

## VanSplash Advisory Group Meeting #9

June 12, 2019

5:30-6:30 p.m. Dinner and informal conversation with Park Board Commissioners and senior staff;

6:30-9:00 p.m. Advisory Group deliberations

Vancouver City Hall

**Members in attendance:** Anthony Abrahams, Jean Campbell, Kaye Chapman, Dale Edwards, Samantha Garrett, Igor Kopecky, Carol Martin, Bronwen Mears, Anthony Mehnert, Barry Morris, Stevie Nguyen, Charles Tai, Jarrett Vaughan, Peter Wong

**Members in attendance by phone:** Michael DiPietro

**Regrets:** Cliff Cheng, Marianne Wieland de Alvarez, Abby Ferris, Arthur Tsai

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

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

### 5:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. Pre-Meeting Dinner, Introductions and Informal Discussion

**Park Board Commissioners in attendance:** Commissioner John Coupar; Commissioner Dave Demers; Commissioner Stuart Mackinnon.

**Senior Staff in attendance:** Daisy Chin, Acting Director of Recreation; Barb Floden, Acting Communications Manager; Doug Shearer, Acting Manager, Planning Policy and Environment

### Remarks on behalf of Park Board Commissioners

**Chair, Commissioner Stuart Mackinnon:** Recognized we are gathering on Coast Salish traditional territory and invites us to join in acts of reconciliation each and every day. Vancouver is magnificent because of the participation of its people and this group exemplifies that. Commissioner Coupar and I have been on the VanSplash journey since the beginning, and we are all terribly interested in what you have to say. We thank you for your thoughtfulness on this journey. There are many contrasting elements. I largely became involved in advocacy and eventually ran for the Board because of the closure of swimming pools. Aquatics are a part of who you are, has contributed to who you are today. Vancouver is a seaborne city – water on three sides of us – Vancouver Park Board recognizes the importance of aquatics and we want to make sure that people have the opportunity through all stages of life to be in the water and exercise. A heartfelt thank you on behalf of all Commissioners. We look forward to your report.

### Welcome, Agenda review and housekeeping:

- Facilitator: Thanks to Commissioner McKinnon for the recognition of First Nations land that we are on. That was a beautiful recognition.
- Session Goals:
  - We have completed part of our purpose here tonight to connect with Commissioners and Park Board senior leaders – it felt like a recognition and celebration of our work together.
  - Discuss and reach consensus on group feedback on:
    - Community concerns,
    - Proposed amendments to Draft Strategy from Jan. 2018,
    - Draft VanSplash Vision, Principles and Goals, and

- Remaining member submissions that have not yet been discussed
- Reminder of Code of Conduct and particularly would like to highlight that we agreed not to attribute comments to individual member. Please remember this in your discussions with the community.

#### Correspondence summary:

- 7 emails received since last batch was sent to you on Monday
- 1 supporting Lord Byng
- 1 supporting the rebuilding of Mount Pleasant outdoor pool
- 1 supporting plan to replace Templeton and Britannia with larger facility at Britannia
- 1 supporting smaller pools / Byng in particular
- 1 expressing concerns about lack of consultation with Kits re: Connaught
  - 1 supporting this email from Kits Community Centre Association
- 1 from MP for Vancouver East supporting Templeton and neighbourhood pools
- Last two emails distributed in hard copy as they came in since the others that were sent by email earlier today

#### Discussion on Community Concerns:

- Background:
  - 48 people spoke at Board meetings in December 2017.
  - Meeting minutes, meeting videos and staff responses were provided to you by email previously
  - We have print-outs of the consolidated speaker summary and correspondence summary from 2017
  - Also, emails received for the AG throughout our process
  - Advisory Group Terms of Reference say the group will review and provide insights on concerns raised by these speakers
- Exercise:
  - Based on the content provided, and your understanding of your stakeholder communities' concerns, what do you think are the top 3 concerns about VanSplash?
  - Each member receives three post-it notes. Participants asked to write out one concern per post-it; 2-3 words per post-it
  - Responses collected and all posted on the wall in a collage
  - Group works together to group and theme all responses; once all responses are themed and grouped together, through discussion and consensus, each theme is given a title
  - The titles and themes resulting from this exercise and discussion are as follows:
- **Reconciliation**
  - Authenticity of reconciliation, partnership, and meaningful collaboration with Indigenous communities
- **Value of Community Consultation**
  - Resources allocated to the loudest voices and not the biggest need
  - Re: Connaught – intensive appropriate consultation
  - Lack of consultation

- Council (VanSplash Advisory Group) not representative of diversity and general public need in aquatic facilities
- **Importance of Community**
  - Not forgetting about the community
  - Community
  - Fear of losing community / neighbourhood aquatic experience
- **Value of a National Competition Pool**
  - Designated pool for international (competitions)
  - Not including an adequate facility(ies) for athletics / competition
  - Competitive pools – need more (with dive boards)
  - A proper competitive aquatic facility – all sports
  - Competitive facilities
  - Training
- **Value of Neighbourhood Pools**
  - Closure of neighbourhood pools
  - Need for upgrades of current GVA pools
  - Lord Byng
  - Closure of community pool
  - Closing Byng
  - Closing VAC
  - Templeton
  - Maintain, retrofit / green up , replace, not to demolish ever
  - Templeton + Lord Byng pools – residents want the pools indefinitely
  - Neighbourhood pools retained (renovated if necessary)
- **Lack of Trust**
  - Trust APGs (advisory group's) input heard (?)
  - Decision makers not listening to recommendations
- **Need More Pools**
  - Different types destination / competition neighbourhood
  - Both destination “training facility” + neighbourhood
  - Lack of available pools / swimming capacity in Vancouver
  - Good access for all to all aquatics
  - Adequate space
  - Supply a mixed size of pools
  - Planning for future needs to look at providing for existing programs
  - Need more pool space
  - Lack of neighbourhood pools
  - Accessibility and inclusive
  - Community access
  - Need more pools
- Uncertainty on Connaught

- Location of city-wide destination pool(s)
- Support for Connaught pool
- Opposition to Connaught
- Support for Outdoor Pools
  - Rebuilding of outdoor pools
  - Rebuild Mt Pleasant outdoor pool
- Climate Disruption
  - Really recognize climate disruption
- Beaches
  - Upgrade of beaches along the GVA inlets



Advisory Group members were each asked to identify the top-three community concerns about VanSplash. Group members worked together to group and theme the identified concerns. This photo shows the results of this exercise.

- Facilitator: So, considering all of these concerns we have identified, have we covered these community concerns in our discussions? Is the input that we have covered to date sufficient on these, or is there other input that you would like to provide? Is anything missing from our feedback?
- Advisory Group member: are we discussing amendments later? Yes.
- Advisory Group member: Water quality might be missing. Talk about Trout Lake being swimmable. Could we add this under beaches?
- Facilitator: How would we word this advice?
- Advisory Group member: address the lack of swimmability in our local lakes, ocean, creeks?
- Suggested wording for recommendation “Address lack of swimmability in outdoor bodies of water”
- Advisory Group members hold up light cards to determine support.
- Advisory Group member holding up yellow card: really talking about poor water quality.
- Revised suggested wording: **“Address water quality in outdoor bodies of water for swimming”**
- Facilitator: does anyone disagree? No. Consensus input
- Facilitator: anything else from community concerns not addressed?
- Advisory Group member: Dissatisfaction with VanSplash process itself has not been addressed. I think it’s different from consultation
- Facilitator: what advice could we give?
- Advisory Group member: for consultation moving forward, suggest a pilot and evaluation of the process; consultation about the process itself
- Facilitator: do we need to add to what we created on Monday around evaluation and process with regard to consultation?
- Advisory Group member: this covers it
- Advisory Group member: does this cover it? Is that enough?
- Advisory Group member: on hot-button issues of Templeton and Byng we have laid out a concrete set of actions on this. We need a strategy for the Park Board to reach comfort so can move forward
- Advisory Group member: the way we communicate with people is changing so quickly, such that we can’t indicate the ways that we consult with the community, we need to leave this open to accommodate change
- Advisory Group member: we keep saying we need more pools, we need them now, have we written this down anywhere?
- Facilitator: We have talked about it a lot and I have heard it as a major theme of our discussions. But I’m not sure we have put this into consensus feedback in a direct way.
- Advisory Group Member: I agree we need more pools now and fast. But the reason pools don’t get built quickly is community consultation. If we put forward calls for more community consultation will we get more pools?
- Facilitator: we have seen though this process if people don’t feel they were consulted they will push back and the strategy was delayed. It is a push and pull.
- Suggested input: **“We need more pools”**
- Facilitator: Does anyone disagree with this being a strong piece of feedback from the group? One person disagrees.

- Advisory Group member: I am struggling. They are going to demolish pools without asking. Yes, we need more pools. But what kind of pool becomes really important to the community. Not every community wants a destination pool.
- Advisory Group member: Fact check: Britannia was never supposed to be a destination pool – it is a community or community plus pool. We are working on the recommendations in VanSplash
- Facilitator: “We need more pools” doesn’t say anything about size, location
- Advisory Group member: This is like the headline. The concerns of the community are about the closures.
- Facilitator: one last call for any additional input on community concerns
- Advisory Group member: how do you construct facilities to keep the programming? Trans-swim needs to have a pool, our triathlon program needs a pool and need outdoor space. Idea of we have some good programs; if we change the facility and program needs are not incorporated, do you risk losing the program?
- Advisory Group member: we touched on this when we said that when the facilities are constructed that the user groups and the NSOs must be meaningfully consulted so that can continue on with programs
- Suggested input: **“Plan facilities with recognition of existing programs”**
- Facilitator: show of support from light cards
- Advisory Group member: is programming in our scope?
- Staff: not facility-specific programming per se, but you can include if you think it is relevant. Facility planning is in scope of VanSplash
- Facilitator: is there anyone who cannot live with this? No. Consensus reached
- Advisory Group member: what about concerns about the use of chlorine in pools?
- Facilitator: my understanding is that pools are mandated to have chlorine under Health Act? Do we mean minimizing chlorine?
- Advisory Group member: we could just target outdoor pools - Second Beach went from salt to chlorination and people want to go back to non-chlorine
- Suggested wording: **“Reduce the use of chlorine whenever possible”**
- Advisory Group member: we have never really talked about this – is it a community concern?
- Advisory Group member: people do get rashes; I have spoken to people about this in the community
- Facilitator: Is there support for this feedback? Yes. Consensus

#### Amendments Proposed by Commissioners from January 2018

- Facilitator: I’d like to suggest that some of these have been discussed and addressed by the group already
- At Monday’s meeting AG members supported the rewording of Indoor Pools Recommendation 1 from these proposed amendments: ***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***
- Already addressed? Yes.
- Proposed amendment re: “Full size” outdoor pools
  - Group input re: 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”***

- Group input re: Outdoor Recommendation 3 *“Need to ensure ability/space for actual swimming in all outdoor pool facilities, dedicated swimming spaces with lines and straight walls”*
- Group input re: Renovating Hillcrest outdoor pool: *“make it a legal competition-size pool”*
- Already addressed? Yes.
- Proposed amendment to strike indoor pools Recommendations #5 and #7 (engage with Templeton and Byng users on impacts of Britannia and Connaught)
  - Group input re: Recs 5 + 7: *Templeton and Byng would remain open for a minimum of five years following the new pools becoming fully operational. During this time there would be a formal consultation process, and a thorough impact study. The group also calls for how engagement is done to be revisited, and that the engagement processes would include evaluation.*
    - Note: Two AG members disagree with above input and one is unsure
- Already addressed? Yes.
- Proposed amendment: Provide a new outdoor pool at Mount Pleasant Park
  - Group input re: *Renovating Hillcrest outdoor pool: “make it a legal competition-size pool”. Group agreed this would meet the needs of those advocating for a pool in Mount Pleasant.*
- Already addressed? Yes.

#### Remaining amendments to discuss and consider:

- Proposed Amendment: *“1.5 Recognizing the opportunity for a cohesive program delivery model at the current pools at the Vancouver Aquatic Centre (VAC) and Kitsilano Beach Park and a potential future new destination pool with a sport training focus at Connaught Park, initiate a comprehensive planning process to review how these three facilities could be best integrated, taking into consideration: current state of the facilities; potential for short-term refit or renovation to accommodate sport or leisure needs; innovative possibilities to increase the seasonal usage at Kitsilano outdoor pool; and an analysis of the costs of renovation of VAC in comparison with the build cost of a new facility.”*
  - Would replace current Draft Recommendation: Provide a new City-wide Destination pool with a sport training focus at Connaught Park as part of a future arena and/or community centre renewal. This facility would replace and improve the sport training capacity of the Vancouver Aquatic Centre and would consider potential for hosting competitions at a level that the site can accommodate as part of the detailed planning.”
- Facilitator: does the group wish to support this? I should have explained before that these Proposed Amendments were put forward in January 2018 by previous Commissioner Kirby-Yung and seconded by Commissioner Coupar. There was no discussion of these proposed amendments by the Board. We don’t know if other Board members would have supported these, or if other Commissioners perhaps had proposed amendments of their own. The whole VanSplash strategy was then referred back to staff, along with these proposed amendments.
- Advisory Group member: I can say that previously the competition community has said yes, we wanted to maintain VAC and renovate to have the proper requirements for competitions in there. We were hoping the city would fund the renovation of VAC to use while new pool being built. Looking at the cost for renovation though it seems that more practical to build new pool rather than renovate.
- Advisory Group member: I am not sure what is intended here for Kits pool.
- Facilitators: do we want to use our light cards to see what is the level of support for this?

- Advisory Group member: it makes more sense to renovate the outdoor pool in Hillcrest rather than changing Kitsilano; Kitsilano is a great pool as it is.
- Advisory Group member: they recently spent \$3 million on kits pool redoing the infrastructure to make it more efficient.
- Facilitator: If the group supports this Proposed Amendment it would be to replace the existing Draft Recommendation to build a sport-training facility at Connaught. Is there any interest in supporting this?
- Advisory Group member: we have supported these things in different areas. We have considered all these things in separate areas.
- Advisory Group member: I don't think this is recommending changes to Kits pool except extending the season for Kits pool
- Advisory Group member: then it should be a separate recommendation. It is very confusing.
- Advisory Group member: we have already discussed this in separate spots
- Facilitator: I think the key words here are "initiate a comprehensive planning process"
- Advisory Group member: the "cohesive program delivery mode" language – that hasn't been our purview. Programming is not part of our mandate
- Advisory Group member: this amendment is no longer needed with some of the recommendations that we have supported in our advisory group. This was put in to ensure that attention paid to competition people. Maybe we should add another recommendation to improve the usability of Kits beyond current seasonal use
- Facilitator: Let's show the colours on support for amendment. Mostly red and yellow. One green.
- Advisory Group member: If we do not support it, does the original wording below it get submitted?
- Facilitator: Our consensus feedback on Recommendation 6 re: destination pool at Connaught is:
  - Need to consult community
  - Sport-training focused facility needs to include diving, synchro, water polo etc.
- On Monday, we also reached consensus on the following input: ***"We need a competition facility with adequate capacity to serve local age group, master and triathletes as well as water polo, diving and synchro. Big enough for provincial and national competitions. Need to consult with National Sports Organizations, Provincial Sports Organizations and User-Groups"***
- Group does not support the amendment.
- Advisory Group would like to add additional recommendation: ***"Extend the Kits pool season, as this is the most unique pool in Vancouver and extended season would increase capacity in the system."*** Consensus.
- Proposed Amendment: Add wording ***"consistent with Park Board goals of accessibility and equity"*** to Indoor Pools Recommendation 11, "Continue to consider building partnerships with other agencies to gain opportunities for public use of non park board aquatic facilities."
- Group supports this amendment. Consensus
- Proposed Amendment: ***"NEW Develop an upgrade and renovation plan, extending operational life-span for neighbourhoods pools not undergoing renewal as part of this strategy, to increase sustainability and operational efficiency including consideration of implementing green technologies."***
- Facilitator: please show your support for this recommendation with your colour cards (green, yellow, red). I see one red.
- Advisory Group member: Which pools were left out? All the ones that everyone has brought up re: retrofitting etc. are addressed in the strategy .

- Advisory Group member: I think this is more about other pools aging out in the future
- Advisory Group member: this wording only restricts it to neighbourhood pools. What about pools like Hillcrest? Doesn't include them.
- Facilitator: Should we suggest "all existing pools"?
- Staff: This work is already being done. We have an Asset Planning system where every single City building is evaluated
- Facilitator: group supports this but want to change wording to all aquatic facilities?
- Advisory Group member: Why do we need to say this if it is already getting done? Are we not just adding more words that are pointless?
- Facilitator: Colours for supporting?
- Can we live with supporting this, and changing neighbourhood pools to **"for all aquatic facilities"**?
- Yes. Consensus
- Proposed Amendment: "2.3 Prioritize locating new full-size outdoor pools to fill current service area gaps." With reference to options one and two.
- Facilitator: This is already underway – Option 2 in Marpole – do not need to discuss? Yes
- Proposed Amendment: "NEW Investigate the potential to provide a new naturally-filtered outdoor swimming experience at Trout Lake (John Hendry Park) that addresses and compensates for water quality issues and swimming concerns."
- Facilitator: Staff have advised this is combination of existing recommendations: Outdoor Pools Recommendation 7, Beaches Recommendation 5 and Innovation Recommendation 8
  - Group input on Outdoor Recommendation 7: "don't limit to South Van "
  - Group supports Beaches 5 and Innovation 8 as-is
- Facilitator: has this been covered?
- Advisory Group member: this is specific to Trout Lake
- Advisory Group member: I would want to make sure we specifically communicate that this was already addressed. Not that we don't support it. We all support the amendment, have just addressed this elsewhere
- Group decides already addressed. Wants it to be clear that we have addressed recommendation elsewhere

#### Draft VanSplash Vision, Principles and Goals

- Facilitator: We discussed this Draft content in our Meeting #4; you asked to come back to it after we discussed the strategy recommendations
- Our previous consensus input:
  - Revised vision: Deliver a wide range of accessible aquatic experiences for residents and visitors that support Vancouver as a highly livable, world-leading coastal city.
    - Added the word "accessible"
    - Changed "world-class" to "world leading"
- Facilitator: Do you have additional input on the Vision, Principles and Goals?
- Advisory Group member: the vision statement reads much more like a mission. A vision is aspirational: a state you want to reach. If we turned the existing vision into a mission, I want to give you a couple suggestions of what the vision statement could be. For example:

- **Building a community of swimmers for life OR Building a community of swimmers for a lifetime**
  - Relates to City of Vancouver and communities within
  - All about serving swimmers – not putting facilities in the middle
  - Swimmers for Life – gets across the idea that it is an activity from cradle to grave
- Advisory Group member: I am in support of an aspirational vision like this
- Advisory Group member: we need pools for everyone, not just swimmers, even for dabblers
- Facilitator: just having a vision that speaks to swimmers could leave people out.
- Advisory Group member: Is there another more inclusive word we could use?
- Advisory Group member: we are looking to build more facilities
- Advisory Group member: could we replace swimmer with aquatic user. I think this is an astute move to go with an aspirational vision statement. We may be aspiring to create a community of swimmers. Just because not using now, could still use in future
- Facilitator: I think the point is that there are a lot of people using facilities who are not swimming
- Advisory Group member: and many people may not be able to
- Advisory Group member: would aquatic users cover it?
- Advisory Group member: no problem with that. But is this the right kind of statement or is our vision really looking at building more pools?
- Advisory Group member: making a statement like building more pools is too limiting talking about beaches as well. Aquatic experiences. And even that might be limiting: what about lying on the beach?
- Suggested wording: ***“Building communities of aquatics users for a lifetime”***
- Advisory Group member: lifetime is more inspiring than for life
- Advisory Group member: Don’t often use the word “users” as a designer, we are designing for people.
- Facilitator: asks for support by show of colours
- Lot of green. Everyone can live with this.
- **This will become our suggested vision**
- **Reworded vision would then become the mission**
- Previous consensus input on principles:
  - Principle 2 add “competition” (Expand the definition of aquatics to include...)
  - Staff has asked you to refer to Glossary for definition of aquatics – traditional definition includes competition
  - Add a principle or goal around delivering a minimum service standard / level of service
    - Is this the same as Goal 1?
    - Did we reach consensus on this?
- Facilitator: What do we mean about minimum service standard? Does anyone want to advocate for input along these lines? No.
- Facilitator: In looking at this content – Vision, Principles, Goals – is there anything missing? Is there any additional feedback on this content?
- Advisory Group member: to be consistent with use of aquatic users in vision, Goal 1 should say continue to increase **annual aquatic visits per capita instead of swims**. Consensus
- Advisory Group member: **“Vansplash: We Need More Pools”** should be the title of our report. Consensus
- No further input

## Remaining Advisory Group Member Submissions that Have Not Yet Been Covered

- Facilitator: The only category we haven't covered is **Fundraising and Sponsorship**. What are the recommendations within Fundraising and Sponsorship?
  - Garner sponsorship from the greater community (clubs, teams, companies)
  - Pursue fundraising to augment the Park Board's Budget
- Facilitator: Is there an additional recommendation here? What wording do we want to suggest putting forward?
- Advisory Group member: I'm feeling that pursuing fundraising is the same as partnerships (existing Recommendation 11)
- Advisory Group member: I mean monetary fundraising
- Facilitator: could put forward as separate or related to partnerships
- Advisory Group member: 1.10 referred to partnerships – what is different?
- Facilitator: Recommendation 11 is talking about using non-city facilities. This is talking about raising money for Park Board, public facilities
- Advisory Group member: We may be able to get a couple hundred thousand dollars, not sure large companies who might even have their names on it; "RBC Connaught Aquatic Centre". Corporate sponsorships
- Advisory Group member: 2004-'05 I served on city naming committee for all city buildings. There is a city naming policy and that would have to be consulted to even see what would be possible. Telus gave \$9 million to become Telus Science World, triggered naming committee response. Telus is now a muted part of the name.
- Advisory Group member: we do have rich people in Vancouver. For example, Jimmy Pattison is giving millions to hospitals. I don't think we should say we can't do it. Let's try it.
- Advisory Group member: our club contributed \$3 million to VAC over the years. But it is not without negative downside. If another club wants to use the equipment we added there is insurance required. If it is a public facility, everyone should be able to use.
- Facilitator: I'm hearing corporate sponsorship, naming rights, pursue fundraising to augment the budget
- Advisory Group member: my only concern is that a member said you couldn't raise millions. Sunset raised all the money to build the whole community centre, which is one of the reasons that the Sunset rink is not attached. Difficult to go ahead with fundraising without concern that it might not continue to be a public (City-owned) facility.
- Advisory Group member: Just add the word fundraising to recommendation 1.10 "continue to consider building partnerships and fundraising" (Facilitator: but this is specifying use of non-park aquatic facilities.)
- Advisory Group member: I sent an email with this recommendation and my thought process was we have BC Place and Rogers Arena in the States and all around the world there are aquatics facilities that are funded by corporations
- Suggested wording, "Pursue fundraising to augment the Park Board's budget"
- Facilitator: colour check. Lots of greens a couple of yellows
- Advisory Group member: can you earmark funds raised for a specific facility?
- Advisory Group member: yes
- Suggested wording: **Empower communities to fundraise for public aquatics facilities**

- Staff: It's hard to ask for money when we don't have a specific project
- Facilitator: colour check – all green. One yellow – can live with it. But I do think it opens up a can of worms for Park Board to say, you want it? Go fundraise
- Advisory Group member: At Renfrew the accessibility lift broke. They didn't have funds. We fundraised for it and gave it to them.
- Advisory Group member: Is there any way to say “not at expense of communities that can't afford it”?
- Suggested wording: Encourage the Park Board to pursue external financial support from external organizations for larger aquatics facilities
- Advisory Group member: clarifies that it would be for communities to approach rich people to help out.
- Advisory Group member: I would wonder if city already has policies about accepting sponsorship. I would imagine sponsors are not able to add limitations to accessibility for the community
- Advisory Group members good to live with “empower communities to fundraise for public aquatics facilities.” Consensus

### Discuss Next Steps

- Facilitator: Advisory Group report: Expect to see the draft report by email on July 2. You will have one week to review the report and reply with any feedback on the content – suggested changes, questions, concerns
- Facilitator: We have scheduled a presentation to the Board on July 30 to deliver your report. This connects with our lack of trust discussions. We wanted to give you an opportunity to go to the decision makers with your report. Everyone is invited to come. The meeting is open to public, but there no public speakers. However, Advisory Group members will be able to speak and share about the process and report.
- The presentation will be by Jennifer, Leila and two Advisory Group members. We will now nominate the two members you think would best represent the group. Please write down two names.
- Advisory Group member: What would we speak about?
- Facilitator: We would work with you to give you a couple of questions to address or a section to speak about. You would share in your own words; we wouldn't tell you what to say
- Selection of Advisory Group members to present: nomination results are Anthony A. and Jarrett
- Facilitator: We will also have a final AG meeting to report back to you how your input is being incorporated into the updated Draft VanSplash strategy. Would you prefer to have that meeting in August or September? Group: September
- We will send out a Doodle poll to schedule that meeting in September.
- Facilitator and Staff: thank you everyone for your commitment and contributions to the group.