



Integrity Commissioner Bulletin 2025-01: **Jurisdiction of the Integrity Commissioner**

We received four separate complaints from members of the public about the Park Board's recent decision pertaining to the Vancouver Aquatic Centre ("VAC") Renewal Program, including the size of the lap pool that was approved for the new facility.

The complaints alleged that the decision demonstrated the Park Board Commissioners were failing to act in accordance with certain standards and values in the Park Board Code of Conduct, including competence, fairness, and leadership in the public interest. Several of the complaints also raised concerns about procedural aspects of the meeting at which the Park Board considered the VAC Renewal Program, including the decision to limit the speaking time for members of the public from five minutes to three minutes.

In addition, we received a number of complaints earlier this year after the Park Board voted to proceed with risk mitigation and restoration work in Stanley Park in response to the hemlock looper outbreak. The complaints made various allegations, including that the Commissioners had disregarded scientific evidence, had failed to show professional leadership, and that they did not act reasonably when they voted to approve the continued logging in Stanley Park.

Decisions about the City's parks and facilities attract significant public interest. Members of the public may disagree with some of those decisions. However, our Office is not intended to replace the functions of the democratically elected Park Board. Our jurisdiction under the Park Board Code of Conduct Policy is about the conduct of elected Park Board Commissioners and Advisory Committee Members, such as in their public communications, or compliance with confidentiality requirements. It is not the role of the Integrity Commissioner to evaluate or second guess the merits of public policy decisions, such as those pertaining to the design and size of new facilities or the restoration of public parks.

Similarly, it is not the role of our Office to assess procedural decisions made by the Park Board at its meetings. We understand that members of the public may take issue with decisions that limit their ability to participate at meetings, but it is not our role to second-guess these discretionary decisions made by the Park Board.

If members of the public have concerns about decisions made by the Park Board, they can reach out to Commissioners individually ([Park Board commissioners | City of Vancouver](#)) or engage in a public campaign to seek support and bring awareness with respect to their concerns. When we receive such complaints, we are required to reject them as being outside of our jurisdiction pursuant to section 5.13 of the Code of Conduct Policy.