

## VanSplash Advisory Group Meeting #6

April 29, 2019, 6:00 – 9:00 p.m.

Vancouver City Hall

**Members in attendance:** Anthony Abrahams, Jean Campbell, Kaye Chapman, Cliff Cheng, Michael DiPietro, Dale Edwards, Abby Ferris, Samantha Garrett, Igor Kopecky, Carol Martin, Bronwen Mears, Anthony Mehnert, Barry Morris, Charles Tai, Arthur Tsai, Jarrett Vaughan, Marianne Wieland de Alvarez

**Regrets:** Stevie Nguyen, Peter Wong

**Park Board staff:** Leila Todd, VanSplash Project Manager

**Third-party facilitator and notetaker:** Jennifer Miller, Abbey-Jane McGrath

### Summary of Meeting Action Items:

1. Park Board staff will create a glossary of terms for Advisory Group reference and to be included in the VanSplash strategy
2. Online survey for Beaches, Wading + Spray, and Innovation recommendations to be sent out by facilitator (will still be discussed in next meeting)
3. Wording for overarching feedback from group about lack of trust in the Park Board to be sent out to Advisory Group by facilitator for group review and comment
4. Email for Advisory Group members to use to communicate with their networks and communities they represent to be sent by facilitator
5. Posters to be considered for aquatic facilities indicating opportunity to provide input to Advisory Group
6. Park Board to advise on suggestion to translate update communication into Chinese language
7. Options for staff involvement in next meeting to be sent out by facilitator for members' input

### Welcome, agenda review and housekeeping:

- Facilitator:
  - Recognized First Nations Territory, housekeeping, emergency procedures.
  - Outlined purpose of today's meeting: To discuss and provide feedback on draft recommendations, with a focus on the least-supported recommendations across all categories (indoor pools, outdoor pools, beaches, spray + wading, and innovation).
  - Reviewed updated Process Framework: we adjusted the focus of last meeting, the focus of tonight's meeting, and added another meeting (on June 10). Opened floor for questions / comments – none.
  - Reviewed agenda: Meeting #6: Lots of discussion time:
    - we will start with indoor pools, coming back to the recommendations we talked about last time, then discussing the online input on other recommendations;
    - then we will turn to outdoor pool recommendations discussion;
    - there will then be a presentation on beaches, wading + spray, and innovation recommendations;
    - next is Feedback Frames prioritization exercise on beaches, wading + spray, and innovation recommendations;
    - followed by discussion of least supported recommendations in those categories;
    - then how we can support you on communications efforts;

- finally, next steps

### Correspondence summary:

- Three emails received:
  - One email calling for support for outdoor swimming pools, community-scale pools and calling for replacement of Mount Pleasant outdoor pool
  - One email encouraging upgrades and renovations to older facilities instead of demolition
    - Staff response that the cost of demolition is considered when weighing options on case-by-case basis
  - One email encourages the group to submit revised wording for Recommendation #1 to explicitly support, restore, upgrade neighbourhood pools
- Full text of emails either already shared or will be sent with post-meeting package

**Greenhouse:** reminder of this tool in order not to lose ideas/suggestions; use post-it notes to write your ideas.

### Questions:

- Advisory Group member: suggestion – we are striving to get consensus on all of our discussions and something that became clear in previous meeting is we tend to get stuck on own personal definitions of words, instead of specific definitions differing from these. Suggestion to the group is that the VanSplash strategy should include a glossary.
- Advisory Group member response: I have a problem with the Park Board definitions; for example, “swimming pool” definition includes pools that are not big or deep enough for an adult to swim in; I do not agree with their definition; I agree with my definition that you should be able to swim in a pool. If the definition is not a good one, I am not going to agree with it
- Advisory Group member: who would write the glossary?
- Facilitator: group would put forward feedback that strategy should include a glossary; staff would decide if they are going to action that feedback and then staff would write the glossary.
- Advisory Group Member: would we then have a chance to review it and accept it?
- Facilitator: this relates to questions that have come up around whether we are able to rewrite the strategy recommendations, put forward new recommendations etc. This is an advisory group – primary role is to provide advice to the Park Board, as opposed to a working group, which is doing the work to generate the content; we have been asked to provide advice; if we were a working group, would have more time and likely not a volunteer group. Our role is to provide advice to staff.
- Advisory Group member: if we are here to give advice, if we agreed that we don’t agree with the primary recommendation, especially for example the city-wide approach to respecting neighbourhoods, if that isn’t incorporated in the recommendations; changing something to reflect what I am hearing from the communities, I thought that is what we are doing here.
- Facilitator: we are providing non-binding feedback and advice; the Park Board will consider the group’s feedback along with technical, budget and environmentally sustainable considerations (shows IAP2 graphic illustrating that sustainable decisions include public input, technical, financial and environmental aspects). The public input piece is very important: if there is no public buy-in to the decision, we have

seen that then the strategy is referred back and there is a delay. But public input is one of four pillars. Important to remember our Terms of Reference that we are not a decision-making body.

- Advisory Group member: there wasn't public input previously. This strategy has to reflect what communities want. Majority of people from your own studies, wanted to have neighbourhood pools maintained. I don't feel like the people that I am representing are being heard.
- Advisory Group member: back to the glossary – the planners have an idea of what the definition is; if we don't have the glossary now I don't see how it helps the group.
- Facilitator: staff will be working to update the VanSplash Strategy after this advisory group process, and the new report will be released publicly. A glossary may help other members of the public in reading and understanding the updated document.
- Staff: Would like to clarify – are you saying that a glossary would help to have now?
- Advisory Group member: Yes.
- Staff: we will make that happen.
- Facilitator: everyone please use the post-it notes to write down the terms you'd like to see in the glossary and staff will work to bring a glossary to the next meeting
- Group agrees they would like to see a glossary sooner rather than later – would help us now as a group, and would be included in next version of strategy so that it would help others

#### **Continue Discussion of Indoor Pools Recommendations:**

- Facilitator: We are continuing with the discussion from last meeting on least-supported indoor pools recommendations.

Recommendation #1: ***Move away from a predominantly neighbourhood scale pool system and deliver a greater diversity of swimming experiences at larger, community and destination scale facilities.***

Facilitator's Summary of What We Heard during last meeting (from the slide):

- *Neighbourhood pools are important – do not eliminate!*
  - *Have value in accessibility by foot, bike, transit and for seniors, marginalized; less crowded/busy*
- *Provide a diverse mix of pool sizes*
  - *Neighbourhood AND bigger facilities*
- *Aim for/maintain neighbourhood pool qualities/design in all sizes of facilities*
- Advisory Group member: how do we balance those who are in support of the recommendation – who we haven't heard from – with this summary, which is from those who do not agree?
- Advisory Group member: if people are in agreement with the recommendation, this is the place to speak up
- Advisory Group member: I was in favour of Recommendation #1, but I think that it is a good qualifier to "maintain neighbourhood qualities." It struck me that the reason that this recommendation was in there in the first place, was to make aquatics more accessible – more and larger facilities throughout Vancouver, distributed equally, so that more people get an aquatic experience; this made me support

this type of strategy. Yes, this would impact existing ones, but with a fixed budget, I would be in support of something that does the most with that budget

- Advisory Group member: I support the recommendation as-is. I go to UBC pool with my kids: There, the kids get to see a diversity of experiences; it is exciting to go to a facility that has lots going on. I have a four-year-old in a wheelchair; it is a great experience for her to see people playing sledge hockey and see that she can one day play this, for example
- Advisory Group member: I gave up with Hillcrest: when school is out, it is so overcrowded; this is the problem with destination pools. I do go to UBC, but we go in the car, which is not green
- Advisory Group member: our pools are overcrowded; we need to build more so that Hillcrest etc. can come down to their proper capacity. Currently operating above capacity – not meant to be that busy, but we lack capacity. Also, the areas where we are going to put destination pools in have density that is unprecedented. The number of neighbourhood pools we would have to put in to fill this demand is not possible. There are too many people. They are not putting in single family homes anymore. In the future, those people are going to be able to walk to these facilities or take transit to them
- Advisory Group member: Two pools that I am familiar with: Templeton and Britannia, primarily neighbourhood pools, and are also destination pools in that people come because they have past associations with those pools either as students or being involved in fundraising to have the pool created. Neighbourhood pools can also double as destination pools. But it is hard for destination pools to double as a neighbourhood pool
- Advisory Group member: when I think of density and the downtown area – they need a destination pool downtown. People manage to get there from everywhere because it is downtown. But the majority of this city IS single family dwellings. When 67 people spoke to Park Board we heard that with \$75 million you could build 10 neighbourhood pools with that money (instead of one destination pool).
- Facilitator: That number doesn't sound correct to me – staff can you please weigh in?
- Staff: My presentation for tonight (later) includes some cost estimates for building costs of small, medium and large pools – a neighbourhood pool in 2019 dollars costs well beyond \$10 million.
- Advisory Group member: Thank you for correcting.
- Advisory Group member: This is a plan for the next 25 years; most of the pools that we have, have doubled their lifespan. It is smart to be thinking about the growth of city and a bedrock being put in to keep access to aquatics. My second point: people are very community-oriented, but this is shifting. With the pools that have lots of options: I see this as a design challenge to create the neighbourhood feeling in larger facility. UBC is a great facility; but has no neighbourhood feel. It is important to embrace design challenges to accommodate lots of different aspects in one spot. Those facilities will serve the city better over the long-term
- Advisory Group member: Almost all new apartment buildings have pools in them, saunas, hot-tubs. People downtown have opportunities for aquatics in new developments
- Advisory Group member: Many of those building's pools are very small; me and the kids go to the pool, but kids cannot do laps; the density thing is very true; there needs to be another pool downtown
- Advisor Group member: Are we just saying we want to retain what we have – community pools that we have? Yes, and build destination pools.
- Advisory Group member: I don't think anyone is saying to move away from smaller, community feel pools; I think this plan is for 25 years from now, to be filling requirements for up to then. None of the

pools that we have now would last 25 years. Recommendation is touching on: yes, we want to maintain those existing pools, but money would be better spent on destination pools, which can be both. Destination pools with community feel. We won't have more functionality just because small pool.

- Advisory Group member: the pools we have now are all going to disappear; but it is keeping the mix. We need destination facilities. But we also need smaller pools where you can close the whole facility for Trans Swim and Teen Night. You cannot do these things in a bigger facility. For example, women only or clothing optional swims. Smaller size gives us flexibility to accommodate different options. There are these needs as well.
- Advisory Group member: From all I have done in my life in swimming: coach, involvement with seniors and swimming, rehab: I have seen what swimming activities can give to a person. Vancouver is 30 years in the past. There is no way Vancouver needs only one new destination pool – it should have three! Swimming is a cheap, healthy activity – you can do it if you are a senior, disabled, if you have money, if you don't. It isn't just for the swimming groups. I was at the provincial championships in Victoria recently and at the same time was public swimming in the other tank (with the water slide packed), and through the three days also saw synchronized swimming, diving all at same time – the amount of people using the same facility was impressive. More that can be done in this type of facility than small pool. There is a growing population in Vancouver; we are not 10 years behind we are 30 years behind. It is ridiculous what they are building in housing and lack of offering in services. If city wants to have a little community, Vancouver has nothing. For everything you need a lot of money. It is a city for who? A park or pool can bring community back. Grandview Heights facility in Surrey is amazing. I was there for 4-5 hours and counted people going in and out of the hot tub and there must have been 10 different nationalities, elderly, parents, kids, daycare for moms to play. We are missing bigtime in Vancouver. It's not about neighbourhood versus destination. We have nothing in Vancouver
- Advisory Group member: suggestion for new wording of Recommendation 1: change first six words of the recommendation to read: "Continue with a neighbourhood scale..." We want destination pools, but don't want to lose neighbourhood pools.
- Facilitator: again, we are an advisory group, not a working group. We can put forward a recommended wording, but we can't expect to see that exact wording in the updated strategy.
- Advisory Group member: Hillcrest is busy, and Templeton is nice, quiet just can get done what you need to. Whatever we do, it will be like the Canada Line – the facility will be overused in one or two years. I am curious to see what's in the staff presentation tonight.
- Facilitator: according to the agenda for tonight, we have already used most of the time we allotted to discuss all 11 indoor pools recommendations. This is a tough nut to crack. From what I understand, Recommendation #1 is one of the recommendations that was a flashpoint for why the strategy was not accepted. We are grappling with differences around the table. How would you like to spend our time in the meeting – continue to discuss this or move on?
- Advisory Group member: people who supported the recommendation should also be included in the feedback to the Park Board.
- Facilitator: we can do that but may be putting forward contradictory input.
- Advisory Group member: it doesn't have to be contradictory. Some pools have cracks and need to be replaced. But I say *replace* them. Edmonds – is a well used pool, but an older pool. Climate disruption is coming. It is going to be much worse. That is a huge part of how I perceive things: the existential loss of

us. Why aren't people talking about this? I don't get that we don't talk about this with how money is being spent in the city

- Advisory Group member: I am all fine with pros and cons that have been brought up with this recommendation. We are giving both a positive and a negative recommendation. All agree that there are things that we disagree and agree with, having them both on there is probably the best way
- Advisory Group member: there are reasons why the plan was not approved last time. Are there specific recommendations that were the most controversial?
- Facilitator: I was not at those meetings. 48 people spoke (68 signed up). There are videos of all the presentations, and there is a summary of what people shared in those presentations. We cannot ask you to watch all the presentations. The focus of the next Advisory Group meeting is all on community concerns. We will have a discussion at the end of today on how to approach that. From what I understand, there was a lot of talk about retaining neighbourhood pools that were said to be "earmarked" for demolition in an earlier version of the strategy (i.e. Byng and Templeton).
- Advisory Group member: Has Vancouver ever said why they have not maintained and improved these facilities? In 2010 said they were replacing one facility and haven't done anything to improve it. Have only built one change room that is accessible. Embarrassing the pools we have for a top-notch city.
- Advisory Group member: Britannia had a rehabilitation about 20 years ago.
- Advisory Group member: Is there any drawback to having supportive and not so supportive comments on one recommendation?
- Facilitator: it makes it harder for staff to update the strategy and bring it forward for approval. It puts it back to staff to find the middle ground. We could come back to same situation as before where some groups are very unhappy and perhaps other groups are supportive of the strategy but not coming forward to speak at a Park Board meeting.
- Advisory Group member: I do not see any drawback as long as whoever puts forward the recommendation - should feed into vision and principles that we discussed at beginning of process. Last time (previous draft strategy) whatever was put forward, the recommendations did not fit into vision/principles. What is more important is to put forward that which fits into the vision/principles. Do not see any problem with conflicting recommendations as long as we put forward the rationale for the position.
- Advisory Group member: We did agree to come to consensus on all feedback and currently we are not doing that. We need to probably come to a consensus on what our feedback would be. This is not achieved by putting something positive and negative. We are not finding the middle ground
- Advisory Group member: the main reason VanSplash went kaput is that people didn't like recommendation to get rid of neighbourhood pools. All of us agree we want destination pools; we also want neighbourhood pools. Why do we have to put forward both sides, I think what we have up there is fine, because Parks Board will have destination pools.
- Advisory Group member: let's move on to other recommendations
- Facilitator: I see many nodding heads. Should we move on to easy wins or keep going with the least-supported recommendations?
- Advisory Group member: we need to talk about those least supported. Let's go in order (of least-supported)

Recommendation #7: *Once the Connaught pool is fully operational, engage with pool users, community members, and key stakeholders to determine the impacts of the new Connaught Pool on Lord Byng Pool.*

Facilitator's Summary of What We Heard during Last Meeting (from the slide):

- *Byng and Connaught areas have diverse needs*
- *Area already serviced by UBC*
- *Need to plan for increase in population on Jericho lands*
- *Again, mix of pool sizes is key*

Facilitator: I am not sure what the group means for bullet two – because serviced by UBC one of Byng / Connaught not needed?

- Advisory Group member: It is difficult to get to UBC on transit; I feel that we need to keep Byng because not as far out as UBC.
- Facilitator: is this group feedback on the slide saying that you want to retain Byng regardless of what might happen at Connaught?
- Advisory Group member: Yes
- Advisory Group member: there has not been proper consultation in the area from what I understand from people near Connaught (Kits area)
- Facilitator: as staff has shared in previous meetings, once the VanSplash Strategy is approved, then they will have consultation in each community related to specific recommendations. So this recommendation is saying when and if Connaught is built, we will engage with Byng community.
- Advisory Group member: the impacts of new pool will be gauged once the pool is built. Not like one is being taken out to build the other
- Advisory Group member: what I'm hearing from the community is that no information was given about a pool that's planned in their backyard
- Staff: there were multiple posters at different community centres about the opportunity to apply for this Advisory Group; we then received an email from members of public saying that there are no posters advertising this Advisory Group. The manager of the facility in question, sent pictures of the posting of group. My point is that it is challenging to get information about consultation/engagement noticed.
- Advisory Group member: Hillcrest – did people actually vote to have a pool? It just happened. As coaches we cannot get enough pool time
- Advisory Group member: This recommendation is saying once Connaught pool is operational, they will engage with Lord Byng pool users to see what their needs are. Doesn't say pool will be demolished. Do we agree with that?
- Advisory Group member: yes, but what has gone on in past?
- Advisory Group member: it is illogical unless the new pool has already been approved, and funding is available, then makes sense to discuss whether we should engage the community
- Facilitator: this is a long-term 25-year plan. There is intention to do certain things, but not written in stone. There is intention to build a pool at Connaught. Has a budget been approved for Connaught?
- Staff: There will be no budget until the VanSplash Strategy is approved

- Advisory Group member: We are getting stuck in the weeds. Recommendation #6 is where the issue of whether to build the (Connaught) pool is.
- Facilitator: I'm hearing that there is a lack of trust in the Park Board. What can we do about that?
- Advisory Group member: Can we strengthen that recommendation to make sure that the consultation occurs?
- Facilitator: It seems the feedback from last meeting is you want to protect Byng no matter what might happen at Connaught. Is that what the group would like to put forward?
- Advisory Group member: Byng is not a great pool. There is no staff space, no classroom, no space for universal change room; there are problems. Do we want to eliminate that pool once the pool is built at Connaught? We might want to rethink it, rebuild it. The majority of people who spoke at the Park Board meeting were from Byng and do not trust the Park Board
- Facilitator: if this group puts forward feedback to replace Byng, what would that mean in terms of budget trade-offs for other facilities?
- Advisory Group member: The issue is can we afford proper destination pools if we commit to neighbourhood pools? Do not want to commit to these if we cannot build larger, more efficient, more used destination pools. No problem with neighbourhood pools, but can we do it all? Reality is there are only so many dollars.
- Advisory Group member: Vancouver is a rich city. Where did all those CACs (community amenity contributions) go? Why are our amenities dwindling?
- Advisory Group member: This is a 25-year plan. I hope we can put a destination pool in that time. Question is not about trust, but who paid for Hillcrest? If it is the same scale as destination pool we are thinking about, where is the money for a destination pool? No problem with neighbourhood pool, destination pools; we can go ahead with all the recommendations, if we don't know if they will be built. Hillcrest facility was built with Federal money, not the Parks Board money.
- Staff: will check on funding for Hillcrest and bring the information back to you – do not know details.
- Advisory Group member: There is such a thing as fundraising. Other countries get companies to sponsor swimming pools and swimming programs. There is a lack of motivation in Vancouver. In the past, we have built swimming pools with fundraising. We can do it instead of just saying the budget isn't there
- Advisory Group member: Maybe we should go back to recommendation #7 – can we go through the bullets and disagree or agree?
- Facilitator – does anyone disagree with what's on this slide (all the bullets)?
- Advisory Group member: I disagree with the second point
- Facilitator: As I said before, I'm not sure what the second bullet means. Can we remove it? Yes
- Remove second bullet – consensus
- Facilitator does anyone disagree with one, three and four? No

Recommendation #6: ***Provide a new City-wide destination pool with sport-training focus, at Connaught Park as part of a future arena and/or community centre renewal.***

Facilitator Summary of What Was Heard at Last Meeting (on the slide):

- *Concerns about Connaught location*



- *Need to consult community*
- *Consider alternative (Templeton?) site if community opposed*
- *Sport-training-focused facility needs to include diving, synchro, water polo etc.*
- Facilitator: What are the concerns with Connaught location? If not Connaught, what are location criteria? With understanding that available land is limited and Park Board not in position to purchase land.
- Advisory Group member: Whatever they build, will have to take away field space.
- Staff: The desktop analysis of configuration says no net loss of field space. Detailed studies still need to be done.
- Advisory Group member: There is concern with Connaught being on West side of city – should be further East
- Advisory Group member: I do not think one should wipe out other – could do something on East side too. Use of facility over 50-year period. I think it is an ideal location – given single-family home transition. Jericho lands is going to be high-density, packing people in. Should also be consideration for an East side facility too
- Facilitator: from what I'm hearing I don't see quick wins on this recommendation. I don't want to stifle your conversation, but need to check in and highlight that we won't be able to get through the other recommendations tonight – which would cut into community concerns conversation slated for next meeting. How would the group like to proceed?
- Advisory Group member: we need to trust we will get through the other recommendations more quickly. These are the important recommendations to discuss
- Advisory Group member: having reviewed the beaches, spray + wading, innovation recommendations – these could be very simple to deal with
- Facilitator: I'm hearing that you want to continue this discussion. We can do something online for beaches, spray + wading and innovation, but I also know there are people in the group who are keen to discuss beaches, innovation and don't want to short shrift those discussions.
- Advisory Group member: What we are discussing today is also community concerns, which was going to be discussed next meeting.
- Facilitator: OK to continue with discussion. Let's pause here and have the staff presentation.

#### **Leila Todd - Presentation: Land Context:**

- 1,000 residents: 1.1-hectare park land: ideal ratio
- Playground: ideal is within a 5 min walk catchment; there are areas in Vancouver where that is not currently achieved
- Estimated building costs in 2019 (not including land):
  - Small pool (comparison – Renfrew) – \$25-30 million cost to build
  - Med (comparison – Killarney) – \$30-40 million
  - Lg (comparison – Hillcrest) – \$55-70 million
- More programming opportunities at large size

- Land where Killarney centre is located is 13.36 hectares – 33 acres. Would be approx. 300 houses to get a park land that size. Municipalities purchase land at market value. Estimated land cost if land assembly even possible would be roughly \$510,000,000.
- Park Board is not in a position to purchase land for one specific programming. Any land would have to have multiple recreational opportunities.
- To put in context, \$44 million in parks and open spaces development is in our approved 2019 budget (as per publicly-available 5-year financial plan). The Park Board only has \$10 million for acquisition of park land in 2019.
- Broadway Plan: there is an opportunity to provide feedback. Engagement in process. Population is coming, subway coming to Broadway drove idea to have public aquatic facility in that area (i.e. Connaught)

Questions:

- Advisory Group member: Because of limitation of land available, and resources to buy land, our hands are tied, is that correct?
- Staff: yes, this is another challenge in Vancouver
- Advisory Group member: Can City help with this challenge?
- Staff: land acquisition is slow and opportunistic, and when land does become available there is competition on what it could be used for
- Advisory Group member: Kits Pool is Park Board land?
- Staff: Yes
- Advisory Group member: Small, medium, large pools – from a number's standpoint, is that showing the amount of park land necessary to build that type of facility?
- Staff: Don't necessarily need that size of land for building only, but available open space is ideal. Used these three as examples because they were built since the 2001 Aquatics Strategy.
- Advisory Group member: Would it not make sense to do Killarney sized pools, given that costs are similar to small size?
- Staff: depends on how you guys look at it?
- Advisory Group member: Killarney example – building cost of entire building (i.e. not just pool)?
- Staff: Yes. Cost for whole building.
- Advisory Group member: Same with Renfrew – not just the cost of aquatics?
- Advisory Group member: has there been any analysis for pools that are indoor/outdoor and community centres?
- Staff: yes, there are cost estimates in strategy – high level
- Advisory Group member: Large facility is double the price, but serves five times the people. Efficiency for dollar, that is where the large ones can serve more
- Advisory Group member: one of the reasons why Byng and Templeton came up is not size of pool, but that those are stand-alone facilities (no other community services). Cannot do these efficiencies.
- Advisory Group member: Believe Renfrew is one of most efficient pools – so it is not a size thing, but rather modernization
- Advisory Group member: I have a concern about us taking on the burden of worrying about cost. This narrows our vision. Rather, quality responses to a quality discipline: recreation. Also, I am concerned about buying into the assumption that the older a building is the more it should be on the

market for demolition. There is a pool built in '30s. Sherbrooke in Winnipeg. It was closed for about five years and then a partnership was formed, and I was delighted to find that pool open, genuinely a neighbourhood pool. They found resources to renovate/restore.

- Advisory Group member: I want to talk about the environmental impact of building a large facility: efficient from heating and cooling perspective and building on rapid transit line. Leads us in direction that something like Connaught is a very wise decision. We need to consider this. This is a new building that is not going to destroy the environment
- Facilitator: we are picking up the discussion on Recommendation #6 now
- Advisory Group member: Broadway corridor: we also need hotels in neighbourhood for competition facility. Broadway is within walking distance (of Connaught) and hotels there.
- Advisory Group member: concerned that underserved areas have to go beyond their area to get services – which is environmentally detrimental. People will be driving. This is a reason why there should be neighbourhood pools – environmentally reasonable, not about size.
- Staff: Greenhouse gas emissions that buildings, particularly pools, introduce to the environment can be much higher than the car ride that brings people there. Transit is an option too to reduce that. Need to consider what are we losing these lands for: greenspace, facilities?
- Facilitator: Just a reminder that the map in the presentation is Park Service Area – proximity to parks, not pools. We saw the proximity to pools map in a previous meeting
- Facilitator: Re: Recommendation 6: Are there people who disagree with the input on the slide?
- Advisory Group member: I do not agree with considering an alternative site
- Facilitator: We have a lack of consensus. How would the group like to reconcile?
- Advisory Group member: I want to hear the rationale for support or against.
- Advisory Group member: We've been talking about the rationale for the last hour
- Advisory Group member: There is a golf course next to Langara – right on the Canada Line. There should be the destination pool there.
- Advisory Group member: The YMCA is building a brand-new pool right there beside Langara Golf Course
- Advisory Group member: So, this is the idea of partnerships?
- Advisory Group member: Would this new pool be considered a destination pool?
- Facilitator: We distributed information to the group by email about what is proposed at the new YMCA facility. There is a pool in place now, and there are plans to replace it.
- Advisory Group Member: We are unable to come up with an alternative location, are those still strongly feeling that – do we want to strike concerns about Connaught location?
- Facilitator: does anyone disagree with getting rid of concerns about Connaught location? No.
- Keep the bullet about consult the community
- Keep the bullet about sport training should include...
- Does anyone disagree? No. Consensus reached.

***Recommendation# 5: Once the Britannia Community-plus pool is fully operational, engage with pool users, community members, key stakeholders to determine the impact of the new Britannia pool on Templeton Pool.***

**Facilitator's Summary of What We Heard at Last Meeting (from the slide):**

- *Both Templeton and Britannia are needed for capacity*
- *Again, retain neighbourhood pools*
  - *Values, qualities, experience, accessibility can't be replaced by larger facility*
- Advisory Group member: I agree with recommendation 5 as-is
- Facilitator: I'm hearing the same lack of trust – concern about Templeton being on chopping block despite what recommendation says
- Advisory Group member: I don't think both are needed.
- Advisory Group member: both are definitely needed. These are not the same neighbourhoods
- Facilitator: can you live with this input going to the Park Board?
- Advisory Group member: how can we strengthen the recommendation to ensure that the engagement is done?
- Facilitator: the wording is that the consultation will be done, so maybe the lack of trust is beyond the recommendation. I will suggest that we put lack of trust in the Greenhouse – so that we can talk about it overarching the whole strategy
- Advisory Group member: I'm not comfortable with this input that both are needed – these two pools are only 1.5 km apart – doesn't make sense to do 2 small pools when can do one larger one
- Advisory Group member: the new Britannia pool is not going to be bigger than current one. These are both well-used community pools
- Advisory Group member: Templeton has its own unique function in serving certain parts of community – worth looking at what the impacts of the new facility is first
- Facilitator: we have feedback to show that group is not against the recommendation in full; can still put forward this feedback and will also show that 10 people agree with the recommendation as-is
- Advisory Group member: If we agree both pools are needed, but 10 people agree with recommendation as-is, if Park Board can come up with option for larger pool in area. Right now, it is said that it will not be a larger pool, it would be the medium size.
- Staff: It is a medium sized pool (what's proposed at Britannia)
- Advisory Group member: I have reservations that Britannia and Templeton are very close together and would it not be better to recommend that Park Board go to another location – say, further East. To put replacement for Templeton. Spread elsewhere in city there is a further spread between pools in a less populated area of the city. Perhaps move Templeton to Hastings Community Centre.
- Advisory Group member: I disagree.
- Advisory Group member: Wouldn't it be more efficient to work with what we've got than move a facility over a couple blocks?
- Advisory Group member: Wouldn't you get cost efficiencies of pool and community centre on major transit route?
- Facilitator: are we getting out of the scope of the recommendation: to consult the community?
- Advisory Group member: Concern with group's feedback saying to keep both of them.
- Facilitator: those who are wanting to put forward that both Templeton and Britannia are needed for capacity, if you believe that Park Board is going to engage with the community, do we need this: "both pools are needed"? If we remove the issue of mistrust, do we need the first bullet?

- Advisory Group member: Still cannot get pool space at these facilities, even though 1.5 km apart. What is the data? Have a feeling it will show very well utilized facilities.
- Advisory Group member: Do the consultation – and if it is needed, then we will keep both of them
- Advisory Group member: a pool well run always makes money. Vancouver does need new pools and there is existing land. Groups are willing to rent
- Advisory Group member: Can we make the first line include an assurance that community will be consulted?
- Staff: Engagement in general for most municipalities has change significantly in the past 20 years. In 2000 there may have been only 2-3 meetings for a large project. With the technology, most municipalities are doing more engagement and hiring experts to assist with process
- Facilitator: could we change the language to say: If engagement studies show that both are needed, both should be retained?
- Advisory Group member: There is no trust. Community engagement has not been done. Britannia community said they had to fight for everything they want. Not understood that there are a lot of poor people without the things fancy communities have.
- Advisory Group member: As long as consultation is done, we have to believe that this will look at what the needs of the community are. If needed, should update pools to meet capacity.
- Advisory Group member: Could we have an overarching statement that emphasizes a lack of trust and the value of consultation that would frame all of the recommendations we are making?
- Facilitator: Yes. Suggested wording: across all recommendations, the AG has identified a lack of trust in the Park Board and a lack of listening to local communities. We see a desire to consult local Vancouverites on all the specific actions in the strategy.
- Advisory Group member: Is the suggestion to combine recommendations 7, 5 and 8, which are looking at what to do with existing pools once other pools are built?
- Advisory Group member: No. This would be a separate piece of feedback across all recommendations.
- Advisory Group member: Could the facilitators write out that wording and send it out to us for feedback as a starting point?
- Facilitator: yes.
- Advisory Group member: That means we are taking out bullet number one - if we are trusting them.
- Advisory Group member: I am not ok removing bullet one – it isn't ok for me to say remove it, when I have heard from the community that they want to keep these pools
- Advisory Group member: If you close Templeton to renovate, we lose our program
- Staff: VanSplash strategy specifies continuing service – that means the plan is to avoid any service gap
- Advisory Group member: build another pool.
- Facilitator: The previous strategy recommendations to get rid of Byng and Templeton are no longer in the draft. But I'm hearing that the Byng and Templeton communities don't believe they are protected/saved.
- Advisory Group member: Suggest change the wording to both Templeton and Britannia “may be” needed for capacity.
- Advisory Group member: “may be” is too weak. Disagree.
- Advisory Group member: Suggest change the wording to add “future” capacity.

- Notetaker: suggestion for wording to replace bullet one: “Any future consultation should start from an understanding that both Templeton and Britannia are needed in 2019 for capacity”
- Group agrees on this wording

**Facilitator:** The other indoor pools recommendations were not discussed at last meeting, but you provided input after last meeting via the online survey.

- Online survey had a 79% response rate; your input was summarized by the facilitators (i.e. not Park Board staff)
- We will share full survey report with members; what is on the slides is a summary

*(From slide): Recommendation 2: **Where feasible, co-locate outdoor pools with indoor pools to offer a greater range of aquatic experiences at each facility and to maximize operational efficiencies.***

- 12 members are OK with this recommendation as-is
- 3 are not. Their input:
  - Problems with definitions of “outdoor pool” i.e. newer one at Hillcrest is a wading pool; not big enough for an adult to swim there
  - Community input should determine type of pool built
  - Co-location should be expanded to other community facilities, not just indoor pool
- Group consensus to put forward these bullet points

*(From slide): Recommendation 3: **Decommission existing stand-alone whirlpools in community centres which have safety and operational challenges.***

- 14 people are OK with this recommendation as-is
- 1 is not:
  - Community consultation is required on what to do with these whirlpools, especially Kits
  - Safety problems can be rectified; staff can be hired (create jobs)
- Advisory Group member: would want to show how many people agreed
- Advisory Group member: my understanding is there are hygiene problems with these whirlpools – but can be fixed
- Advisory Group member: I’m familiar with other old whirlpools at non-Vancouver facilities and there are problems with some parts that can’t be replaced. If people even sit on filter, can get sucked into it and can drown. Cannot fix it. All the old stand-alone whirlpools are like this.
- Staff: This recommendation is only about stand-alone whirlpools in three community centres: Kitsilano, Dunbar and Marpole. Not connected with a pool. Just a whirlpool.
- Advisory Group member: Kits do have a stand-alone whirlpool. They seem to really want it there. If they build Connaught, there will be a (new) whirlpool there.
- Group consensus to remove the feedback and group supports the recommendation as-is

*(From slide): Recommendation 4: **Replace Britannia neighbourhood pool with a new Community-plus scale pool on the Britannia site.***

- 11 people are OK with this as-is
- 4 are not:
  - Do not increase size of Britannia facility
    - Renovate only – do not replace
    - Needs to be replaced
  - More / better consultation + listening is required with this community to understand what they want
    - Be sure to include all classes and ethnicities
- Advisory Group member: who is opposed to replacing?
- Advisory Group member: I'm a fervent believer in renovating: more cost efficient and respects what has gone into it
- Staff: Car analogy: can continue to repair and replace parts, but comes a time when it's not safe to get on the highway. There is a liability component to public facilities that are highly used, and a point at which it is no longer feasible to do patchwork.
- Advisory Group member: replace and definitely with larger facility to serve that community – if large enough, could be adequate to fulfill needs of that community and Templeton
- Advisory Group member: bigger is not always better. Progress is what everyone goes for, not always the best thing. Have people been asked in that community?
- Advisory Group member: What size is community-plus? How much bigger? Between medium and large – how described in VanSplash. That community is terrified that something like Hillcrest will be dropped in there. Something Killarney size would probably be ok. Community is rattled because bigger than that. Trust issue again.
- Advisory Group member: Should be as big as possible. Do not see advantage of keeping same size. It's a more densely populated area.
- Advisory Group member: Renovations can add to usage – what about along these lines?
- Advisory Group member: agree that should be as large as possible. Architect who spoke before explained that a renovation at this point in time, with all that changes in architectural requirements, requires that the pool needs to get redone. Could call it a renovation but would essentially be the same thing as replacing.
- Advisory Group member: close enough to downtown that whole population could go there as a destination pool
- Facilitator: suggest we remove all of first section on not to increase size, renovate only, replace – Group consensus
- Advisory Group member: suggest we add “and user groups” to feedback about consulting the community – Group consensus

**Discussion on communications update, engaging your networks and approach for next meeting:**

- Facilitator:
  - Staff member has left meeting for wrap-up conversation
  - If there is any feedback that you would like to give without staff in the room, now is the opportunity

- Advisory Group member: Sean Healey – it is really helpful to have him present – because he had an in-depth knowledge of the issues and projects
- Advisory Group member: I have a lack of comfort with him in the room – if need to speak about people who report to him (facilities staff, etc.)
- Advisory Group member: I agree
- Facilitator: I want to touch on communications and then we can work back to staff and their role in the next meeting.
- Facilitator: Would like to remind you of the Terms of Reference and section 7.9 under Roles and Responsibilities: “Members are asked to share information about the group’s work with and listen to input from community members and other interested groups and individuals.”
  - We are also planning an update communication to the VanSplash email list
  - How can we support you in engaging the communities you represent, so you can bring their voices to the table too?
- Advisory Group member: I like the idea of an **email** directing people to where to go and what we are doing
- Facilitator: we can develop an email you can copy and paste with an update on our work so far (brief summary) and include link to meeting notes and ask for input
- Advisory Group member: Would it be appropriate to put up **posters** around pools as a reminder that we are here and how they can contact us?
- Advisory Group member: I work with a lot of Native people. Really important issue: consultation around land has not always gone well. Try to make it as clear – trust is something that they keep bringing back to me. Has to be dealt with.
- Facilitator: transparency is something that can help with lack of trust. Could be a start to share an email.
- Advisory Group member: Can information be produced in Chinese language? I share some updates with my contacts but cannot give them enough information.
- Facilitator: I will raise this with Park Board staff and explore if there are resources for this, but important to note there are many different languages in Vancouver and if we translate into one, why not all? We grappled with this during the application process for this group as well.

#### Next Steps / Wrap-up:

- Facilitator: Next meeting is May 13; focus will be on recommendations (the ones we didn’t get to discuss tonight) and community concerns
- Community Concerns discussion – what we have been asked to review and provide insights on:
  - amendments to strategy proposed by previous Commissioners at Jan 28, 2018 meeting
  - concerns by 48 members of the public who spoke about Draft strategy at Dec. 11 and 12, 2017 and Jan 29, 2018 Board meetings.
- Facilitator: what would you like to see for this discussion? What do you need to be successful? For example, we have identified it’s not appropriate for staff to give presentation on community concerns, as you are representing the community.
- Facilitator reminded group of the Power and Magic of Neighbourhood Pools book developed by Byng and Templeton communities that was shared by email previously, and passed around a hard copy of the book as well as a selection of the book content that was suggested by a member of the public.



- Advisory Group member: After our first advisory group meeting, 30 people showed up at the pool to talk to me about what happened at the meeting and what they wanted. It's a big responsibility. Takes me time to understand all these different pools. What you could do because trust issue is so huge in that community, is there any possibility of showing what these people were so adamant about?
- Advisory Group Member: Could provide links to the meeting videos
- Facilitator: Many hours of videos – we cannot reasonably ask you to watch all of those. We cannot pull out certain sections of the videos to show you – would not be appropriate We'll send out the links and if you would like to watch them, please do.
- Advisory Group member: Different concerns all come back to lack of trust. Wonder if what we are doing here is all a sham and decisions already made. The community wants improvements. We know facilities are out of date and want concrete statement that they think something is happening so that they can regain their trust. Whether don't like Kits renovation, or don't want Kensington Pool closed, often one certain issue.
- Facilitator: We will discuss lack of trust as part of community concerns discussion. What do you see as staff's role during that discussion?
- Advisory Group member: I don't mind if they are here. There have been public consultations, but then have ignored results.
- Facilitator: Anything else we can do to support you in next meetings?
- Advisory Group member: Role of staff depends on what we hear back from our communities with next outreach portion. Are staff flexible enough that they could come to answer questions, but then leave?
- Facilitator: Suggestion that you can give your feedback on staff's involvement in the online feedback before next meeting: We can give some options for staff involvement – i.e. present for part of meeting, all of meeting, none of meeting.
- Group agrees.