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The AMS is grateful for the opportunity to provide feedback and consult on UBC’s Game Plan. We believe that this plan presents a unique opportunity to shape and improve the student experience. As such, we would like to address the Guiding Principles of the proposal, as well as our views toward the outlined options for each hub.

The AMS strongly believes that aligning UBC’s Game Plan with UBC’s academic mission should be the first and foremost principle in any development. As such, we do not believe that there should be any net loss to academic land for future development (even if this does not result in a net loss of floor space). We also wish to stress the importance of having an academic facility dedicated to the School of Kinesiology (Appendix A).

While the AMS supports, in principle, granting additional resources towards facilities for varsity athletics, insofar as it supports student success and University pride, we believe that this should not be to the detriment of fostering recreational excellence. Furthermore, the AMS strongly believes that the allocation of resources between the recreation hub and spectator hub must be equitable, but not necessarily even, such that UBC develops recreational excellence and athletic excellence of equal and comparable quality. We feel recreational and athletic excellence are best measured in terms of dedicated space, spending, and staff, relative to both each other as well as to U15 schools.

The AMS also agrees that any renovations or developments of athletic facilities must have a strong financial case and minimize the costs incurred by students. Consequently, the AMS supports, in principle, moving the stadium to generate revenue from prepaid land, leases with the following expectations:

1. That all revenue generated is transferred to the Student Housing Financing Endowment (SHFE).
2. That this revenue is not loaned directly to the Athletics & Recreation but rather to Student Housing and Hospitality Services (SHHS), to be utilized to increase UBC’s financing capacity for additional student housing.
3. That the spend rate from the interest on the loan repaid by SHHS can be used, in part, to repay the initial loan by Athletics & Recreation.
4. That revenue from the spend rate is divided equitably, but not evenly, such that varsity and recreation are positioned to achieve equal degrees of excellence as outlined above.
5. That all revenues from student fees and tuition be allocated proportionally, but not evenly, with any remaining difference between the costs of the recreational and spectator hub to be covered through self-generated revenue, private sponsorship, or donations.

To clarify, the AMS does not support any options for which the revenue or profits from land leases is spent on the capital projects directly rather than being invested into one of UBC’s endowment accounts and generating income from the endowment spend rate. We strongly believe that UBC’s endowed lands must be used in a sustainable way that reflects the 99-year term the land lease income represents.

In regards to the proposed options, the AMS feels that several proposed options are preferable to the rest. In regards to the spectator hub, the AMS supports moving the stadium to either Whitman Field or the Rashpal
Dhillon Oval, contingent on revenues being utilized as outlined above and therefore believes that option one provides the least benefit and greatest cost to students. Furthermore, the AMS does not support the reduction of available academic land, regardless of whether there is a net gain or loss to academic floor-space, and believes that the School of Kinesiology should be provided with independent, school-specific facilities designed and dedicated to furthering their academic mission. As such, the AMS does not support Options 4 or Options 5. In evaluating Options 2 and Options 3, the AMS believes that costs incurred by students should be minimized, but that either option is acceptable as long as there is a strong financial case. Accordingly, the AMS supports the renovations to the baseball stadium, given that it is entirely donor-funded, but would like to see concerns about the impact that a reduction in field-space will have on student recreational programming addressed.

In regards to the Recreational hub, the AMS agrees that heritage is an important aspect of UBC’s culture, but that this alone is not reason enough to justify not maximizing the potential space that could be provided to students with Option 3. As such, the AMS fully supports Option 3, but still bears concerns that the proposed renovations to recreational and varsity athletic spaces do not bring students’ recreational experience to the same level of excellence that is currently enjoyed by varsity athletics. As such, the AMS would like to see new planned fitness space, in addition to Option 3, developed for the finalized Game Plan. Finally, we would like to express the necessity of not limiting student recreational access solely to the recreational hub and that while the concept of having centralized ‘hubs’ is agreeable, there is much to be gained from maximizing utilization by allowing access to students and clubs that currently do not have sufficient access.

In summary, the AMS would like to stress the importance of securing recreational excellence in tandem with varsity excellence, of maintaining the current level of academic land available for future growth, and of minimizing costs to students while maximizing available capital for future student housing growth. Finally, we would like to thank the University for taking the time to consult students and other stakeholders on this plan.
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Ava Nasiri on behalf of AMS Council
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