrease the incident of body checking and collision and subsequent injuries, as the game is more wide open, with greater emphasis given to skills, passing and play-making. *
- If an Olympic-sized pad was put at the top, it could cantilever out and provide an overhang that would partly shade lower windows from the sun. *
- An Olympic-sized pad is necessary for speed skaters to host competitions outside of local events.
- Kids and adults alike really enjoy playing hockey on the larger ice surface.

7.2.4 Design Considerations

- The design should be innovative, creative, and spectacular. *
- There is a tremendous opportunity to create an environment that challenges the entrenched mentality around hockey as a brutish sport.
- This sports complex can have features and appointments that wrap each ice surface with elements of style and class that in themselves will add a sophistication and aesthetic to reflect the inherent grace and skill of the game.
- Given that many of the tenants will be children and youth in minor hockey programs, it is incumbent upon the design team to create a space that inspires our youth and reinforces positive behavior in their development as young hockey players and as young citizens.
- The design should be culturally exciting and beautiful.
- The facility should be considered a “building for the ages”, so costs can be amortized over the long-term.
- Form must follow function.
- Views and activities occurring outside the proposed windows may distract users and compromise their safety.
- Shadow movement on the ice from clouds may distract users and compromise their safety.

7.2.5 Pan Am Games

- Linking the construction of this facility to the Pan Am Games will accelerate its start date since it would have to be ready by 2015. *

7.2.6 Land Use

- The design should account for the economic benefit and development opportunities offered through efficient land use. *

7.2.7 Conformity to Surrounding Area and Vision

- The facility should integrate with the Lower Don Lands Plan. *
- The height of the building should fit in with the surrounding developments.
- The design should hold respect for valley and be able to integrate.
- The facility should be integrated into other priorities, agendas, and interests in the area.

7.2.8 Technical

- Boards should be removable for the purposes of speed and figure skating.
- It is imperative that the four ice surfaces be hard in all seasons, especially given the large amount of glass proposed in the designs.

7.2.9 Accessibility

- The building should be fully accessible to all users.
- At least one rink should be fully accessible for sledge hockey.

7.2.10 Cost

- Costs must be properly considered.

7.2.11 Environmental Issues

- Environmental impacts must be considered.
- Roofs should be green.
- The facility should be sustainable and energy efficient.
- The facility should take into account the biological regeneration principles of the Bring Back the Don group.

7.2.12 Transit

- Transit access must be properly considered.
- All publicity for the facility and all agreements with users should emphasize maximising use of the LRT to run on Commissioners with maps and directions.

Question:

- How does the proposal meet the City's objective to reduce car dependence (e.g., by locating near high-level transit service, by reducing available parking, and by being located near the population served)?

7.2.13 Safety

- Safety issues must be considered.

Question:

- How might this proposal contribute to safety and a vibrant public realm (i.e. the street), especially for women and children walking through the area in the evening?

7.2.14 Other

- The facility should be convenient.
- The facility must be usable all year round.
- There should be areas for pre-game meals.

7.3 Other feedback?

7.3.1 Two-by-Two (2x2) Pads

- An alternative design of two towers of two pads each is suggested. **
- Two stacked parking lots below grade should be incorporated. *
- This design should have a central concourse or atrium. *
- The third level of each tower could have off-ice activity space. *
- This design would help avoid elevator bottlenecks.
- Two of the pads should be Olympic-sized.

Question:

- It is possible to fit two towers into the footprint of the Icescraper design?

7.3.2 Area Context

- A roundtable of various interest groups should be formed so that the Sports Complex can integrate with other major projects.

Questions:

- What is proposed height of neighbouring development both to south and east?
- Is there an optimal height for the facility to best fit into its surrounding context?
- How does the proposed recreational complex capitalize on or improve the existing recreational uses in the area which are focused on water front parks, trails, urban wilderness exploration, cycling, hiking, canoeing kayaking and sailing?
- How does a planned single land-use fit with a strategy for mixed-use revitalization of the Port Lands?

7.3.3 Technical

- Elevators may create a traffic bottleneck.
- Elevator safety issues need to be considered (e.g., combatants and fans in the same tight space after a heated game).
- Elevators should be used for players going to change rooms and spectators should use stairs and ramps.
- Sunlight issues can be mitigated with light shelves and outside awnings designed to respond to the direction of sunlight.
- Heat chimneys can reduce the need for air conditioning (i.e., all spaces should have ceiling or high ventilators so that hot air will escape as it rises).

7.3.4 Other

- Having an even number of pads is good.
- Whichever design is chosen should factor in anywhere from 2000 to 4000 square feet for a dry land off-ice training and sports injury clinic.

Questions:

- Demographic and recreation trends indicate a preference for inexpensive, informal, non-scheduled recreation. Is there a recreation needs assessment that asks the City “what do you like to do for exercise?” How does this proposal fit into recreation trends and needs?
- Will the plaza be used on a day-to-day basis?
- Is it possible to have a public outdoor ice rink?
- Where is the public art going?

8 Closing Remarks and Next Steps

Gwen McIntosh thanked everyone for their attendance, and said that the project team had learned a lot from the evening’s discussions. Gwen reminded attendees of the Public Meeting on Tuesday, July 13, 2010, and stated that the design options would be presented to the Waterfront Design Review Panel that same week. She also explained that people can speak to the Executive Committee about this project by making a deputation on Monday, August 16, 2010. To do so, interested parties were asked to contact Imogen Nugent at 416.392.8485 on or after August 9, 2010, and before noon on August 13, 2010. For general information on making deputations to a committee, please visit <http://www.toronto.ca/committees/speak.htm>. Gwen McIntosh thanked participants, and adjourned the meeting.

DESIGN OPTIONS FOR THE PORT LANDS SPORTS CENTRE
STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP SUMMARY REPORT – JULY 8, 2010

Appendix A – Stakeholder and Project Team Attendance

First Name	Last Name	Organization	Sector
STAKEHOLDERS			
Braz	Menezes	York Quay Neighbourhood Association	Community
Carmen	Cummings	Scarborough Young Bruins Hockey Club - GTHL	Sports Community
Dalton C.	Shipway	Friends of the Lower Don Lands (FOLD)	Community
David	White	Waterfront Action Committee	Community
Denise	Aloisio	North Toronto Skating Club	Sports Community
Desmond	Preudhomme	Toronto Speed Skating Club	Sports Community
Don	West	GTHL	Sports Community
Evan	Armstrong	Sport Seneca	Sports Community
Heather	Johnson	University Skating Club	Sports Community
Heather	Watman	Toronto Penguins Hockey Club - GTHL	Sports Community
Jim	Panno	Panno Therapeutic Inc.	Sports Community
Julie	Beddoes	Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood Association	Community
Karen	Pitre	Toronto Sport Council	Sports Community
Kevin	Perry	Panno Therapeutic Inc.	Sports Community
Linda	Stapleton	Sport Seneca	Sports Community
Lori	Wells	Beaches Lacrosse	Sports Community
Matt	Rhodes	Parasport Ontario	Sports Community
Neil	Clifford	Toronto Non-Contact Hockey League	Sports Community
Paul	Dineen	Toronto Association of BIAs	Business & Economics
Rollo	Myers	West Don Lands Committee	Community
Ron	Baker	Leaside Girls Hockey	Sports Community
Steve	Falkner	Toronto Aces - GTHL	Sports Community
Susan	Lewin	Toronto Society of Architects	Planning & Design
Sylvia	Pellman	St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association	Community
Tim	McCutcheon	Leaside Hockey Association	Sports Community
Vickie	Mulé	Hillcrest Sports Club	Sports Community
Wayne	Burrett	Toronto Inline Skating Club	Sports Community
CITY STAFF AND PROJECT TEAM MEMBERS			
Nick	Lewis	City of Toronto	
Paula	Fletcher	City of Toronto	
Robert	Freedman	City of Toronto	
Susan	Serran	City of Toronto	
John	Piper	City of Toronto - Office of the Mayor	
Malcolm	Bromley	City of Toronto - Parks, Forestry and Recreation	
Gwen	Mcintosh	City of Toronto - Waterfront Secretariat	
Irene	Bauer	City of Toronto - Waterfront Secretariat	
Bob	Goyeche	rdh architects inc.	
Daniel	Herljevic	rdh architects inc.	

DESIGN OPTIONS FOR THE PORT LANDS SPORTS CENTRE
STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP SUMMARY REPORT – JULY 8, 2010

First Name	Last Name	Organization	Sector
Erik	Boyko	rdh architects inc.	
Tracey	Smith	Toronto Port Lands Company	
Don	Haley	TRCA	
Brenda	Webster	Waterfront Toronto	
Chris	Glaisek	Waterfront Toronto	
Raffi	Bedrosyan	Waterfront Toronto	
FACILITATORS			
David	Dilks	Lura Consulting	
Kurtis	Elton	Lura Consulting	

Appendix B – Compilation of Questions and Answers

- Q1: Could you clarify the parking arrangements for the stacked design option?
A1: The design team is looking at a variety of alternatives for parking arrangements. One of the images from the rdh presentation represents the current site as is, with surface parking. There is an option to have one level of parking underneath the plaza that slopes up to the first mezzanine. Both options are being examined.
- Q2: Do you get the same number of parking spaces using either alternative?
A2: Yes, the goal was to meet the minimum requirement requested by the City.
- Q3: Have you done any work on the costing of the two options?
A3: There has been some preliminary work on costing. Either option is going to take us above the \$34 million that is available for the project, so we have to look at opportunities to make the difference.
- Q4: Is there likely to be a large cost difference between one and the other?
A4: The stacked will certainly be more, but that is not driving the discussion. The architects are trying to ensure the differentiation between the two is as modest as possible.
- Q5: In your costing exercises, will you take into account the value of the land saved using the stacked option?
A5: Yes. Council has asked that staff look at that.
- Q6: Sports complexes come and go, but the Don River ecosystem has been there for over 10 000 years. The river must come first. How is runoff from the site being considered?
A6: It is a requirement by the City of Toronto to not allow runoff into the river. One of our top priorities is to capture all stormwater and keep it on the site and let it drain in an appropriate manner. We will use stormwater for toilets and irrigation, etc.
- Q7: Once plans are approved, when would development go ahead? Will the project be tied into others in the area?
A7: That is one thing that will be considered by Council going forward. There is pre-development work occurring now. Our job is to tell Council what we've learned, what we know, what we think, and they make the decision. The project of course must fit in with the vision for the Lower Don Lands development.
- Q8: Is there a gap in the maintenance costs between the two designs?
A8: The maintenance costs in the stacked design are very similar to a traditional ice pad. The elevators are the only additional maintenance item.
- Q9: What will happen to the roads in the area? Will they be able to handle the increased traffic?
A9: As far as roads or any other development in the area go, all of that is undergoing consideration as part of the EAs for the LDL plan. Many pieces must be brought together. The main point is that the area is being looked at holistically.

Q10: Why not consider a mixed-use building that combines, for example, the sports facilities with residential accommodation? This could fill the funding gap mentioned earlier.

A10: One problem is that private and public projects work on very different timelines. The other is that the stacked building will already be tall, so to build on top of it may not allow it to properly fit into the area.

Q11: What is the height of the stacked option?

A11: It goes up eight storeys, so if you're running on the upper mezzanine, you're on the seventh floor overlooking the park.

Q12: Do you need four zambonis for the stacked option?

A12: You could have just two ice resurfacers toggle between the four floors. It was envisioned for a facility of this size to have three ice resurfacers. That would be a decision to be made by whoever's running the facility. It probably makes sense to have four there so it's the operator who goes up and down rather than the machine. Overall, a cost-benefit analysis will be necessary to determine the better option.

Q13: Is there any opportunity to tie this in to the athlete's village for the PanAm games so it is built by 2015?

A13: That should be written down as a question or suggestion.

Q14: Are the four pads NHL-sized?

A14: Yes.

Q15: Did you look into constructing Olympic-sized pads? Having an Olympic-sized pad is a requirement for hosting provincial, national, or international speedskating competitions.

A15: Yes, we figured Olympic-sized pads were not as practical as NHL-sized pads for most purposes. However, we are not done looking into this matter.

Q16: Have there been measures taken to make sure the pads will be accessible in terms of board requirements, benches, and the like for sledge hockey?

A16: It is our intention to investigate into this matter. I think we have the opportunity to make this project more accessible than normal. Perhaps one or more rink will be made to be fully accessible for sledge hockey players.

Q17: How long will it take to build the facility?

A17: Construction time will be eighteen months or more. Once approved, you have to go through a detailed design process that takes six to nine months, but you can start construction before the process is finalized.