

## VanSplash Advisory Group Meeting #7

May 13, 2019, 6:00 – 9:00 p.m.

Vancouver City Hall

**Members in attendance:** Jean Campbell, Cliff Cheng, Michael DiPietro, Dale Edwards, Abby Ferris, Igor Kopecky, Carol Martin, Bronwen Mears, Anthony Mehnert, Barry Morris, Stevie Nguyen, Arthur Tsai, Jarrett Vaughan, Marianne Wieland de Alvarez, Peter Wong

**Members in attendance by phone:** Charles Tai

**Regrets:** Anthony Abrahams, Kaye Chapman, Samantha Garrett

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

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

### Summary of Meeting Action Items:

1. Will determine date for additional meeting from Advisory Group member's preferred dates

#### Welcome, Agenda review and housekeeping:

- Facilitator:
  - Recognized First Nations Territory – explanation of why we do this: to ground us to the land, to reflect and remember our colonial history and recognize that there are different views and ways of being in the world
  - Went through housekeeping, emergency procedures
  - Outlined purpose of today's meeting and agenda outline:
    - To continue discussion from last meeting on recommendations: indoor, outdoor, beaches, wading and spray and innovation;
    - To discuss the lack of trust issue that was raised in last meeting;
    - To start discussion of community concerns;
    - To discuss if there is a desire to add an additional meeting
  - Referenced the Code of Conduct that was authored together, which is posted on the wall.

#### Correspondence summary:

- 22 emails received between May 1 and May 12: sent to you in full by email this morning
  - Emails include messages to VanSplash email, the facilitator and passed on from Advisory Group members as a result of outreach to your networks:
    - 9 emails calling for replacement of Mt Pleasant outdoor pool and/or supporting outdoor pools in general
    - 1 expressing support for full-service aquatic centre in Hastings Sunrise area
    - 1 suggesting replacing Templeton with a new facility at Hastings Community Centre
    - 1 suggesting VanSplash should state no pools will be decommissioned but will be upgraded, renovated, enshrined

- 1 from AG member to Board suggesting “benchmark” package for all public pools (i.e. 25m+ tank, whirlpool, sauna, steam, diving tank, etc.) and that priority #1 is addressing service gaps
- 1 supporting community pools and Templeton in particular
- 1 with concerns AG not following Board motion from January to only consider expansion + improvement
- 1 supporting large facility on the West side of Vancouver
- 1 calling for more small pools like Byng
- 1 calling for renovation and expansion of existing facilities
- 1 with concerns about lack of adequate aquatic training facilities, support for proposed sport training pool at Connaught, calls to continue improving sport training at VAC and Byng until new pools delivered
- 1 calling for more lane swimming capacity + more outdoor pools with lanes
- 1 with concerns about lack of information/communication re: VanSplash
- 1 with question about plans for new outdoor pool at Marpole Community Centre
- 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

#### Follow-up items from last meeting:

- Staff: A **Draft Glossary** has been authored and print-out provided for each of you tonight; this has not been peer-reviewed so stress the draft status; if anything is missing, please let us know. If you feel it is useful for the VanSplash document, it will need to be run past some other staff members prior to being included.
- Staff: Re: **update communications** discussed last meeting:
  - **Posters:** were sent last Thursday to various supervisors at community centres
  - **Postcards:** 10 per Advisory Group member; please distribute to your networks
  - **E-blast:** update sent on Friday at noon to VanSplash list asking to go to website and see meeting notes
  - **Facebook Ad:** paid campaign to share AG update and invite people to see the meeting notes etc.
- Facilitator: we anticipate we will get more letters for the group from these invites to send information to the Advisory Group – our plan is to send the input in one group to Advisory Group members as consolidated correspondence, instead of one at a time.
- Advisory Group member: I have received calls from people who did not realize they could send an e-mail to you; I am clarifying that they can now do this.
- Staff: Yes, have always been able to send emails re: VanSplash.
- Facilitator: Would like to clarify that the current engagement process for VanSplash is the Advisory Group. We are inviting email submissions for the group, but we are not intending to do broad public engagement on VanSplash right now. The AG is the current engagement opportunity. There have been two previous phases of broad engagement on VanSplash. As such, please share the meeting minutes and information with your groups and contacts; please do send this information out, so that people know this information is available and being shared.

- Facilitator: Re: AG member **suggestion to translate update communication**: We have considered the issue of translation from the beginning of this process, from the point in time of the application to join the Advisory Group; but we determined that if we start with translation there, we have to translate everything throughout the process and have interpretation services available at all meetings to support a non-English speaking AG member; the resources were not available to support this extensive effort.
  - Because this is a city-wide process, we cannot just translate into one language; there is a City policy on translation based on the census and numbers of people speaking certain languages
  - Our recommendation is that we wait until the end of the Advisory Group's work and once we have a report, then we translate to give people an update on what we have done, how it has been used and the next steps.
  - Please also note that, once the park board gets to community-level engagement on each specific aquatic project, the city will look at translation for that area.

#### Greenhouse:

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

#### Survey results regarding staff's role:

- The majority of Advisory Group members want Park Board staff to be present for the full meeting. It has been decided that the staff will step out for the discussion on "lack of trust", but will step back in after, as some participants have indicated that it is good for staff to listen to the group's discussion on community concerns. If there are questions that come up for staff when staff are not here, we will have a place to put those questions up (on flip charts on the wall) so that they are saved and addressed by staff.

#### Discussion on Indoor Pool Recommendations:

- We covered Recommendations 1-7 at the last Advisory Group meeting
- Now picking up where we left off

#### Recommendation #8: *Replace the Vancouver Aquatic Centre with a new City-wide destination pool with a health and wellness focus, with co-located outdoor aquatic amenities*

- Survey results:
  - 12 ok with the recommendation as is
  - 3 are not
    - 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.
    - Downtown location needs to serve families, visitors, etc.
  - Don't like co-located outdoor pool; already one nearby at 2<sup>nd</sup> Beach
- Advisory Group member: can last point be clarified on co-located outdoor pool?

- Advisory Group member: guessing this means that they do not want outdoor pool also at the aquatic center
- Advisory Group member: why would we say no, just because there is one down the road?
- Advisory Group member: recommendation doesn't say what it would be - it may not be an outdoor pool; wording says "outdoor aquatic amenities"
- Advisory Group member: I suspect the person who wrote this was thinking about working with limited resources
- Advisory Group member: my concern would be that there is only so much space, if you want a decent sized pool that hosts events and has recreation and leisure, there would not also be space for outdoor facilities on the same footprint
- Facilitator: we could adjust wording to "any outdoor amenities considered should not limit the size of the indoor pool"
- Advisory Group member: or any outdoor amenities should be secondary
- Staff: there are also pools that can be indoor and outdoor at same time
- Advisory Group member: Aldergrove voted to have a pool that is not completely enclosed – the pool has a covered outdoor pool, like a garage; the reason being that an exclusively outdoor pool closed when they built this facility
- Advisory Group member: that one is also right beside an ice rink, using excess heat generated by that to offset heat
- Advisory Group member: that was a community demand, they were going to enclose it all – it goes against the trend in the situation where a community did not want to lose outdoor pool
- Facilitator: potential wording could be, "consider indoor/outdoor spaces that can be flexible" instead of the last bullet?
- Advisory Group member: if they are considering building a destination pool, it is up to the architects how to do it. Vancouver Aquatic Centre is a prime place, gorgeous, anywhere else this would be a glass wall – why do we have to worry? Let's just say yes, we need a destination pool
- Facilitator: I am hearing a suggestion to remove the last bullet?
- Advisory Group member: Assuming Connaught will serve competitive requirements of the city, the rebuild of Vancouver Aquatic Centre will look at how Connaught is doing that and see if it is doing adequate job of serving these needs – but there could still be more need there
- Advisory Group member: An outdoor pool is needed but 2<sup>nd</sup> Beach and Vancouver Aquatic Centre are in close proximity, and it may be hard for those on East side to get to those facilities
- Advisory Group member: it is a good idea to have a new destination pool at Vancouver Aquatic Centre, but I heard that there would be possibility that the City would look for tenders to build something away from current site, wouldn't they then just build one between Stanley Park and Burrard Street?
- Staff: The VanSplash Strategy allows for replacement of VAC through two facilities: one at Connaught and one in the West End, but these are still at the preliminary planning stage.
- Facilitator: on what land parcel will replacement Vancouver Aquatic Centre go?
- Staff: this needs to be determined as part of study and discussions
- Advisory Group member: I heard an expression of interest went out for the VAC replacement?

- Staff: A Request for Expressions of Interest for consulting services went out on Friday for the West End waterfront parks and Beach Ave Master Plan. This area includes VAC. The request for interest was for the planning process, not specifically for the replacement of VAC.
- Advisory Group member: if these two facilities are built separately, then they wouldn't have to shut down existing Vancouver Aquatic Centre, because there would be an existing pool to use.
- Staff: Two facilities are recommended because one replacement for VAC is not enough – Connaught is not enough to serve the capacity needed
- Facilitator: I'd like to bring us back to the draft feedback on the screen: *Is the group OK to move forward without last bullet? Group says yes*
- Advisory Group member: replacing Vancouver Aquatic Centre is what they are talking about, so would be somewhere on the Park land that they already have

Recommendation #9: ***Replace Kerrisdale pool with a new Community scale pool, as part of a future Community Centre and/or arena renewal to take advantage of co-location synergies including energy savings, operational efficiencies, and the community interest in larger facilities offering a diverse range of amenities and services in one location***

- *13 people are ok with this as is*
- *2 are not*
  - *Support recommendation but should be higher priority moved up in timeline*
  - *Could this be a good location for destination competitive facility?*
  - *Don't agree with co-locating the rink*
  - *Intensive consultation with community is needed*
  - *Needs upgrades; not convinced of replacement*
- Advisory Group member: The ice rink and pool are not currently on same property - where will this be?
- Advisory Group member: why would someone not agree with co-locating?
- Facilitator: does anyone disagree with removing the co-location bullet? No. We are removing.
- Advisory Group member: I do not understand meaning of "destination competitive" facility
- Staff: a larger facility with capacity for competitions – can add this into the glossary
- Advisory Group member: we should push to have this replaced; it needs to be replaced – remove not convinced of replacement
- Facilitator: can we remove not convinced of replacement?
- Advisory Group member: I thought maybe the top could come off and it could be an outdoor pool and not be replaced. When we were taken there, we were made to think it was a ridiculous pool, but why can't you just keep something that is there that is working? People do go there
- Advisory Group member: I live five minutes from there; I do not use it because there is a lack of aquatic experiences: no sauna, no hot tub, the change room is run down; the area is going to be greatly updated because of the Greenway and the streetcar and the Broadway Skytrain extension. It is a heavily developed area now; this area has been underserved for too long

- Advisory Group member: we all should agree that we should remove that bullet; my reasoning is that we are talking about demolishing pools and we do not have the skill set to make this decision. This should not be a recommendation from this group; we do not have the educational background to be making decisions on whether to replace a pool or not
- Advisory Group member: there are so many schools around there that would benefit if it was a bigger facility. In 2000 swimming was supposed to be part of the PE program in schools
- Advisory Group member: my kids use that pool for the high school swim program, and it is very hard to get swim space; it is leaking, too small
- Facilitator can we remove last bullet?
- Group: yes
- Left with
  - Support recommendation, but should be higher priority and
  - Intensive consultation with community is needed
- Advisory Group member: can we indicate that we want to “be sure to include schools” in consultation bullet
- Group: yes
- Facilitator: later in the meeting we are discussing lack of trust and I’d like to suggest one way to address lack of trust could be through providing input on what meaningful engagement looks like; this could include wording around user groups, etc.

Recommendation #10: ***Renovate Kensington Pool to enhance accessibility and increase opportunities for adaptive and therapeutic swimming***

- 13 ok with this recommendation as-is
- 2 are not
  - *With therapy focus, concern is other facilities will not prioritize therapy components*
    - *Therapy needs are varied – one pool won’t meet all therapy needs*
    - *Therapy users need to have options close to home*
  - *Should this facility be made larger?*
  - *More discussion/Community consultation required*
- Advisory Group member: backwards to say don’t have therapy here because there might be an impact on providing therapy at other locations.
- Advisory Group member: we need to keep in mind that this pool was originally designed to be a therapy pool; it has warmer water than other pools, etc. All destination pools have therapy aspects etc., but Kensington was not built this way; it is simply a matter of bringing it up to today’s standards
- Advisory Group member: this focuses on the lack of trust – if we have a therapy pool, will we then not have beach entries and other accessibility/therapy features at other pools? Will they say, “oh, you have this at Kensington, so we don’t need it elsewhere?”
- Facilitator: we could we put forward feedback that therapy components should be included at all facilities. Would everyone like to replace current therapy bullets with: “Ensure therapy components are offered at all pools” - Yes

- Advisory Group member: you actually cannot do a lot of therapy at Kensington, even though it was designed for this – no accessible showers, changerooms not up to date.
- Facilitator: regarding the bullet “should this facility be made larger?”
- Advisory Group member: does the word renovate imply that it should not be made larger?
- Staff member: this is in the DRAFT glossary - “renovate: may or may not accommodate growth”
- Advisory Group member: at Renfrew, the pool was substantially renovated – they added into ravine, etc. but the tank stayed the same size – half of community centre is a 55-year-old building, half is beautiful
- Facilitator: how should we address this bullet point?
- Advisory Group member: if we renovated the Kensington pool and related facilities - the universal change rooms; this is what we want, to get more people in and out of the pool properly
- If the recommendation is just focused on pool, the group is ok to remove this bullet

**Flip Chart Re: Recommendation #10:** ensure therapy components are offered at all pools

Recommendation 11: *Continue to consider building partnerships with other agencies to gain opportunities for public use of non-park board aquatic facilities*

- 14 ok with this as-is
- 1 is not
  - Concern that partnerships will make it more expensive for users (higher admission fees)
  - More discussion needed on types of partnerships  
*What is meant by agencies?*
- Staff: agencies is in the glossary
- Advisory Group member: We didn’t agree on Recommendation 1 –
- Facilitator: yes, we are coming back to that recommendation after we go through the rest of the recommendations
- Advisory Group member: I am thinking of the partnership we talked about before near Langara – when it is a private company are the same access opportunities available to the public? Just because it is a partnership does that mean it is inclusive for the community?
- Staff: The YMCA situation at Langara is very unique. There is parallel programming – there will be a discussion to have same programming as all other Park Board facilities.
- Advisory Group member: the YMCA is particularly good in working with community. For example, as a member of the YM when One Card was brought in, they worked on infrastructure to have cost-sharing parity
- Advisory Group member: partnerships are not always responsive in practice – I have watched Britannia over the years with its Parks Board/School Board agreement – there is sometimes a delay when a breakdown in equipment occurs, because the two agencies have to quibble over who puts up the money. In practice these partnerships sometimes get into territorialism.
- Advisory Group member: in general, there is a silo between School Board and Parks Board – for example, there is no swimming in the P.E. curriculum. The high school has a parking lot, but people

who go to farmer's market cannot use the parking lot because it is blocked off to community on the weekend. Could we say there needs to be a partnership between Parks Board and School Board?

- Facilitator: repeats wording of recommendation – high level
- Advisory Group member: I have a concern that partnerships will make it more expensive for users – yes, this is a legitimate concern and it should be left in.
- Advisory Group member: should we remove more discussion on the types of partnerships – is this getting out of scope of this group? Yes.
- Advisory Group member: We should ensure that there is equal access for the public – not just about being more expensive, but if there is a private partnership, we need to make sure everyone in the public has access
- Advisory Group member: even in the current public facilities, equal access is not the case. There is already unequal access within the system
- Advisory Group member: We could put in wording about striving for equal access
- Advisory Group member: if you start talking about equal access it will come down to Community Associations. Just leave in bullet on admission fees
- Group: Just leave in bullet one.
- Facilitator: Does anyone disagree? No.

#### Outdoor Pool Recommendations:

- Outdoor Pools Recommendations were covered in both Survey 1 and Survey 2
- Survey 2 had 16 completed responses + 2 partial responses
- 16 out of 19 Advisory Group members = 84% response rate
- Summary of survey input done by Delaney team; full survey report for Survey 2 will be shared with group, as was Survey 1 report

#### Recommendation #1: ***Continue to invest in the existing outdoor pools to keep them as unique city wide (destination) facilities within Vancouver***

- 14 OK with this as is
- 1 is not: this is not a priority right now
  - Should be a medium range item
- Advisory Group Member: suggest we get rid of this feedback
- Facilitator: This is the time and opportunity for any member to convince the group of this feedback
- Facilitator: Removing bullet point and putting forward no feedback on Outdoor Pools Recommendation #1. Does anyone in the group disagree?
- Group: No
- Advisory Group Member: want to clarify that by “destination” in this recommendation means people coming from all over to existing outdoor pools here, not building a bigger facility?
- Yes

#### Recommendation 2: ***Prioritize locating new outdoor pools to fill current service area gaps in southcentral and southeast Vancouver***

- *16 ok with as is*
- *2 are not:*
  - *Service gaps need to be addressed by new indoor pools, because they are year round*
  - *Prioritize replacement of demolished outdoor pools before locating new outdoor pools*
  - *Renovating of existing should be priority across city*
- Advisory Group member: outdoor facilities should be prioritized with the impact of climate change - this is a higher priority than 10 years ago; outdoor facilities are not just for swimming, but to cool down and for leisure and recreation. Training and competitive training can also be outdoor – it would be great to have an outdoor facility that is better than 2<sup>nd</sup> Beach; we are lacking compared to other Lower Mainland outdoor facilities
- Advisory Group member: I agree and would move to remove all bullets
- Advisory Group member: I wish to speak for Mount Pleasant – I have been advocating for 16 years for replacement of the Mount Pleasant outdoor pool. I would like to speak to that as an additional recommendation. Four outdoor pools have been closed; I have been involved in trying to save two of them. Our advocacy has been ignored. Marpole is one of pools demolished, so that would be within the service gap area identified in this recommendation. I would like to see this as an additional recommendation
- Facilitator: Is this a Greenhouse item? Because it is not in the current recommendations
- Advisory Group member: no, this is not acceptable to me – we should be able to add to the recommendations
- Facilitator: instead of discussing this in outdoor recommendations, I see this as part of the “what else?” discussion that’s coming later in our process
- Advisory Group Member: but this is to do with outdoor pools, so we should discuss with outdoor pools
- Facilitator: turns the issue to the group
- Advisory Group member: this is a new recommendation, but the idea is that we will go through existing ones, and then get to new recommendations. It isn’t that that we would be disregarding this recommendation as an outdoor pool recommendation
- Advisory Group member: I would like to support replacing the pools, there are lots of emails about this, why couldn’t we just keep “prioritize replacement of demolished outdoor pools”?
- Advisory Group member: as far as the pools that are gone, I kind of look at the City as clean slate - if we look at pools that service the city now, as they best service communities. Would we want to prioritize those communities where pools have been demolished over other underserved areas that have never had a pool?
- Advisory Group member: this comes back to the trust issue – about demolished pools
- Advisory Group member: some of the service gaps exist because of closed pools
- Facilitator: what if we remove service gaps need to be addressed and keep the second bullet
- Advisory Group member: no, that would nullify the recommendation - we would then need to remove this recommendation
- Advisory Group member: what about “prioritize the replacement of demolished outdoor pools and equally prioritize underserved areas.”

- Advisory Group Member: if we prioritize the demolished pools and build those four pools back again, these may not be the best locations to have maximize coverage – why would we limit it to those locations, if there is a better location nearby?
- Advisory Group Member: those locations are perfect locations because Sunset and Marpole can be co-located and Mount Pleasant is very urbanized and very park deficient, Parks Board promised us that pool in the master plan of Mount Pleasant, the community raised over \$100,000 for this.
- Advisory Group Member: I have a question about this recommendation being under outdoor pools, but in light of the service gap does this mean there are areas without service and they will then get an outdoor pool before an indoor pool. I think that the service gap needs to be addressed by indoor pools in South East –for example, the River District; there is no pool there. I would not want outdoor pool put there and then community to be told that they have pool, so no indoor pool. Shouldn't be instead of an indoor pool – I'm not against outdoor pool.
- Advisory Group member: I am torn with this discussion, because I swam at Sunset and Marpole outdoor pools, but this recommendation addresses that South East corridor where there is population growth and lacking in service. We cannot please all the communities. It is a struggle that it's hard to satisfy all.
- Advisory Group member: the actual recommendation is looking at South Central South East for outdoor pools – we have no outdoor pools there. The nearest outdoor pool is going to Kits, which is ridiculous. I grew up swimming at Mount Pleasant, but we need to look at where are the people now – efficiency.
- Advisory Group member: but look at the Cambie corridor – all the people there, Mount Pleasant is really deficient in parks and pools
- Advisory Group member: is there a way to rewrite the recommendation so that it would include what was promised: prioritizing replacement of the demolished outdoor pool?
- Advisory Group member: I do think that the service gap needs to be addressed – those people are there already (in South) and are not being serviced. But the Cambie Corridor is coming – projected growth. We have a large population now in the South that is not being serviced.
- Facilitator: Can we address demolished pools separately from this recommendation?
- Advisory Group Member: Yes, as long as we do address it
- Advisory Group Member: Please put it on a post it note – we will address Mount Pleasant Pool at the end and slash the online feedback here and move on
- Facilitator: are we moving forward with this recommendation as is and addressing Mount Pleasant and demolished pools separately?
- Group: Yes
- Advisory Group Member: Where is Mount Pleasant at?
- Staff: Most municipalities base a neighbourhood park at 2 hectares; Mount Pleasant is 1.12ha. In an area with parklands deficiency, surrounded by a neighbourhood with low parkland, it is a gem of a park. There was a park master plan that looked at having a pool in the middle of the green space. Park space is valuable and you have been hearing about the concerns at Connaught; that a facility proposed to be built on the footprint of an existing footprint and there are park concerns. Some people do not want a new facility in a park, the feedback is mixed.

- Advisory Group Member: Is there funding for this now?
- Staff: There is nothing in the capital plan at the moment to build a pool in Mount Pleasant Park.
- Facilitator: could we have some more information about what happened here? We have heard the word “promise” here and in lots of the emails. What was decided previously and what happened to it?
- Staff: Yes. There are Board meeting minutes that I can share with the group.
- Advisory Group Member: I have been trying to get Mount Pleasant back since 2004 – it worked well in that park for many years. 86% of that neighbourhood wanted this pool as first priority in public consultation. It was in the master plan. We were promised a neighbourhood pool.
- Advisory Group member: I would like to move past Mount Pleasant. We are getting stuck in weeds here.

Recommendation 3: ***Provide a balance of recreation, fun, socializing and fitness, through a range of outdoor pool facilities and experiences***

- *12 people are ok with this as -is*
- *3 are not:*
  - *Don't limit uses / create individually focused facilities*
  - *Need to ensure ability/space for actual swimming in all outdoor pool facilities*
  - *Dedicated swimming spaces with lines and straight walls*
  - *Swimming first, then additional experiences*
- Advisory Group Member: disagree with swimming first, and then additional experiences – it is not fair to prioritize
- Advisory Group Member: there should be a component of training space, but I am not opposed to having recreational space and play space for children with warmer weather
- Facilitator: can we remove last bullet and leave the others?
- Advisory Group member: let's clarify the first bullet points – does it mean someone wants individually-focused facilities?
- Facilitator: My understanding of what people wrote in the survey was don't limit uses and don't create individually-focused facilities. We can make those two separate bullets for clarity. And lose the last bullet?
- Group: yes

Recommendation 4: ***Consider an outdoor pool or spray feature with every new indoor pool facility where possible with site constraints and site planning objectives***

- *15 ok as is*
- *2 are not*
  - *As long as size and scope of indoor pool isn't compromised*
  - *Too broad - need definition of spray park*
  - *only support if community consultation shows desire for these additional features*

- Advisory Group member: is there a policy or a minimum size identified for an indoor pool / a policy on minimum size?
- Staff: there is no policy yet, the updated VanSplash Strategy, if approved, will become the policy. The strategy talks about what is required to meet capacity.
- Advisory Group member: There may be an outdoor pool already close by, may not be wanted by the community
- Advisory Group member: there is no definition of spray park in our glossary
- Advisory Group member: water is not all year round at spray parks
- Staff: you can make them year-round play structures
- Advisory Group member: the definition of a spray park is no pooling of water, no tank as per [BC health regulations provided](#)
- Advisory Group member: are splash park and spray park the same thing?
- Staff: Yes
- Facilitator: staff will add spray park to the glossary
- Advisory Group member: If you have a nice pool with a spray park, it will call people in. We don't need to ask the community. We need more pools and spray parks, for the community. I would like to remove community consultation piece.
- Advisory Group member: we are going to have more heat waves, the community will want this. This bullet is saying that the community should be consulted when they build the new indoor pool
- Advisory Group member: we should be trying to speed up the process for more aquatics in Vancouver; if we put in too many barriers – don't do this; only support if that – it shows a lack of support of development. Not many communities would turn down a spray feature
- Facilitator: Only keep bullet one?
- Group: Yes

**Recommendation 5 – *Revitalize existing outdoor pools: Improve or replace changing facilities, improve food and beverage service offerings, improve or replace mechanical equipment, improve new spray features and improve deck areas to enhance quality of experience***

- *All 15 survey respondents are OK with this as is. NO discussion required; no feedback from group on this recommendation*

**Recommendation 6 – *Provide a new co-located outdoor pool in South Vancouver considering Killarney or Marpole Community Centres as possible locations***

- *14 people are ok as is*
- *1 not: remove limitation/focus on South Van*
- Advisory Group member: there is already a recommendation focusing on South Vancouver.
- Facilitator: The next recommendation (#7) also makes reference to South Vancouver and has less support than this one, with comments about multiple recommendations for South Vancouver
- Advisory Group member: let's look at Recommendation 7 now and come back to this

Recommendation 7 – *Provide a new City-wide naturally filtered destination outdoor pool in South Vancouver i.e. non-chlorinated*

- 14 ok with as is
- 4 not:
  - Same as recommendation 2 and Recommendation 6 re: South Van redundant (x2)
  - Don't limit to South Van
  - Concern that making naturally filtered will hold up development of this badly-needed outdoor pool
  
- Advisory Group member: I don't want the South Vancouver limitation to limit the possibility of this happening; greatly support this recommendation and want it to move forward in whatever area of the city
- Advisory Group member: I am not opposed to having something in South Vancouver, but I am concerned about a naturally filtered facility because of the resources required to build that facility. This might take away from other more urgent facilities, other Indoor and Outdoor facilities that may be more of a priority
- Advisory Group member: we have polluted so much of our environment and this is an opportunity to finally get a cleaner source, why would we not begin to do this? Money should have gone to this a long time ago
- Advisory Group member: are the VanSplash Recommendations listed in order of priority?
- Staff: no
- Facilitator: there have been some other comments about priority in the survey input; I'd like to suggest prioritizing is out of scope for the group's work – all of you will have different priorities for what facility or recommendation should be first / highest priority
- Advisory Group member: it is important to have a non-chlorine facility for those with allergies etc.
- Advisory Group member: I know that it said South Vancouver in three of recommendations, because of service gap, but this is also there because that is where there is space for such a facility – even if we remove reference to South Van, it will end up there.
- Facilitator: this feedback is not saying don't put it in South Van, just don't limit to South Van
- Staff: in the VanSplash Strategy the emphasis is along Fraser River – many studies would have to be done. There is an Edmonton pool where vegetation cleans the water.
- Advisory Group member: There is the park near Boundary Park - It used to be a landfill and the river is across Marine Way. It has been discussed as ecologically important area for filtering.
- Facilitator: should we remove bullets one and three – and just put forward don't limit to South Vancouver?
- Group: agrees

Back to Recommendation 6 – *Provide a new co-located outdoor pool in South Vancouver considering Killarney or Marpole Community Centres as possible locations*

- 14 people are ok as is
- 1 not: remove limitation/focus on South Van

- Advisory Group member: I fully support an outdoor pool at Marpole and Marpole is one of the four outdoor pools that was closed
- Facilitator: it's my understanding that this one Recommendation was approved and moved forward by the previous Board when VanSplash was referred back in January 2018. What is the progress on the Marpole outdoor pool
- Staff: Yes – this recommendation was approved by the previous Board and has moved forward in Marpole. For Marpole we are getting ready for engagement with community – I can connect you with the project manager for more information if you wish.
- Advisory Group member: I am OK to remove bullet and move forward with recommendation 6 as-is
- Group: agrees
- Facilitator: I'd like to clarify that we are putting forward consensus feedback – that means the bullet points we are all agreeing to will be put forward to staff as from the group as a whole, not just the few people who said they couldn't live with the recommendation as-is.
- Facilitator: would like to pause here and look at the agenda; we have one hour left in meeting but still 20 recommendations to discuss. What would we would like to focus on next: Beaches, Wading and Spray and Innovation Recommendations, Lack of Trust, Community Concerns?
- Advisory Group member: keep going with recommendations (x2)
- Advisory Group member: would like to have lack of trust conversation and community concerns because the lack of trust is in the back of our heads all the time. Then discuss whether we need to add another meeting
- Facilitator: re: adding a meeting - on our current work schedule, we have one more working meeting and one reporting back and wrap-up meeting planned for sometime in July. So basically four hours of meeting time left together to get through the rest of the material.
- Advisory Group: Could we wait until the end of the meeting to vote on an additional meeting
- Facilitator: What would the group like to do now, continue with recommendations or discuss lack of trust? – show of hands
- Continue with Recommendations – 3 people
- Discuss lack of trust and community concerns - more
- Staff member steps out of the meeting as planned for lack of trust discussion

#### Lack of Trust:

- Facilitator: We heard from some in the last meeting that there is a desire to strengthen the wording re: community engagement, to ensure meaningful consultation is done with impacted communities, user groups and stakeholders
- Facilitator: As requested last meeting, I wrote something up on lack of trust, but then decided it should not be my words; should be your words. However, based on what I heard last meeting, want to suggest a starting place:
  - Could feedback from the group be a call for meaningful engagement based on community engagement core values from IAP2 – as adopted by City of Vancouver – things like i.e. everyone potentially interested or impacted by an initiative has the right to be involved, etc.

- The city has adopted the core values for public participation - it says on the City website “hold us to account”
  - There are also slides on the City’s guiding principles for engagement; these include principles on clear communication, etc.
- Could the feedback from the group be a call for meaningful engagement based on the [City’s core values and guiding principles for engagement](#)?
- Advisory Group member: I have concerns around the number of people on a survey from a city of 650,000 people – it was a very small amount and not representative of the City as a whole; community engagement for me should start much earlier.
- Facilitator: there’s a difference between public opinion research/polling and engagement. Engagement cannot promise a representative sample, because it is engagement by choice. Representative sample is a different process.
- Advisory Group member: The lack of trust is not a problem with the park board (elected officials) but the park board staff.
- Advisory Group member: mistrust for me comes from the past; elected officials of the past – I am not saying I distrust this parks board, but there have been mistakes and broken promises in the past
- Facilitator: how do we move forward from that, and what feedback can the group provide – does this approach based on engagement core values cover it?
- Advisory Group member: there should be more in writing
- Advisory Group member: What you propose seems reasonable. I have never heard of a trust issue in my community. I don’t feel like addressing this is going to improve aquatics services. The reality of dealing with government is that you are often dealing with things from a broader perspective. Controversial to say this in this group, but this recommendation could slow things down significantly.
- Advisory Group member: I am hearing that there should be a recognition of broken promises, and accountability around past promises
- Advisory Group member: I don’t like the suggestions that staff are trained experts. I am an expert on my neighbourhood, just because someone is qualified doesn’t make them an expert on my neighbourhood
- Advisory Group member: I think the top-down world that we live in is going to be coming to a head – we are facing issues of money laundering, climate change, First Nations issues. The top-down world we live in is falling apart. We are facing serious issues and better start dealing with it
- Advisory Group Member: there is a level of mistrust is built into any system, it is one thing to say hold me to account and another thing called the iron guard of oligarchy, those who have control will always make the decisions.
- Advisory Group Member: there is a level of mistrust virtually built into any system. This is due to, first, an "iron law of oligarchy" (from an Italian political sociologist, Roberto Michels). It conveys, secondly, that no matter the best of intentions, those who control and/or gatekeep the information (its access, content, implementation, reviews, appeals, etc.) will have the essential power and, vice versa. This would apply to Park Board commissioners or trustees, civil servants and especially those in upper management, and to even our advisory committee deliberations and the mandates. It

seems thus that all we can realistically do is to make adjustments, revisions, and aim for improved democratic decision-making.

- Advisory Group member: In the VanSplash Report – the amended report – Recommendation 1 is still the same in the report: moving away from neighbourhood pools to destination pools. But the previous Board passed revised wording that hasn't been implemented.
- Facilitator: the proposed amendments to the strategy from a previous Commissioner in January 2018 were not passed. They were put forward but not passed. That was when VanSplash was referred back to staff for more work, and that's why we're here tonight. Those proposed amendments were not passed.
- Advisory Group member: If as a citizen I cannot understand what is going on, then this is failed public engagement. None of the people who speak other languages were included, many people not respected and included.
- Advisory Group member: My lack of trust stems from a conversation I had where it was suggested that VanSplash is likely not going to go through, elections are coming, there will be a new Park Board. Park Board has its own governance, the Mayor has no control over the board, not even PM Trudeau can have any say in what they come up with. No accountability? I lump all the Park Board together – previous one, and this one. And then next park board is going to say this is garbage again. I don't trust any one of them.
- Advisory Group Member: is it park board staff or elected officials? Because park board staff have their own way of doing things – the tender went out for the West End planning process<sup>1</sup> and City Councillors didn't even know about it. Elected officials do not even know what the Park Board staff is doing. It isn't the elected officials; it is the staff. They are restricting information to the elected officials. Elected officials request information and they never get it.
- Advisory Group member: I was trying to get permanent facilities for the dragon boat facility. Promises were made and then it was a complete change, promises were broken and we have a dock but no boathouse.
- Facilitator: I am hearing your reasons behind the lack of trust. I want to bring us back to what can we do about it as a group – what feedback can we put forward? It's important to remember trust is a two-way street – it takes Park Board and us to improve. What can we do as a group?
- Advisory Group member: they have to follow through on the results of public consultation, which they have not always.
- Facilitator: want to remind us again that just because engagement shows the community wants something, it doesn't mean it will happen. There are other factors that must also be considered. The IAP2 core value says the input will influence the decision, but sometimes it is: we heard you want this, but we can't do it because of this

---

<sup>1</sup> Information provided by staff following the meeting: A Request for Expression of Interest was released on Friday May 10 for Consulting Services for West end Waterfront Parks and Beach Avenue Master Plan: <https://bids.vancouver.ca/bidopp/EOI/RFEOI-PS20190485.htm> Subsequently, a memo was sent by staff to Park Board commissioners: <https://parkboardmeetings.vancouver.ca/files/MEMO-WestEndWaterfrontMasterPlanRFEOI-20190513.pdf>

- Advisory Group member: They gave 16 choices of what was wanted in the Mount Pleasant Park and 86% wanted the pool. The least wanted thing on the list was a skateboard park and that is what we got
- Advisory Group member: In terms of solutions, I thought that there was a motion that went through the elected officials that said that they were not going to decommission Lord Byng or Templeton. When it came up as one of the recommendations, that when Connaught was built then would see what community would feel, there was no mention of the motion not to decommission those two pools. This upset the community. They are going to stand up and go down in a huge number if this is not respected.
- Advisory Group member: to get back to feedback of what we would like to do to address, just clear communication is the biggest thing we could emphasize to park board. Many of the emails coming back to us are angrily worded emails about things we have learned are not true during this process. The best way to address the lack of faith is that we need to have more clarity and clear communication.
- Advisory Group member: We need to remember this whole group is non-binding in the first place. They don't have to listen to us. We just have to put forward a unified voice. No promise is broken if they don't do what we ask them to. Everyone has valid stories, but there are no promises here.
- Advisory Group member: There was a promise to build in 2010 – it's completely absurd that there is one little pool on 57<sup>th</sup>. They lied to people, promised accessible pool and now nothing is there for people with disabilities. Access for all means all pools in Vancouver should be accessible
- Advisory Group Member: There is a comment in one of the emails asking why the Advisory Group is still being asked to consider closing pools
- Facilitator: I would like to suggest there has not been a single word has been said through this group process that's in contravention of the Board's motion from January. We have not said anything about decommissioning pools looking forward. The wording of the VanSplash Recommendations does not say anything about closing pools – neither Byng nor Templeton. It says the communities will be consulted.
- Advisory Group member: this is inferred in considering the impact, but it was never actually said.
- Facilitator: Back to the feedback from the group on meaningful engagement. Should this feedback be related to some recommendations (i.e. specific to Byng, Templeton, Connaught) or should it apply across all recommendations?
- Group: across all recommendations
- Facilitator: Suggestion that the feedback re: lack of trust should include the meaningful engagement across all recommendations, and the suggested wording around lack of clarity and clear communication, directed at both park board staff and elected officials
- Group: Agree

#### **Facilitator Flip Charts from Lack of Trust Discussion:**

- Engage earlier
- Issue is with staff
- Accountability on past promises
- Access to information

- Lack of clarity and clear communication
- Agenda of staff
- Elected officials kept in dark
- Follow through on what you hear in consultation
- Protect Byng and Templeton in strategy wording
- Park Board and staff

#### Exercise:

- Facilitator: we want to understand if the lack of trust is across all members, or just some.
- *In 2-3 words, how would you describe/characterize the relationship between your community and the Park Board?* (members write on sticky notes, which are passed around before being read in order for responses to be anonymous)
- Responses:
  - It seems fine!
  - With senior staff: poor distrust both ways
  - Lack of trust
  - Very low on trust of parks staff!
  - Distant yet no issues
  - No problem
  - Lack of relationship – no specific outreach beyond narrow (few) existing outreach (i.e. just inside with outspoken people)
  - No trust, no follow through, frustrating
  - Old fashioned not realistic with what Vancouver needs
  - Adversarial, unproductive, arduous
  - Informal, non-binding and loaded with built-in vested interests
  - Divorced, separated, hatred
  - Mistrust, lack of trust
  - Very poor
  - Desire for more!
- Facilitator: Would we like to spend more time discussing lack of trust? We have an exercise that we could do in the next meeting; looks at ideal future state and steps we could take to get there. With the recognition that we are running out of time.
- Fist of five – on count of three, hold up five fingers if you really want to have more discussion on lack of trust, one finger if you are done with this conversation.
  - Average score was just over 1 out of 5
  - Facilitator: we will not spend more time discussing lack of trust

#### Wrap-up/next steps:

- Facilitator: Considering the content we still need to go through, is there a need for us to add an additional meeting? Nine of 16 say yes.
- Possible dates were circulated and participants indicated when they are not available

