

VanSplash Advisory Group Meeting #8

June 10, 2019, 6:00 – 9:00 p.m.

Vancouver City Hall

Members in attendance: Anthony Abrahams, Jean Campbell, Kaye Chapman, Dale Edwards, Abby Ferris, Igor Kopecky, Carol Martin, Bronwen Mears, Anthony Mehnert, Stevie Nguyen, Charles Tai, Jarrett Vaughan, Marianne Wieland de Alvarez, Peter Wong

Members in attendance by phone: Michael DiPietro

Regrets: Cliff Cheng, Samantha Garrett, Barry Morris, Arthur Tsai

Park Board staff: Leila Todd, VanSplash Project Manager, Michelle Larigakis, Public Engagement – Planning, Policy and Environment

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

Welcome, Agenda review and housekeeping:

- Facilitator:
 - Recognized First Nations Territory – to ground us on the land
 - As we look toward developing our report, we would like to take photos, request for permission to use photos in the report. If anyone has concerns, please let facilitator know.
 - Session Goals:
 - To discuss and reach consensus on Draft VanSplash indoor pools Recommendation 1
 - To discuss and reach consensus on additional recommendations and feedback put by Advisory Group members
 - To discuss and reach consensus on the remaining Draft strategy recommendations that have not yet been discussed (beaches, wading and spray, innovation)
 - These are the highest priority items as identified by Advisory Group members
 - Reminder of Code of Conduct posted at the front
 - Request from a group member that any members identify themselves if they are associated with the rally outside City Hall right now. Member had concern there could be a real or perceived conflict of interest
 - One member indicates they knew about the rally but didn't encourage people to come
 - One member indicates they were aware of the rally and indicated to those interested that it was a free world if people wanted to come
 - One member said they know some of the rally participants through their aquatics activities

Correspondence summary:

- 177 emails received from May 13 to June 10 through VanSplash address, direct to facilitator and /or forwarded from Advisory Group
- 111 emails related to the replacement plans for VAC, plans for new Connaught pool, considerations for a competition facility. Content included:

- Connaught plans are not sufficient for provincial and national competitions – calls to reconsider scale of plans
- Concerns re: plans to replace VAC with Connaught
- Consider refurbishing VAC
- Concerns about Connaught for diving and water polo
- Support for high performance swim centre and consult user groups
- 54 emails in support of neighbourhood/community pools. Content included:
 - Save pools from closure: Byng, Templeton, VAC, Britannia, Kerrisdale
 - Preserve future of neighbourhood pools in VanSplash
 - Restore and renovate existing pools
 - Maintain, renovate, restore and replace with same size pools
 - Support for smaller pools, neighbourhood pools
 - Include neighbourhood pools and destination pools; have both small and big; balance of large and small pools
 - Develop new neighbourhood pools and retain existing ones
 - No to destination pools
 - Support amendments put forward by Commissioners in 2018
- 5 emails supporting an outdoor pool in Mount Pleasant
- 1 email expressing concerns about the AGs mandate
 - Response from staff: following Board direction to only consider improvement and expansion
- 1 email expressing support for aquatics innovation and increase in accessibility of aquatics choices
- 1 email expressing concerns about plans for a natural outdoor pool
- 1 email sharing background and concerns re: feeling that neighbourhood pools are being eliminated through VanSplash
- 3 email exchanges between Advisory Group members and either staff or facilitator
 - Questions about risks of AG putting forward out-of-scope input; encouraging group to have faith in expertise
 - Questions about Jan 14 Board motion to only consider improvement and expansion of aquatics facilities
 - Questions about plans for Connaught and replacement of VAC; urging that sport governing bodies need to be consulted in plans for completion facility
- The full text of emails was sent via email to participants; facilitator encouraged members to read the emails in full; we expect more are coming and will continue to compile and share with group
- Advisory Group member: I got an email from the VP on the Board of Hastings Community Association – wanting to let me know that Hastings Community Association did not support a notice that was circulated, containing inaccurate information, and HCA is fully in support of the Advisory Group

Continue Discussion of Indoor Pools: Recommendation One

- Facilitator: Summary of our discussions to date on Recommendation One:
 - Mix of agreement and strong disagreement from Feedback Frames
 - Neighbourhood pools are important and have special qualities
 - Want a mix of pool sizes

- Vancouver needs more pools!
- Want most capacity possible / value for money
- Advisory Group member submission for consideration:
 - *“All currently existing neighbourhood pools (as of 2019) will continue to exist and will be maintained, retrofitted, renovated or replaced and not demolished”* in keeping with the spirit of the motion not to decommission neighbourhood pools such as Lord Byng and Templeton, I would like to put forward this recommendation to be read in conjunction with Recommendation One
- Advisory Group member: no one wants to close any pools. How do we engage in this discussion – we were told we should avoid rewriting recommendations. But should we try to rewrite the recommendation? Or should we put the emphasis on the fact we don’t support the recommendation?
- Facilitator: You could try to rewrite. It might take a long time. But you can suggest wording
- Advisory Group member: the wording in the existing recommendation was too ambiguous and you will continue to get much more input from communities if it is not clear that those pools will not be demolished.
- Advisory Group member: when you read through emails and see what happened historically, this whole committee seems to be constructed around community pools and Templeton and Byng. Unless there is a way to show there is something built on fact and not opinion and passion, these things are going to get hung up. What if you modified recommendation one with a caveat? People believe the city is trying to put forward an idea of closing Byng after Connaught is built, but you aren’t going to know the impact until those new pools are up and running. There should be an addition that says those new pools can be built, but the other pools will be left open (Byng and Templeton) for five years with commitment to a full consultation and impact study. This would be a way to give Recommendation One a comfort level for everyone.
- Facilitator: You each have a set of cards that we can try using tonight to quickly indicate level of support for a specific piece of feedback. Green, Yellow and Red – like traffic lights. Explanations of what the colours mean are on the back of each card. If you hold up your green light: I support / can live with this input as-is. Yellow: I am unsure / I have a suggestion to adjust this input. Red: I am not comfortable / do not support this input. Let’s try this with the suggestion we just heard about keeping Byng and Templeton open for a minimum of five years and completing comprehensive consultation and an impact study
- Advisory Group members show support for this with Green, Red, Yellow Light Cards: a mix of colours were shown by the Advisory Group members
- Facilitator: Yellows, do you have a suggestion for an adjustment that might be more palatable to group?
- Advisory Group member: In the January 2018 meeting, (former Commissioner) Kirby-Yung put forward an amendment for re-wording of Indoor Pools Recommendation 1: “Support a balanced delivery model that includes neighbourhood scale pools as well as larger community and destination scale facilities to deliver a greater diversity of aquatic experiences.” This moves to a more balanced approach
- Advisory Group members show support: lots of green light cards
- Advisory Group member: this wording doesn’t mean that they are not going to close the pools – this is still dangerous water

- Advisory Group member: I support the balance of neighbourhood and destination pools language. Templeton and Connaught are so close together – is it more fair to the Vancouver community to put new neighbourhood pools in other neighbourhoods as opposed to renovating the existing neighbourhood pools. Is this more fair for the entire city?
- Advisory Group member: the proposed amendment is very reasonable. The current recommendation doesn't say it will or will not close pools – it is more of a visionary statement. It would be more strategic to add a recommendation where we say we don't recommend closing pools.
- Advisory Group member: the whole strategy is going to be challenging if we don't say something concrete around the Templeton and Byng pools. I was suggesting something that has a concrete timeline and set of actions to evaluate the impact once these pools are up and running (previous suggestion re: five years)
- Facilitator: let's get the temperature on supporting the recommendation as written by previous Commissioner, and then try to pull some wording as a group to add some more specific wording around Templeton and Byng
- Advisory Group member: we were instructed to not talk about pool closures – are we opening ourselves to having none of our input considered?
- Facilitator: if group wants to put something forward protecting pools, that could still be within our scope – because we are discussing improving and expansion. The direction from the Board was to only consider possible improvement and expansion of facilities.
- Advisory Group member: Also we could approach this through Indoor Recommendations 5 and 7. We could add a timeframe into those recommendations instead of Recommendation 1 - could put the idea of a five-year term in there.
- Current draft 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”
- Current draft 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”
- These recommendations could say that these pools would be open for five years with a commitment to community consultation and impact studies
- Facilitator asks for Advisory Group members to raise light cards as temperature check: lots of green lights raised
- Facilitator: The group seems to be leaning toward endorsing the revised Recommendation 1 wording from the previous commissioner and additional wording in Recommendations 5 and 7 to indicate Byng and Templeton would stay open for five years and that there would be community consultation and impact study commitment
- Advisory Group member: disagrees – I don't believe that if Connaught was built, they would leave the other pools... I don't think there has been proper consultation at Byng and Templeton
- Facilitator: The suggestion is that consultation would be done in that five-year period.
- Advisory Group member: The idea of consultation is also predicated by what people have experienced in the past with consultation, which has created a lack of trust. For example, the email list by the Park Board did not have right groups on it.

- Facilitator: We cannot fix the past. But this group has talked a lot about consultation and put forward a lot of consensus input on doing meaningful consultation
- Advisory Group member: We could add in the idea of *formal* community consultation and a *thorough* impact study, but the important thing to recognize is that we cannot understand impact of a new pool until it is up and running. This allows the community to engage once the pool is up and running.
- Advisory Group member: maybe we need to explicitly say “revisit how community consultations have been done with impacted communities.”
- Advisory Group member: 1. The community consultation issue could be addressed by putting consultation in the glossary to put parameters around what this means. 2. If you don’t like these ideas as an Advisory Group member, then need to suggest something better
- Advisory Group member: I would feel better with consultation if there was a pilot to determine if qualitative aspects have been met. If there was an evaluation of that engagement.
- Advisory Group member: The VanSplash Strategy didn’t pass because of Templeton and Byng. I would be doing the people outside (in the rally) a disservice if I didn’t support them. Where consultation has been done and communities wanted to keep pools, like Mount Pleasant, the pools were gotten rid of.
- Facilitator: most of the group is feeling comfortable with what is on the flip chart (Byng and Templeton would remain open for five years minimum after Connaught and Britannia opened; consultation and impact studies would be done; revisit how engagement is done; include evaluation). For those who are not, how can we adjust this such that we can all live with it?
- Advisory Group member: I like what was on the slide – the suggestion put forward by a group member – “All currently existing neighbourhood pools (as of 2019) will continue to exist and will be maintained, retrofitted, renovated or replaced and not demolished”
- Advisory Group member: There are major concerns about the buildings – those pools are going to fall apart; they are over their 40-year lifespan. We need to get some pools built. We are doing a disservice; we are restricting them. It would be better to say we need neighbourhood and destination pools. We need to get something built
- Facilitator asks for temperature on the submission on the screen re: not demolished – lots of yellow lights raised
- Advisory Group member: I am not comfortable with this. Our instructions were to not talk about closing pools. Why are we talking about NOT closing pools? We are not supposed to be talking about closing pools in the first place. This is not in our mandate.
- Advisory Group member: but we have been talking about it in our meetings – about not closing pools.
- Facilitator: we have been instructed to only consider possible future expansion and improvement. Does the group feel this is in contravention of that?
- Group: yes
- Facilitator: several group members feel that this is outside of our mandate. So, we cannot put this forward
- Facilitator: We are considering the amended wording to Recommendation 1 and additional wording on Recommendations 5 and 7 to say a 5-year minimum for Templeton and Byng pools to be kept open, with a commitment to consultation and impact study. As well as revisiting how engagement is done and with evaluation. Other comments?

- Advisory Group member: we were promised that our pool would be open for one year and would have consultation. Why would we think this would actually be done?
- Facilitator: we have no guarantee anything would get done. But we can put this forward as a group
- Advisory Group member: just a reminder that this advisory group is non-binding. We all want to get some pools built. There will be other avenues to protest and discuss different ways to do things; we need to move forward now – we need to build five or six pools before we consider closing any down
- Advisory Group member: can we move forward with what we have on the flip chart and indicate in the notes that two or three members disagree?
- Facilitator: yes – that could be a way forward
- Temperature check with light cards on Amendment to Recommendation 1 and additional wording on Rec 5 and 7 – indicating a 5-year minimum for Templeton and Byng with a consultation and impact study. As well as, revisit how engagement is done and with evaluation
- Facilitator: Three people disagree. Do you want to move on with note that three people disagree?
- Advisory Group member: is the only way you would agree is if we said we would never ever close these pools? (addressed to Advisory Group members disagreeing)
- Advisory Group member: yes
- Advisory Group member: there needs to be a guarantee that there is always a neighbourhood pool
- Advisory Group member: consultation won't change that neighbourhood pools offer something different than larger facilities
- Advisory Group member: I am feeling like they will do community consultation and the City will close these pools anyhow. This is the most important recommendation on the table because it could torpedo the rest. But a proper community consultation and impact study is important, and we could look at having specific requirements. I swim at Byng and think there should be a pool there.
- Advisory Group member: does it help the two members disagreeing if we say that we will keep a certain number of neighbourhood pools in the city? I just think that they might be better elsewhere
- Advisory Group member: no because we are robbing Peter to pay Paul. Every neighbourhood needs a pool. Renovate the one that is already there.
- Advisory Group member: not renovating and doing more to maintain pools is the reason that we have this whole problem in the first place. Yes, pools will need to be renovated. People keep saying they want somewhere close that they can go. We need to keep them, and they haven't been maintained and we have to deal with that
- Advisory Group member: To renovate a pool it is closed for 18 months to 2 years. If we don't build capacity first, then there will be no pool to swim at while it's being renovated. If the pool is closed for 18 months our program would be gone.
- Advisory Group member: True, we haven't built enough to keep up; we are looking at what Hillcrest looks like; but communities that are keeping pace like Victoria – they have older pools and mid-aged pools and newer pools; the biggest thing is that we are so far behind. When you say we haven't been keeping up: some pools have been open 10 years but have had 20 years of use, so they are just keeping it up enough to keep it open. Need more pools to not have this problem of so much use. Facilities that we have already built are already overcrowded. Remember that when you say that you don't like it. The Connaught pool that they are looking to build is going to be bigger than Hillcrest – it will be a place for people to come and stay nearby for a week for competitions

- Facilitator: is the place where we have landed on Recommendation 1 sufficient to help move VanSplash forward, or do we need to spend some more time talking about it? Are we ready to move on? Nodding heads.
- Final result: Two Advisory Group members opposed and one undecided on the flip chart recommendation re: five years, consultation and impact study.

Discuss Members' Submission for New Recommendations/Additional Feedback

- Facilitator: I have categorized all of the recommendations received on the flip charts on the wall
- **Operations:** Staff have advised that things related to operations do not belong in strategy. They are outside the scope of a long-term planning strategy. Leila has taken these recommendations directly to operations staff and has information to report back on these. Would you all like to receive the report-back? Nodding heads. OK, we will report back to the whole group by email.
- **Priority:** These recommendations all relate to prioritizing. What should take priority within the strategy – Facilitator suggests that this is out of scope for the Advisory Group; all members will have different priorities. If we feel that we cannot reach consensus on these, are we okay not to discuss?
- Temperature check with light cards: most do not wish to talk about it. We can return on Wednesday if we have time
- **AG Member Submissions Already Covered?**
- Less focus on use- specific/niche facilities:
 - covered in group input on Indoor Recommendation 8 *“Health and wellness focus is too narrow; should be a large, multi-purpose facility serving the needs of a wide variety/all user groups – wellness, health, sport training, competitive meets, diving, lessons etc.”*
 - covered in group input on Indoor Recommendation 10 *“Ensure therapy components are offered at all pools”*
 - covered in group input on Outdoor Recommendation 3 *“Don’t limit uses; don’t create individually focused facilities.”*
- Planning and building new destination pools should always be driven by public consultation that clearly indicates this is desired by a significant portion of community where facilities being built AND In consultation and planning of facilities community and user groups needs are considered
 - already covered in group input: *“across all recommendations, ensure meaningful consultation is done with impacted communities, user groups and stakeholders – based on City’s core values and guiding principles for engagement”*
 - Already covered in group input on Indoor recommendations 2, 4, 9, 10 – all mention need for consultation with community, user groups, schools
- Outdoor pools need to be big and deep enough for adult to swim
 - covered in group input on Indoor Recommendation 2: *“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.”
 - Covered in group input on Recommendation 3: *“Need to ensure ability/space for actual swimming in all outdoor pool facilities; dedicated swimming spaces with lines and straight walls.”*
- Too much focus on South Van – (outdoor Recommendations 6 and 7)
 - Covered in group input re: Outdoor Recommendation 7: *“Don’t limit to South Van”*

- Now that we have determined that these are covered, this leaves us with five categories of additional input. The facilitator has grouped the remaining non-operations, non-priority submissions by theme:
 - Bigger Picture – connecting with other issues/overarching policies – i.e. climate crisis, reconciliation
 - Fundraising and Sponsorship
 - Replace Outdoor Pools
 - Accessibility
 - Competition Needs
- Facilitator: asks Advisory Group members to take three dot stickers and prioritize the three categories that you most want to discuss and reach consensus on
- Facilitator: Bigger Picture, Competition and Outdoor Pools are top priorities; we will start with these
- **Submissions Theme: Competition Needs**
- Facilitator: What are the recommendations within this theme?
 - Competition facility at Connaught should be adequate in capacity to serve local age group, master and triathlete as well as water polo, diving and synchro. Big enough for provincial and preferably national competitions.
- Advisory Group member: a question I have is that why can't this be downtown or somewhere near VAC as opposed to where it is now at Connaught? I don't think community is ready for it and has been properly consulted.
- Advisory Group member: if we remove the location would it work?
- Advisory Group member: Yes
- Advisory Group member: we do not have any pool in the region that can do all of that stuff anymore – New West getting rid of diving, UBC doesn't have it. We need to tell in our recommendation that we want a recommendation that can do all that in one space. Let them figure out where it is. Just tell them, we should have these facilities
- ***Need a competition facility adequate in capacity to serve local age group, master and triathlete as well as water polo, diving and synchro, big enough for provincial and national camps***
- Advisory Group member: I wonder if we have to specify high diving boards?
- Advisory Group member: 1. Specifying national-level competition would include all heights of diving boards, leads to next piece of 2. there being a consultation with sports bodies when this facility is constructed. This is crucial to meet needs of communities they are going to serve.
- Facilitator: ***Add: to consult with National Sports Organizations, Provincial Sports Organizations and User-Groups***
- Facilitator: Does anyone disagree with this?
- No disagreement. Consensus Input
- **Submissions Theme: Bigger Picture**
- Recommendations within this theme:
 - First Nations people must be included an elected commission and, in all discussions, and planning with regard to aquatics facilities
 - Must always be a clear recognition of climate disruption and have decision-making and planning has addressed climate concerns

- Strategy should show clear recognition of social issues and know these have been addressed
- Need to plan in consideration of non-city facilities
- Need to view all recommendations through lens of climate change
- Member submission for consideration: First Nations people must be included in an elected commission and in all discussions and planning with regard to aquatics facilities
- Staff: I have a message to read from the Reconciliation Team at Park Board: “Thank you for advocating for greater respect around working in unceded territory. It's really important that the broader community understand this imperative, and it's gratifying to know that you do. We are working intergovernmentally with the Nations, and consulting on a regular basis.”
- Advisory Group Member: when people talk about unceded territory. If First Nations were included there would be a different picture of what all of these buildings would look like. I wanted to have a Musqueam person come and speak to the group. It is a time issue. It does take time to listen to what First Nations have to say; most people want to listen, but you need to take the time to listen.
- Facilitator: What are the recommendations within this theme?
- Advisory Group Member: the consultation process, if I understand correctly, this goes through the reconciliation planner. The process exists in a substantial forward-thinking way. What we recommend could water down what is already being done.
- Staff: meetings happen government to government and it is hard to incorporate it in all of this. But if it is important to you, we will make sure it has been heard
- Facilitator: what consensus input are we putting forward?
- *Suggested wording: Ensure First Nations are included in consultation processes*
- Advisory Group member: could we include some of the same caveats that we have put around consultation with community – i.e. evaluation?
- Facilitator: suggests putting with other consultation and engagement input
- Advisory Group member: would agree with that
- *Suggested wording: Ensure First Nations are included in the consultation processes through the reconciliation team. (Put with other input re: engagement)*
- Advisory Group member: I don't agree with specifying reconciliation team
- Advisory Group Member: I think other member is talking about including First Nations understandings of water
- ***Ensure First Nations are included in consultation processes; communities and cultural traditions re: water / aquatics are considered / consulted on.***
- Facilitator: Does anyone disagree? No. Consensus reached.
- Member submission for consideration: Must always be a clear recognition of climate disruption and have decision-making and planning has addressed climate concerns
- ***Suggested wording: Plan in consideration of climate change***
- Temperature check with light cards: All greens. Consensus
- Member submission for consideration: Strategy should show clear recognition of social issues and know these have been addressed
- Advisory Group member: do we want to specify kind of social issues?
- Advisory Group member: do you think that in facilities and usage should be specified in above Plan in consideration of Climate Change?

- Advisory Group member: Could it water things down if we get too specific? More words might make more cumbersome
- Advisory Group member: specifies that social issues had to do with homelessness and opioid issue and there are social classes in the city – class structures impact on what the city does. There are many areas of the city that are not considered. Could have showers in certain areas of the city, for example. Pools must be amenable for people who need to shower. Just consideration for people who are homeless in the city
- Suggestion: Strategy should show clear recognition of social issues including homelessness, opioid crisis, socio-economic diversity and how these have been addressed
- Several group members express they feel this input is more about programming
- Advisory Group member: activities in the water are a low cost. We are trying to get more pools. We cannot do much about all this other stuff. If we offer a recreation center on the east side, thousands of people will benefit from this. Was talking to a lifeguard from New York from a low-income area; there was a pool in neighbourhood people that was the place where people were were smiling, really brought up neighbourhood. Vancouver is behind. In competitive sports we are behind
- Advisory Group member: I agree it is a programming thing. Kits has a great thing about showers for the homeless. Shower kits on the West and East side. We adapt to what we have on the programming side.
- Group consensus on moving forward without input on social issues
- Member submission for consideration: Need to plan in consideration of non-City facilities (e.g. Jericho pool closure)
- Advisory Group member: The use of non-city pools i.e. synchro. If a pool changes, we will have a lot of people who will need access to non-city facilities
- Advisory Group member: I'd like to draw attention to facilities in City of Burnaby as well; Vancouver residents are using these
- Facilitator: Add on non-city facilities and adjacent municipal facilities?
- Facilitator: Consensus input on this? There are a couple of yellows in light cards.
- Advisory Group member: we need to plan in consideration of non-city and adjacent municipal facilities
- Advisory Group member: I do not want to see this holding anything up – we need more pools
- Advisory Group member: I would assume the city has taken this into account. It might be valid but takes away from focus on recommendations that we have worked on
- Advisory Group member: distracts from meat of our work
- Staff: Regional context was considered in the VanSplash strategy. It's included in the report.
- Facilitator: Is the group OK to leave this off? Nodding heads. Leaving off
- For Bigger Picture, recommendations on Climate Change and First Nations will be included.
- **Submissions Theme: Replace Outdoor pools**
- Recommendations in this theme:
 - Replace Mt Pleasant Outdoor Pool
 - Any aquatics strategy should prioritize rebuilding existing outdoor pools that were decommissioned
 - Replace Mt Pleasant pool
 - Also replace Hastings, Sunset and Marpole

- Advisory Group member: we have been working on this for 16 years. We would like to see the replacement of Mount Pleasant pool. It is in the master plan for Mount Pleasant park to be built when funds are available. We only have 3 outdoor pools in the city. With climate change we need more outdoor pools. Not saying this will be first on list. Just want to add to the list, will take our turn. We are willing to fundraise with Park Board's permission. Difficult to fundraise unless Park Board say yes, this pool will happen
- Facilitator: let's get a reading from the group with the light cards. Some reds and a couple yellows.
- Advisory Group member: if it is already on the table, why do we have to put it in the strategy? Has it not passed through this if it is in the plan?
- Staff: there was discussion that we have received feedback from community that they would like pool in park. There was \$1 million at the time in funds for park development. The cost at the time for an outdoor pool was \$5 million. This was left in plan as possibility, pending available funding. Since then staff have had no direction from the Board to proceed.
- Advisory Group member: John Coupar and Sarah Kirby-Yung already asked to transfer funds for pool to be constructed.
- Facilitator: It was included in the proposed amendments in January 2018. These were not carried – referred back to staff
- Advisory Group member: community has rallied a lot of support for this but doesn't necessarily justify development of anything. There are a lot of pools around Mt Pleasant – Hillcrest has an outdoor facility. It is far closer for Mount Pleasant than a lot of communities. Not fair to rest of city
- Advisory Group Member: we are park and pool deficient. They closed two outdoor pools and replaced them with one wading pool at Hillcrest.
- Facilitator: We are not reaching consensus on this. Does anyone have suggested rewording – what is the way forward?
- Advisory Group member: can we suggest building outdoor pools without specifying location?
- Facilitator: building more outdoor pools is already in the strategy. Marpole pool has moved forward
- Advisory Group member: Suggest instead a recommendation to renovate Hillcrest to make it a full-size outdoor pool
- **Renovate Hillcrest outdoor pool to make it a full-size outdoor pool** – group consensus on this as a recommendation
- Facilitator: Does that mean that replace Mount Pleasant outdoor pool is off the table?
- Advisory Group member: yes, if the group agrees on renovate Hillcrest
- Advisory Group Member: could we make the recommendation include that it was a trainable facility?
- Advisory Group member: not space for 50m, but space for 25m
- Advisory Group member: should say legal competition pool so the pool is not too short.
- **Add legal competition size** – group consensus
- Facilitator: We have talked about the top three priorities. We will come back to other recommendations on Wednesday

Discuss Remaining Draft Recommendations: Beaches, Wading + Spray, Innovation

- Facilitator: we are now going back to Recommendations in the strategy. We have done two online surveys. These slides include your feedback on these recommendations from the surveys

- **Beaches Recommendation 1: *Consider activating or enhancing the range of aquatic experiences offered at beaches, i.e. temporary water play***
 - 16 OK with this recommendation as-is 1 is not:
 - Inflatable in water play structures (such as Wibit) would be problematic in Vancouver because of tides, rough water, rough bottom
- Facilitator: does the group support this feedback as consensus feedback? Let's use the light cards: All reds
- Recommendation 1 goes forward as-is; no feedback
- Advisory Group member: I have a general recommendation on beach – our waterfront is also a cultural heritage site – has to be a First Nations consultation process for anything that goes forward on waterfront
- Staff: Park Board is doing that work; archeologist is on staff

- **Beaches Recommendation 2: *Find a better way to collect information on how many people use our beaches and how they use them***
 - 16 people ok with as is; 1 is not
 - Generally supportive of more beaches, but concerned about cost to collect this info vs benefit
 - Needs to be cost-efficient
- Consensus: recommendation goes forward without feedback

- **Beaches Recommendation 3: *Invest in maintaining and enhancing existing beaches: upgrade or replace changing facilities, upgrade food and beverage service offerings, provide opportunities for shade.***
 - 16 people are ok with as is; 1 not
 - Add beach accessibility for people with disabilities
- Facilitator: does anyone disagree with this feedback?
- No - consensus to put forward with accessibility feedback
- Advisory Group member: accessibility is not just for people with disabilities
- Advisory Group member: accessibility also makes accessible to bikes as well as those with wheelchairs
- Advisory Group member: this is an implementation issue
- **Consensus: Add beach accessibility for people with disabilities – keep language as is**

- **Beaches Recommendation 4: *Consider enhancing the diversity of experiences at/from beach***
 - 15 ok with as is; 2 are not
 - Same as Recommendation 1 (range of aquatic experiences)
 - Ensure ocean is kept clean
 - Prioritize non-motorized options
- Facilitator: Are these the same? Recommendation 1 and 4?
- Advisory Group member: one referring to aquatics; one could be beach volleyball, anything
- Staff: also included activities beyond swimming
- Recommendation 1 speaking to aquatic experiences
- Recommendation 4 speaking about all experiences

- Advisory Group member: leave both in because broad and will cause city to do interesting things
- Facilitator: No one disagrees?
- Advisory Group member: I don't think city can control non-motorized sports
- Staff: this is addressed outside of VanSplash strategy – in the On-Water Strategy
- Consensus on moving forward with recommendation as is
- **Recommendation 5 – Invest in Swimming improvements at Trout Lake**
 - 14 people are OK with as is; 3 not
 - Not feasible (x2)
 - Should not be high priority with other aquatics investments needed
 - Lake too dirty for swimming
- Advisory Group member: first half of summer is packed, and second half of summer not clean enough to swim
- Advisory Group member: I'm sure it must be feasible on some level if it's in the strategy
- Facilitator: Leave Recommendation 5 as is? – consensus.

Wading and Spray Recommendations

- **Wading and Spray Recommendation 1: *To facilitate the emerging spray park system, continue to convert wading pools to spray parks or decommission them, pending locational criteria and consultation with communities***
 - 15 people ok with as is; 2 not
 - Include a reference that spray parks can be used for essential cooling down during heat waves
 - Safety and health benefits particularly for the vulnerable (seniors and children)
 - Not just for play
 - Advisory Group member: If things are changing, why can't cooling down be a part of it?
 - Advisory Group member: why wouldn't we say that for pools too? It's inherent in being a spray park.
 - Advisory Group member: other piece is programming: during a heat wave: there are extended hours open, more lifeguards. An emergency thing that comes into action. Part of scheduling and programming.
 - Advisory Group member: the ones I am familiar with have change rooms. Are there some without?
 - Facilitator: Continue converting wading pools to spray parks is the language of the recommendation
 - Advisory Group members: consensus to support recommendation as-is; no feedback
- **Wading and Spray Recommendation 2: *“Provide spray parks at destination and highly urban parks serving large populations.”***
 - 16 people are ok with this as is; 1 is not
 - Advisory Group member: Relative to where destination pools are going in
 - Advisory Group member: Focus should not be on adding spray parks at destination pools
 - Advisory Group member: Supportive of spray features for large/urban populations for safety in heat waves
 - Facilitator: Recommendation as is? – no feedback – consensus

- **Recommendation 3: *Provide neighbourhood spray parks based on greatest social and geographic need and through consultation with local communities***
 - Facilitator: all ok with as is; no discussion

- **Recommendation 4: *Consider co-locating accessible spray parks with indoor or outdoor pools, and/or with washrooms and community centres***
 - 14 people are ok with this as -is; 3 are not
 - Spray parks not needed with pools
 - Can/should be available in locations without pools
 - Benefit is these can be delivered without huge infrastructure
 - Advisory Group member: very valid comments; don't even need a washroom.
 - Advisory Group member: what if kids spend the whole day there?
 - Advisory Group member: having a washroom is good.
 - Advisory Group member: doesn't necessarily have to be with a pool though.
 - Advisory Group member: do they mean publicly accessible (like don't need to go through pool – i.e. admission) or wheelchair accessible?
 - Staff: it says consider – it is optional for efficiencies – not trying to say all spray parks must be with a pool
 - Advisory Group member: would you have it at an elementary school? There is a field house so part of parks system
 - Staff: the area would go through a few lenses, such as available servicing, before a park would be selected for a spray park
 - Advisory Group member: infrastructure under each spray park can be very different, the location is likely going to determine what type of park will be there
 - Facilitator: asks for temperature check with light cards: two yellows
 - Advisory Group member: I like to remove limitations. The comments remove the limitations, but the wording of the Recommendation is “to consider” so maybe not necessary
 - Advisory Group member: so much more flexibility to create facilities if this is removed
 - Facilitator: I read this as don't put a spray park next to a pool – should we say don't limit?
 - Advisory Group member: should we consider putting spray parks next to pools where we already have the mechanical infrastructure?
 - Facilitator: can all live with this recommendation as-is – no feedback? All can live with this

- **Recommendation 5: *Where possible, design spray parks in a way that water can be recycle for park use, i.e. adjacent irrigation or water features***
 - All ok with as is; no discussion

- **Recommendation 6: distribute spray parks more evenly throughout the City corresponding to population distribution and density**
 - All ok with as is; no discussion

- Facilitator: I'd like to pause here for consideration of the ***accessibility flip chart*** (Submissions Theme: **Accessibility**) as both suggestions are in relation to spray parks.
 - Add "accessible to all wading + spray recommendations
 - Accessibility needs to include getting to the spray park (level pathway, disabled parking, etc.)
- Facilitator Do all agree? Yes. Will both be included as consensus input

Innovation Recommendations

- **Innovation Recommendation 1: *Provide a combination of temporary and permanent aquatic innovations***
 - 12 oks with as is; 4 not
 - Vague/unclear needs to be more specific
 - Meaning of "temporary" is unclear
 - Needs to be more specific
 - Focus should be on innovations that address impacts of climate disruption
 - Advisory Group member: woman from HMCA showed us all these things from other countries. Would be great to have these in Vancouver where we are on an ocean
 - Advisory Group member: we have not discussed temporary pools – these are put up in other locations like Budapest
 - Advisory Group member: Temporary pop up pools – could those be included here? Those could be up by next summer.
 - Advisory Group member: everyone excited about this. If we add specifics it could be limiting?
 - Facilitator: could we put feedback saying provide more explanation on what this means in strategy?
 - Staff: the strategy says: seasonal, interchangeable, perm feature costs usually more – doesn't say what feature but includes these intentions.
 - Advisory Group member: open water is now biggest growing sport in the world. That is where I see the temporary – a dock for activities.
 - Advisory Group member: ok with temporary being unclear because leaves wide open. Could hinder innovation to limit
 - Facilitator: Recommendation 1 as-is; no feedback - consensus
- **Innovation Recommendation 2: *Provide wellness amenities, connected with existing and future pools***
 - 14 ok with as is; 2 not
 - Meaning of wellness amenities is unclear
 - Would like to see focus on accessibility and therapeutic aspects
 - Staff: From slides sent to you previously: plunge pools hot and cold, connected to nature
 - Advisory Group member: my partner had botched back surgery and jets in hot tubs are important for him. So important to make sure facilities are therapeutic for those groups of users. I like the recommendation that says focus on accessibility and therapeutic aspects.
 - Facilitator asks for group to raise light cards. Group: couple of yellows.
 - Advisory Group member: don't know if it needs to be specifically here. Changes recommendation to focus on therapeutic instead of health and wellness. Wellness is a broader category.
 - Facilitator: what about ***include accessibility and therapeutic aspects***
 - Group consensus

- **Innovation Recommendation 3: *Add outdoor hot tubs at larger destination outdoor pools that aren't co-located with an indoor pool or hot tub***
 - 13 ok with as is; 3 are not
 - Not at the loss or sacrifice of basic pool upkeep
- Group consensus to put forward as-is; no feedback

- **Innovation Recommendation 4: *Build destination spray parks for fun and cooling aquatic experiences in urban areas***
 - 13 people ok with as is; 3 not
 - Ensure this fits the community's needs
 - Consult with neighbourhood to see if their priority is indoor pool instead of spray park (if budget cannot provide both)
 - Unclear. Not at the sacrifice of basic services
- Advisory Group member: destination just means a bigger spray park? Yes
- Facilitator: consensus to go forward as-is; no feedback

- **Innovation Recommendation 5: *Create urban beaches for relaxation and play***
 - 12 people ok with as is; 4 not
 - Not logical/need in a city with natural beaches (x2)
 - Don't need sand if have enough/updated park space; sand may end up being toilet for animals
 - Unrealistic given limited land and price of land
 - Need more info on what means and cost
- Advisory Group member: see example in New West along riverfront; to give access to sand experiences
- Advisory Group member: better use of resources to improve on existing beaches
- Advisory Group member: New West is an excellent example because uses existing dock and put some sand – deemed temporary. Could be good by Science World, up on dock as water not swimmable
- Advisory Group member: False Creek is a good example. Even if dumped a bunch of sand wouldn't solve accessibility, usage let alone water swim-ability
- Facilitator: light cards indicate all green to move on with recommendation as-is; no feedback

- **Innovation Recommendation 6: *Build a Harbour deck for improved access to our inlet***
 - 11 people ok with as is; 5 not
 - Potential waste of resources when we are so far behind updating aquatics facilities
 - ***Inlet should be plural – False Creek and Coal Harbour***
 - Believe this already exists
 - Whose jurisdiction? Park Board or Port Authority?
- Advisory Group member: is False Creek considered part of Burrard Inlet? No
- Advisory Group member: may want to specify False Creek and Burrard Inlet
- Facilitator: Put forward with only bullet number two; inlets – consensus

- **Innovation Recommendation 7: *Provide play structures in the ocean at existing beaches***
 - 12 ok as is; 4 are not
 - Focus money and resources on other recs
 - Structures could harm natural beach environment
 - Wind, tides and sharp rocks/shells could be a problem for inflatables
 - Lake – ok. Ocean – big question mark
 - Support family participation and learning, but not plastic
- Advisory Group member: the pictures provided do not help lead us to support recommendation. Plastic and colours would not be supported by residents with views. Natural docks might be.
- Advisory Group member: City of Penticton example – structure is anchored to shore. Only anchors impacting. Seasonal; can try just for one year. Peachland there is one that is half the size of Penticton. Harrison Lake has one
- Advisory Group member: these are natural environments. Every time we put things into the ocean we are damaging our environment. Do we want to be recommending that? How do you put a play structure into Spanish Banks with those tides?
- Facilitator: with considerations of environmental protection?
- Staff: we have to go through Vancouver Coastal Health anyway for approvals
- Advisory Group member: but environmental in terms of trying to get back ecological environment. Each time we put something in the water we are changing that environment
- Facilitator: do we want to put “*with consideration of ecological and environmental impacts*”?
- Consensus on moving forward with this recommendation with this feedback

- **Recommendation 8: *Build a naturally-filtered outdoor pool for better connection to nature***
 - 13 ok as is; 3 are not
 - Not a priority and not currently feasible due to health regulations
 - Spending time on this might detract from work on other facilities
- Advisory Group member: we are so far behind on facilities in this city. This would be nice, but....
- Advisory Group member: ok with all innovations but hope that there is prioritization on pools for the city. If we have enough money to do everything then great.
- Advisory Group member: many people allergic to chlorine were very excited about a natural chlorine-free pool
- Facilitator: This is a 25 -year strategy.
- Advisory Group member: do sequence a lot of these things. This is an important feature to have a diverse range of aquatic facilities.
- Facilitator: Consensus on moving forward as-is; no feedback

- **Recommendation 9: *Assess feasibility of floating pool in False Creek***
 - 13 ok with as is; 3 are not
 - Focus on upgrading aquatics facilities
 - False Creek is busy waterway -may impact paddlers, others
 - Water quality issues in False Creek
 - Need more info on costs and environmental risks

- Chlorinated water?
- Advisory Group member: what is this?
- Advisory Group member: it's a swimming pool in the ocean. Separate water.
- Advisory Group member: huge paddling area in that area. Dragon boats. 2 clubs in that area. Protected. Somewhere to go in the winter. Like concerns with Connaught if we have a big facility do we take out the field space? Do we take out the padding space if we do this?
- Advisory Group member: would not want to displace any existing communities there.
- Advisory Group member: back to timeline, don't understand why aquatic timeline is around 2023 yet Connaught pool will be after than and renovation of VAC will be even further down the road
- Staff: all of staff is well aware of state of VAC. Chance of them focusing on this while VAC is not being addressed is unlikely. Would explore these possibilities in innovation but would not be instead of replacing VAC. The idea was to explore one innovation per capital plan and each would have their own feasibility assessment
- Facilitator: Recommendation 9 with a piece of feedback that says *consult existing user groups in False Creek*.
- Advisory Group member: I think consulting the paddlers is a delay in development of this idea
- Advisory Group member: I am on a dragon boat team and I would not object to the pool
- Advisory Group member: Presentation on making a wave park at False Creek. Discussed taking down part of pierage, wouldn't lose paddling space, would gain a pool in that area. By Plaza of Nations could remove Pierage and would actually gain usable area for paddlers
- Facilitator: what about "Consider existing user groups"?
- AG member: let's take a vote to see if we leave it as it is
- Two members abstain
- Consensus from rest of group to leave as-is; no feedback

Discuss Next Steps for AG: Final Report, Presentation to Board, Wrap-Up Meeting

- Facilitator: Delaney team will draft a report based on consensus input
- Draft report will come to you for review and feedback
- Expect a draft report by email on July 2 for your review and feedback
- Will just be a text version – graphics/photos later
- July 30 – special meeting with the Board to present report. Members of the public will be allowed to attend.
- Looking to identify two advisory group members to join Leila and Jennifer to present – at Wednesday's meeting we will anonymously nominate two people – think about who you think would represent the group well for this presentation.
- Also to come is a wrap-up meeting to report back on how insights were used, and explain staff's recommendations to the Board. We can have this in August or September – will discuss your preference on Wed.
- No paper evaluation tonight, but please let us know anything in particular you liked about tonight and want to see more of, and anything you'd like to adjust or change for Wednesday's meeting: Liked tonight: liked light cards; Change: nothing
- Facilitator: I think we have done amazingly well; great progress tonight – consensus is difficult

- Thank you for those who cannot be here on Wed. Thanks for all the hours you've committed, reviewing correspondence and attending meetings
- Senior Staff and Board members are coming to meet with you on Wednesday. Informal meet and greet.