

# PEMBERTON & AREA Recreation Facilities Implementation Plan



**Prepared by:**  
Caroline Lamont  
Manager of Development Services

July 2, 2013

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report reviews the various initiatives that have been undertaken during the past year in an attempt to engage the community about their thoughts and opinions related to future recreation facilities (both indoor and outdoor) in the Pemberton area (Village, Area C and Lil'wat Nation). The *Recreation Facilities Implementation Plan* brings forward an informed and community driven process to develop and/or enhance new recreation facilities for area residents.

This report first outlines the approach that was adopted in preparing the Implementation Plan, together with a summary of the findings from several background reports and community consultation initiatives. This is followed by the Implementation Plan that recommends certain actions based on the key themes of partnerships, facilities, capital costs, ongoing operations and transportation. There is recognition that additional consultation with area recreation providers and users as well as new information will be required before moving forward with additional recreation project(s).

## 2.0 APPROACH

The Recreation Facilities Implementation Plan responds to the Village of Pemberton's Official Community Plan actions to:

- update the community recreation master plan including governance decisions, facilities locations, and the community needs;
- ensure that future governance decisions identify the expectations and ongoing costs to local government administration, operations and works;
- facilitate discussions with the SLRD and Lil'wat Nation with regard to combining available resources to expand on the recreational offerings of the entire valley; and
- develop an acquisition plan to acquire lands identified for future community facilities.

In 2012, the Village of Pemberton focused efforts towards addressing the above stated OCP directions. The approach adopted by the Village was to provide greater details about the prospective facilities (notably to identify programming and cost estimates) that would empower the community and stakeholders to make informed decisions about the facilities they needed as well as the cost implications of these amenities on local property taxpayers. In the summer of 2012, the Village commenced work on a *Pemberton Area and Mount Currie Recreation Overview* and retained consultants to prepare a *Feasibility Study and Preliminary Business Analysis for Proposed Multi-Use Recreational Facility*. Lil'wat and Pemberton Area C contributed information and provided comment on the *Recreation Overview*. The Village and Lil'wat financially contributed to the *Feasibility Study and Preliminary Business Analysis*. Area C did not financially contribute or endorse the work, however, the Joint Recreation Services Manager provided information and reviewed the report. Area C indicated that the *Feasibility Study and Preliminary Business Analysis* did not address the broader needs of the community such as Area C locations.

The public consultation commenced with a community meeting to learn about the greater community's perspective about recreation. This information helped inform the *Feasibility Study and Preliminary Business Analysis*. A second more extensive community consultation shared the information from the *Feasibility Study and Business Analysis* through a questionnaire and meeting sessions. All of the outreach opportunities were inclusive to the greater Pemberton area which included Area C as well Lil'wat Nation<sup>1</sup>. The questionnaire's response rate was over 10% of resident adults (19 years and older) for Area C and the Village of Pemberton. Greater details about the findings of the reports and consultation are provided in the next section of this report.

### 3.0 BACKGROUND REPORTS AND COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

The information gathered from the reports and public outreach initiatives were fundamental to the development of this Implementation Plan. This section of the report provides an overview of the key information and directions learned during this planning process.

#### a. Pemberton Area and Mount Currie Recreation Overview, October 2012

Village staff prepared the *Recreation Overview* which compiled existing information about the greater community's existing recreational offerings and outlined the area's current social and economic status. In particular, the report focused on recreation governance considering decision making, and financial tools as well as strategic, land use and recreation master plans. The report also provided an inventory of existing and competing recreation facilities and a profile of the greater community highlighting socio-economic characteristics, recreation groups and interests together with current trends in the area.

The report also provided a summary of key observations relating to the provision of recreation facilities in the area, specifically:

**Governance** - Any partnerships in developing recreation facilities need to have a governance structure that operates within the fiscal goals of the community and ensures transparency and accountability. Each government needs to feel that they are equal players in the decision making structure despite legislative differences. Community consultation and advisory/stakeholder groups must be part of any decision making process.

**Financials** - The cost of both capital construction and ongoing operating costs must be in line with what each of the partners are able to afford and yet must equally result in a fair contribution. Alternatively, innovative yet proven funding options will be needed to ensure that the facility will be fiscally sustainable and, where possible, potential risks should be avoided or diverted to third party operators (i.e. P3 structure).

**Recreation Facilities and Community Needs** - There is general support from area governments that a significant recreation facility such as an ice rink, field house or swimming pool can only be realized through collaboration. Recreational facilities provide more opportunities for all ages in supporting healthy living and wellness. There is a lack of indoor recreational facilities in the Pemberton area, yet there are many world class, outdoor recreational experiences offered in the Pemberton-Whistler area. The use of the facilities must take into account the competing opportunities for recreation that exist in the area.

**Socio-economic Realities** - The overview provides a range of socio-economic indicators that should be recognized in the planning of new recreation facilities. In particular: the study area has many young families; a relatively stable population; Whistler is a daily employment destination for many of the residents; an existing, strong volunteer initiatives and associations supporting recreation and leisure activities; and an appetite in the community to pursue innovative and less traditional approaches for the design,

development and ongoing funding of such amenities, provided there is public accountability.

**b. Recreate Recreation Public Engagement, November 2012**

Public meetings and online opportunities were provided by the Village (open to all residents of the area) to collect high level ideas about the future of recreation in the area. The following provides a summary of the responses collected from on-line opportunities as well as interactive sessions held in the community and at both the secondary and elementary schools. The outreach was intended to collect initial perceptions about preferred recreation facilities, advantages, challenges, locations and funding.

***Preferred Recreational Facilities*** - The sessions focused on the need for an arena, field house and pool, with the following community directions:

- The arena with a single sheet of ice should include amenities such a concession, observation level, running track, roller derby loop, rental/pro shop, curling rink, and consideration of second pad or Olympic size ice.
- The field house should offer a wide range of facilities including indoor and outdoor access to washrooms, change rooms, food and beverage area, locker rooms, a track, grandstand for seating, sound system, ample power for future expansion, community kitchen (with rentable space) properly purposed floors for a wide range of activities (basketball, soccer, gymnastics, dance, track, wrestling, etc), accommodate trade shows, second storey observation room, fitness facility, etc.
- The pool could be outdoor or indoor, as the outdoor pool may be a unique draw in the area, an indoor pool provides a better year round recreation. The facility should be innovative in its design considering new technology such as geo-thermal heating or heat exchange. Consider new technology to help with efficiency. Building should be built so it can be added to later and include other amenities/multipurpose rooms.

***Advantages*** - The community identified the following as certain advantages that would exist if the Pemberton area had certain indoor recreational facilities:

- a local arena would significantly reduce the gas/driving time of going to Whistler, as well as provide a sustained local league, children learning hockey skills and skating, more recreation opportunities, dry pad space for other uses and the ability to host tournaments.
- All facilities would provide poor weather recreation options for locals and tourists, and improve the quality of life for existing and future residents in Pemberton.
- There are social benefits in providing a field house for youth and community as it brings a range of activities together under one roof.
- There are also economic benefits of a field house or an arena such as trade shows or a restaurant.

- The pool could attract more people to live in Pemberton; increase tax base and keep dollars locally.
- Swimming is an affordable life skill, and a pool will give the kids something to do; keep families (living) in Pemberton, while no longer having to deal with Whistler's Meadow Park waitlists.
- A pool is accessible to all ages and would be great for local swimming programs (safety, learn to swim), rehabilitation, enhanced retirement, competitions and provide jobs.

**Challenges** - The following challenges were identified by the community as it concerns the provision of indoor recreational facilities:

- the ability to afford the capital and operating costs and the need to look at new partnerships such as independent power producers, private schools and academies, naming rights, fundraising, increase taxes, community donations, sweat equity and making it a functional not fancy building.
- The population cannot sustain the cost of a pool given the capital and operating costs and the potential number of users. There was concern that there is no easy way to deliver a pool, as there are concerns with affordability (tax base) even though it would attract new investment and residents. The feasibility of the pool should look at operational costs.
- The cost to build the facility considering the local site constraints, as well as the long term sustainability and costs for operating and maintenance. There needs to be a good understanding of the risks in building such a facility considering competition, summer use, functionality, etc.

**Location** - The community identified many sites for new recreation facility development and the preferred characteristics such as accessed to trail connections and transit and enables long term expansion, not be in the ALR, above flood elevations, reasonable site prep costs and offer outdoor facilities. The specific sites mentioned included the gravel pit site near Pemberton Plateau, the Mainroad's site, the existing high school, the old high school, and the Arbutus Street (privately held) sites (behind the Gateway building).

**Funding** - Possible funding sources considered industry (i.e. mining and logging), sponsors, Independent Power Plants, tournaments, independent schools, links to small business and amenity funds.

**c. Feasibility Study and Preliminary Business Analysis for Proposed Multi-Use Recreational Facility, February 2013 (Canlan Ice Sports)**

This study assessed the viability of developing shared recreational facilities, within the Village of Pemberton, Squamish Lillooet Regional District (SLRD) Electoral Area C and Lil'wat Nation. The study results were also intended to meaningfully engage the greater community in discussions with regard to the viability of pursuing recreation facilities. The key findings of study commissioned by the Village and Lil'wat Nation, are as follows:

- three initial options of a pool, arena and gym<sup>ii</sup> were considered, as well as combining the amenities in a multi-use recreation facility.
- significant annual subsidies from the municipal governments will be required to financially sustain the operations due to the area's relatively small population (5,823).
- the proposed facilities should be designed and programmed to serve both the immediate population and also attract visitors from out of town.
- Any facility will require a solid ramp up period for the business, initially causing lower than normal financial results and significant operating deficits through the early years of operation. As a result ancillary revenue streams within the facility will ultimately be affected by the required ramp-up period.
- financial pro formas were prepared that identify the likely operating deficits as well as the annual debt servicing costs considering the capital costs of the facility.

Facility Type	Annual Operating Costs	Annual Debt Service	Annual Costs
Standalone Ice Arena \$7,750,000	\$180,000 - \$215,000	\$540,000	\$720,000-\$755,000
Standalone Field House \$4,200,000	\$65,000-\$108,000	\$294,000	\$359,000-\$402,000
Standalone Pool \$9,370,000	\$800,000-\$1,000,000	\$660,000	\$1,460,000-\$1,660,000
Combined Arena/Field House \$11,000,000	\$160,000-\$200,000	\$771,000	\$931,000-\$971,000
Combined Arena/Pool \$17,000,000	\$920,000-\$1,200,000	\$1,192,000	\$2,112,000-\$2,392,000
Combined Arena/Pool/Field House \$21,300,000	\$900,000-\$1,100,000	\$1,494,000	\$2,394,000-\$2,594,000

- There could be a reduction of the capital costs through the possibility of grants received from the Provincial and Federal governments.
- The report conclusions were presented to the community and feedback collected with regard to the following:
  - the confirmation of the communities appetite for seeing tax increases in the provision of certain facilities;
  - the exploration of partnership structures (both public and private) that the greater community may want to entertain to reduce costs to the local governments;
  - combined support from area governments in providing new recreation facilities

#### d. Recreate Recreation Questionnaire and Sessions, April – May 2013

The Village commenced the second phase of the *Recreate Recreation* public engagement process for residents and stakeholders in the greater Pemberton area. The purpose of the consultation was to provide the community with an overview of the key findings from the *Feasibility Study and Preliminary Business Analysis'* findings and collect meaningful feedback on

issues related to the report as well as other recreation needs identified by through the planning process. The following summarizes the findings of the respondents:

- recreate most often if a pool, rink and playing fields (improved) were provided locally. In considering indoor activities leisure swimming, swimming lessons, spa facilities and skating would be most frequently utilized. In considering outdoor activities, leisure swimming, soccer, skating, swimming lessons, spa facilities and a wading pool were most popular.
- felt most strongly that recreation facilities would provide more recreational activities and opportunities; reduce the amount of driving time to Whistler; and make the community a more desirable place to live.
- 12.6% indicated that they did not want any new recreation facilities as they did not want the community to change, preferred the Gates Lake facility, wanted to use the existing facilities more effectively and focus on outdoor activities.
- had varying support for tax increases related to providing a new recreation facility, notably:
  - 17% did not want any increase in their property taxes;
  - cumulatively<sup>iii</sup> 63% would accept an increase in their property taxes if less than \$150/year
  - cumulatively 35% would accept an increase in their property taxes if between \$150-300/year
  - cumulatively 28% would accept an increase in their property taxes if between \$301-500/year
  - 19% would accept an increase in their property taxes without a limit
  - 10.6% would accept a one-time payment per property address for capital costs
  - tax increases were conditional on the type of facility proposed, the opportunity to reduce costs through corporate sponsorship and grants, and a tax increase for a set number of years.
- indicated that there was strong support whereby the costs to build and operate recreation facilities be shared by the residents of the greater Pemberton area, notably:
  - 76% indicated that the Village cost share with Area C and Lil'wat Nation
  - 58.5% indicated that the Village share with private interests such as an independent school, land developer or other sponsorship
  - 34% indicated that the Village share with Area C
  - 27% indicated that the Village share with Lil'wat Nation
- felt that the design of the facility be functional first and foremost (69%), and that they accommodate long term recreation facility expansion for new indoor facilities (52%) and outdoor facilities (47%). Energy efficiency was supported if it did not significantly increase capital costs (45%).
- indicated that the location of the facility should be close to trails and neighbourhoods and accommodate the community's long term recreation needs. There was less support for being on school board property, not in ALR and close to both Village and Mount Currie.
- when understanding the capital and operating cost implications, the majority of respondents supported either a standalone single surface arena (49.7%) or a



standalone field house (52%). A slightly less percentage supported a standalone pool (42.8%).

- when understanding the capital and operating cost implications, the support hovered between 32-39% for combined facilities, whereby support for a soccer/lacrosse/football field was 73.5% and a softball/baseball field was 54.9%. All-weather fields only had 23.7% support.
- When understanding the capital and operating cost implications, there was only 26.7% support of the proposed Gates Lake facility.
- Other recreation facilities that were suggested included: equestrian facilities, outdoor pool, curling rink, running track, cross country ski trails, outdoor skating rink, tennis courts, climbing walls, and gymnasium.
- 53.5% supported a contribution to Whistler to ensure registration priorities, while 57.6% supported the introduction of a shuttle to Pemberton and Whistler facilities, and slightly less 44.1% supported the introduction of a recreation shuttle to Pemberton facilities.
- 13.6% would reject all types of development of new recreation facilities in the next five to ten years primarily due to the costs implications to the community. In particular, there was mention that the existing Community Centre's borrowing should be retired first, the population is too small to sustain such facilities, do not want increased taxes and concern with the potential for the mismanagement of new facilities, during construction and operations.
- Top three priorities favoured the construction of a standalone single surface arena, standalone field house and outdoor soccer field. The lowest priority was no new facilities, recreation shuttle to Pemberton facilities and a recreation shuttle to Pemberton and Whistler facilities.

A key component of the questionnaire, however was the open ended questions, particularly related to the respondents answers related to financial considerations and programming of the proposed facilities. The following list has compiled these important responses:

***Financial Considerations:***

- Concern with the projected costs (capital costs, debt service and operating costs).
- Explore other funding sources rather than the Village doing it independently
- Explore the following funding sources: grants, subsidies, private interests, Area C and Lil'wat
- Prove that the process will be more fiscally responsible than the current community centre
- Standalone facilities are not cost effective, need to phase the facility development
- Address the existing debt and the impacts of future debt.
- Resolve governance structure for recreation in the area by clearly articulating roles and responsibilities
- Retrofit community centre to maximize its recreation, leisure and cultural opportunities – explore its full potential,
- Improve and maintain current playing fields

- Review capital and operating cost implications with Area C with regard to the proposed Gates Lake facility
- Ensure the user fees will be affordable
- Transparency in decision making

***Facility Programming:***

In considering the design of the proposed recreational facilities, there was strong consensus in the results that any new facility should be first and foremost functional. In addition some of the results added new amenities, however, for the most part there seemed to be a desire to ensure that the facilities were constructed to meet the community's needs but not be excessive.

## 4.0 IMPLEMENTATION

This section provides an implementation plan that draws on the preferred directions in moving forward with any new or enhanced recreational facilities. The actions identified have considered the information provided in the *Recreation Overview* and *Feasibility Study and Preliminary Business Analysis* together with the findings of the various community consultation sessions. The action items have considered the following themes: recreation partnerships, upgraded or facility selection, capital funding sources, ongoing operations, site development and transportation options. The action items are illustrated in a flowchart format in Appendix A.

The major challenge in preparing this Implementation Plan is the realization that this initiative (at this time) has been primarily a Village project<sup>iv</sup>. The Recreation Service that is administered by PVUS has not yet endorsed this recreation planning process. Similarly, there is not yet a commitment from Lil'wat Nation to partner on future recreation planning and development in the greater Pemberton area.

As a result, action items outlined in green within Appendix A, are those tasks that currently fall within the responsibilities of the Recreation Service. The Recreation Services' involvement, however, will be pending the support of PVUS with regard to this recreation planning process. If PVUS and/or the Lil'wat do not fully endorse the direction of this planning process, then the Village will need to determine whether they want to simply continue direction of the shared service and/or proceed independently with the recommendations included in this report.

The following provides a summary about the various themes with the related action items:

### a. Recreation Partnerships

The *Recreation Overview* report indicates that recreation facilities and services in the greater Pemberton area are delivered by many organizations including the Village of Pemberton, PVUS (Squamish Lillooet Regional District Area C SLRD and the Village), Lil'wat Nation, School District No. 48, the Resort Municipality of Whistler and many private businesses. For the most part, PVUS is responsible for the delivery of recreation to Pemberton and Area C, which is administered through the Pemberton and Area Recreation Service.

The initial community engagement sessions as well as the questionnaire indicated that the current governance approach to recreation has its challenges that appear to be affecting the delivery and planning of the needed services and facilities. This observation is further confirmed by recent initiatives undertaken independently by the Village/Lil'wat Nation and later Area C. For example, the recreation planning process in which this Implementation Plan is part of was not supported by Area C but rather was led by the Village with some contribution by the Lil'wat Nation. Area C did not want to participate in the community outreach and *Recreation Overview* and *Feasibility Study and Preliminary Business Analysis* as it does not address the broader needs of the community such as Area C locations, including Gates Lake. In addition, in late 2012, Area C retained a consultant (through the Electoral Areas) to prepare an independent review of the recreation service and the relationship issues between Area C and the Village (the Village were not asked to participate in funding, however they were interviewed by the consultant). An initial draft of the discussion paper was

prepared and presented to PVUS in February 2013, and an edited version is currently being completed by the consultant.

Prior to embarking on the development of another major recreation facility (indoor or outdoor) there needs to be greater clarity on the roles and responsibilities of the various recreation providers in the greater Pemberton area. As highlighted in the *Recreation Overview and Feasibility Study and Preliminary Business Analysis*: “the area’s relatively small population (5,823) will not be enough to financially sustain the operations of a facility without significant annual subsidies from the municipal governments”, as a result any future recreation facility will need to identify the opportunities to jointly (directly or indirectly) fund and operate such amenities. The following identifies certain actions related to partnerships for recreation, which should be pursued in the course of planning for any new or enhanced recreation facilities:

- ⇒ Village to meet with Area C to determine their interest and participation in the development and ongoing operation of new indoor and/or outdoor recreation facilities.
- ⇒ Village to meet with Lil’wat Nation to determine the level of interest in the development and ongoing operation of new indoor and/or outdoor recreation facilities.
- ⇒ Village to pursue private interests such as an independent school to determine interest in the development and ongoing operation of new indoor and/or outdoor recreation facilities.
- ⇒ Meet with RMOW to discuss recreational services in the larger service area (i.e. user fees for non-Whistler residents and future recreation facilities in Whistler).
- ⇒ Meet with the School Board on any plans for future recreation facilities in the Pemberton area, including playing fields.
- ⇒ Following a decision on new recreation facilities, establish agreements for all partners that will be involved in the development and operation of the new recreation facilities.

#### **b. Preferred Facilities**

The public outreach and the background reports were intended to enable the community to make informed decisions about the needs for new or enhanced recreation facilities. In the initial stages of the outreach, the focus was on three indoor facilities being an arena, field house and pool. In response to public comment, the questionnaire also included the opportunity to comment on the proposed Gates Lake community space and park as well as outdoor soccer/lacrosse/football field, softball/baseball field and an all-weather soccer/lacrosse/football field. The questionnaire provided ballpark (Class D) cost estimates for both capital and operating costs (including debt servicing).

The questionnaire requested that respondents prioritize eleven different recreation amenities. The cumulative score indicated the following top five priorities:

	Overall Priority Ranking	First Priority Votes	Second Priority Votes	Third Priority Votes	Total of Top 3 Votes
Standalone Single Surface Arena	5.12	32	54	36	122
Standalone Field House	5.17	29	34	48	111
Soccer/Lacrosse/ Football Field	5.49	32	34	21	87
Single Surface Area/Field house	5.93	29	17	26	72
Indoor Pool <i>(there were also a handful of outdoor pool votes as top priority that have not been included)</i>	6.28	19	28	35	82

The respondents gave the highest priority to the standalone single surface arena, however, soccer/lacrosse/football field tied with the most first priority votes. When considering the three top priorities, the standalone arena came out on top. The field house and arena were ranked the highest priorities as far as indoor facilities. In reviewing these survey results, however, there does not appear to be one facility that is clearly a top priority for the majority of the respondents. As a result, additional information and consultation should be pursued to further define the preferred projects as outlined in the following actions:

- ⇒ Explore other options for swimming lessons, including organizing Pemberton only instructors for use of the Whistler's Meadow Park pool.
- ⇒ Village to investigate the preliminary costs to build and operate an outdoor pool, for the primary function of swimming lessons and includes spa facilities such as a whirlpool, steam room and/or sauna.
- ⇒ Further dialogue between Area C and Village at PVUS on the long term planning of the Gates property and the cost implications on the Recreation Service.
- ⇒ Investigate the preliminary costs to build and operate an outdoor pool, for the primary function of swimming lessons and may include spa facilities such as a whirlpool, steam room and/or sauna.
- ⇒ Explore partnerships with private interests (independent school) to build either the arena or field house facility.
- ⇒ Following a decision on new recreation facilities, form a community/ stakeholder advisory group to assist with the planning and construction options.
- ⇒ Following a decision on new recreation facilities, prepare shelf ready funding applications

### c. Capital Funding Sources

The questionnaire format and the responses considered the willingness of the community to afford new recreation facilities. The survey included pointed questions related to the tax implications of new facilities as well as open ended questions related to the respondents' concern with any of the proposed standalone, combined, field and other community facilities.

The results consistently indicated that approximately 12-14% of the respondents did not want any new recreation facilities. There was concern with the cost of construction and ongoing operations. In addition, the questionnaire also asked the level of support for a tax increase whereby 17% of respondents indicated that they would not support a tax increase. Alternatively, the remainder of the respondents indicated various levels of support for tax increase. Further derived from this question was that 83% would support an <\$150 tax increase, 55% would support between \$150-\$300 tax increase; and 28% would support between \$301-\$500 tax increase (per year).

The respondents consistently indicated that they had financial concerns with the facilities proposed, despite their support. Due to the relatively small population base in the Pemberton area and no recreation reserve funds, there will be ongoing costs of the facility operations as well as debt financing. There was also added concern with regard to the debt currently outstanding on the Community Centre and the challenges this building had with cost overruns during development as well as ongoing maintenance deficiencies.

It will be important to address the community's concerns, prior to embarking on the development of another major recreation facility (indoor or outdoor). The following actions consider capital funding factors:

- ⇒ Provide the community with information related to the current fiscal status of the new Cottonwood Community Centre and the financial plan to retire the debt.
- ⇒ Pursue sources of funding to cover capital costs, such as other area governments (SLRD Area C and Lil'wat Nation) senior government grants (shelf ready application), amenity funds from development projects, private sponsorship or partnerships (independent school) and fundraising.
- ⇒ Following a decision on new recreation facilities, develop a sound financial plan for new recreation facilities that identifies available capital funds (government reserves, amenity funds, private partnerships, sponsorship, etc.), borrowing potential and ongoing operating costs.
- ⇒ Following a decision on new recreation facilities, provide opportunities for the community to learn about and provide comment on the financial plan for a new recreation facility. Any borrowing will require a referendum which will ensure public consent.

#### d. Ongoing Operations

As evident in the preferred facilities section, the community has indicated that an arena and a field house have the highest priority as far indoor facilities, while playing (soccer) fields were top priority for outdoor facilities. The challenge in building a new facility is not only the capital costs and ongoing debt financing but also the opportunities to maximize the use of the facility. The questionnaire requested that respondents identify activities that they would participate in, as well as the programming preferences of the individual facilities.

Although the respondents indicated that they would use a swimming pool most often, the support appeared to wane when the costs of constructing and operating the facility were realized. Regardless, there were many respondents that requested the capital and operating costs for an outdoor pool.

With a focus on the arena and field house, the activities that could use the facilities are as follows:

Arena		Field House
Leisure Skating/Shinny		<i>Soccer</i>
Learn to Skate		<i>Gymnastics</i>
Curling		<i>Trampoline</i>
Organized Minor Hockey		Basketball
Organized Adult Hockey		Badminton
Drop In Hockey		<i>Roller Derby</i>
Figure Skating		<i>Ball Hockey</i>
Broomball		Volleyball
Dry Floor (no ice)	<i>Gymnastics</i>	<i>Lacrosse</i>
	<i>Trampoline</i>	<i>Conventions/Trade Shows/Concerts</i>
	<i>Ball Hockey / Roller Derby</i>	Indoor Track and Field
	<i>Lacrosse</i>	Football
	<i>Soccer</i>	Tennis
	<i>Conventions/Trade Shows/Concerts</i>	

The arena would have a concrete floor (when ice is not in). The *Feasibility Study and Preliminary Business Analysis* indicated that it was likely that the ice would not be in from April to mid-August, which then would open the building's use for other activities as noted above. A prime tenant such as a sports academy could also boost user fees. The challenge is that during this time many people would prefer to do soccer, lacrosse, and ball hockey outside although the building could be used for competitions and camps. Alternatively, there may be benefits to keeping the ice in the arena later or earlier in the skating/hockey season to host tournaments or camps.

In reviewing the programming of the arena the community indicated that the facility should be functional and thought that the number of change rooms and lobby space could be reduced. The arena should have a flexible design whereby a multipurpose room could be reprogrammed as a change room and also consider the potential to facilitate curling at certain times

([www.curling.ca](http://www.curling.ca)). The questionnaire also asked respondents whether they would support working with the Resort Municipality of Whistler to guarantee the availability of certain programs (swimming lessons). There was support for pursuing options to achieve this goal.

For the use of the field house to be maximized the facility will need to provide the appropriate flooring (turf, wood, etc.), infrastructure (goals, nets, equipment storage, etc.) and change rooms/washrooms. Facilities should also be accessible from the outdoors to maximize the use of the grounds in the long term. There was also indication that a fitness facility and yoga/dance area would complement the uses at the field house. The construction of a multi-use field house may impact the bookings at the existing Community Centre, particularly considering a fitness gym and yoga/dance area.

Currently the ongoing operations of recreation facilities in the area are undertaken by the PVUS and Lil'wat Nation (Recreation Department). As mentioned the current governance structure of PVUS has challenges that should be resolved before any new recreation facilities are added. Any facilities that are done in partnership with the Lil'wat Nation or other private interests should have agreements in place to ensure that the roles, responsibilities and financial commitments are established.

The following actions identify a certain consultation and information that should be addressed before the programming of such facilities are finalized:

- ⇒ Work to resolve governance and operational issues between the Village and Area C (PVUS) that hinder the effective, fiscally responsible and efficient delivery of existing and new recreation facilities.
- ⇒ Meet with the School Board to address the current management and maintenance of the existing playing fields.
- ⇒ Determine possible revenue/usage impacts on existing community centre with the introduction of new recreation facilities.
- ⇒ Determine the roles and responsibilities (including the lead) for all organizations that are vital to the initial development and ongoing operation of the new recreation facilities.
- ⇒ Explore with independent and public schools potential bookings or partnerships for recreational facilities.
- ⇒ Explore a joint Pemberton /Whistler Minor Hockey and Adult Hockey Associations; use of field house for Pemberton and Whistler Soccer Associations training and/or camps; and Pemberton Gymnastics the potential for gymnastics and trampoline.



### e. Site Acquisition

The community has provided through the initial recreation consultation meetings and the questionnaire, direction with regard to the preferred location of new recreation facilities. In particular, respondents indicated that the new facility should have direct trail access, be close to neighbourhoods and accommodate recreation needs for the next 20-30 years. The Pemberton area is challenged as there are few sites that are able to meet the criteria as well as be relatively affordable and not within the Agricultural Land Reserve.

In August 2012, the Village was gifted an 8.3 hectare (20 acre) parcel to the Village. The site currently has indirect trail access to the Village (Bathtub Trail and Forest Service Road) but the site will be directly on the new Friendship Trail (which is intended to connect the Village and Mount Currie). The site is large enough to accommodate a field house, arena, pool and playing fields and therefore fulfill community needs in the longer term. It is immediately adjacent to the Plateau neighbourhood and the future Hillside development. The proposed Friendship Trail and bridge will provide ease of off-road access and a short 5 minute drive to both Mount Currie and Pemberton.

The following actions should be pursued with regard to the acquisition and planning of the future recreation site:

- ⇒ Pending ALC acceptance of non-farm use, execute Offer to Purchase for the Pemberton Farm Road East site (Gravel Pit).
- ⇒ Determine the site preparation costs to accommodate flood protection, geotechnical considerations and any ALC conditions (if approved).
- ⇒ Pending ALC acceptance of non-farm use, rezone property to accommodate the proposed recreation uses.
- ⇒ Pursue site preparation works and services in a cost effective manner as opportunities arise.
- ⇒ Pending ALC acceptance of non-farm use and the selection of the new recreation facilities, Master plan the site to complement surrounding uses including but not limited to the private school, residential and commercial development (also subject to an ALC exclusion), natural environmental features and the Friendship Trail.
- ⇒ Pursue site preparation works in a cost effective manner.

### f. Transportation Improvements

The *Feasibility Study and Preliminary Business Analysis* and the questionnaire both recognized that an option in addressing challenges related to recreation may be improved by enhanced transportation links. Currently there are daily trips by Pemberton area residents to Whistler for a range of recreational facilities to use the pool, ice rink and other facilities that could be accommodated in a field house (i.e. gymnastics and tampoline), as they are not offered in the Pemberton area. In addition, the proposed Gates Lake facility is intended to increase

recreational opportunities in the Poole Creek to D'Arcy area, which would reduce trips to Pemberton. The questionnaire asked respondents whether they would support improved transportation links rather than the construction of new facilities to Pemberton and Whistler facilities. There was 44% support for a Pemberton area shuttle, and a 58% support for a Whistler shuttle, although when asked to prioritise these options over new facilities, they were the least popular.

Regardless, in the consideration of new recreation facilities there needs to be a recognition that residents in the Pemberton area currently do pay a service charge (time and transportation costs of driving) to recreate if they participate in programs that require distanced driving. As noted in the *Feasibility Study and Preliminary Business Analysis*, a family with a child that plays hockey will be required to drive the 60 km return trip to the Meadow Park rink between 2-3 times a week for approximately 7 months. Although many families car pool, there are significant costs to this commitment, which likely exceed the tax increase for the users property (that would be needed to develop and operate a local facility).

At this time there was no action items related to transportation improvements.

## 5.0 NEXT STEPS

This draft Implementation Plan has been prepared for initial review by Council at their July 2, 2013 Committee of the Whole to further discuss the planning process and this report. It is the intent that following Pemberton's initial review of the document, separate meetings will be arranged by staff to review the findings with the staff of the SLRD and Lil'wat Nation. If there is agreement on the Implementation Plan, then this document will be recommended for approval and action.

---

<sup>i</sup> Lil'wat however did not promote the outreach opportunities within their community. Newspaper advertisements, email blasts, signage, handout notices and the radio were used to further promote participation in the Pemberton/Area C region.

<sup>ii</sup> a stand-alone gym was not considered as part of the study as alternatively a multisport field house with both turf and hard court surfaces would deliver a greater mix of indoor sports. In addition, it provides the flexibility to offer certain options such as a performing arts stage, or a venue for small concerts and community event type productions such as smaller industry trade shows, conventions, car shows and productions of that nature.

<sup>iii</sup> The cumulative results have calculated the level of support for tax increases. For example if a respondent supported a tax increase of \$301-\$500, it is assumed that they also support a tax increase of less than \$500. It is these cumulative number that has been indicated.

<sup>iv</sup> Although the Recreation Advisory Committee have supported and members have actively participated in the initiatives

## APPENDIX A – RECREATION FACILITIES ACTION ITEMS

### RECREATION PARTNERSHIPS

### FACILITY SELECTION

### CAPITAL FUNDING

### ON GOING OPERATIONS

### SITE ACQUISITION

**CONSULT**  
Village to meet with Area C to determine their interest and participation in the development and ongoing operation of new indoor and/or outdoor recreation facilities.

**NEW INFORMATION**  
Explore other options for swimming lessons, including organizing Pemberton only instructors for use of the Whistler’s Meadow Park pool.

**SHARE INFORMATION**  
Provide the community with information related to the current fiscal status of the new Cottonwood Community Centre and the financial plan to retire the debt.

**CONSULT**  
Work to resolve governance and operational issues between the Village and Area C (PVUS) that hinder the effective, fiscally responsible and efficient delivery of existing and new recreation facilities

**DECISION**  
Pending ALC acceptance of non-farm use, execute Offer to Purchase for the Pemberton Farm Road East site (Gravel Pit).

**CONSULT**  
Village to meet with Lil’wat Nation to determine the level of interest in the development and ongoing operation of new indoor and/or outdoor recreation facilities.

**NEW INFORMATION**  
Village to investigate the preliminary costs to build and operate an outdoor pool, for the primary function of swimming lessons and includes spa facilities such as a whirlpool, steam room and/or sauna.

**NEW INFORMATION**  
Village staff to pursue sources of funding to cover capital costs (i.e. area governments (SLRD Area C and Lil’wat Nation), senior government grants, amenity funds from development, sponsorship or partnerships (independent school) and fundraising.

**CONSULT**  
Meet with the School Board to address the current management and maintenance of the existing playing fields,

**ACTION**  
Pending ALC acceptance of non-farm use, rezone property to accommodate the proposed recreation uses.

**CONSULT**  
Village to pursue private interests such as an independent school to determine interest in the development and ongoing operation of new indoor and/or outdoor recreation facilities.

**CONSULT**  
Further dialogue between Area C and Village at PVUS on the long term planning of the Gates property and the cost implications on the Recreation Service.

**NEW INFORMATION**  
Determine possible revenue/usage impacts on existing community centre with the introduction of new recreation facilities

**ACTION**  
Determine the site preparation costs to accommodate flood protection, geotechnical considerations and any ALC conditions (if approved)

**CONSULT**  
Meet with RMOW to discuss recreational services in the larger service area (i.e. user fees for non-Whistler residents, future recreation facilities in Whistler

**NEW INFORMATION**  
Investigate the preliminary costs to build and operate an outdoor pool, for the primary function of swimming lessons and may include spa facilities such as a whirlpool, steam room and/or sauna.

**NEW INFORMATION**  
Determine the roles and responsibilities (including the lead) for all organizations that are vital to the initial development and ongoing operation of the new recreation facilities.

**ACTION**  
Pursue site preparation works and services in a cost effective manner as opportunities arise.

**CONSULT**  
Meet with the School Board on any plans for future recreation facilities in the Pemberton area, including playing fields.

**CONSULT**  
Explore partnerships with private interests (independent school) to build/operate either the arena or field house facility.

**CONSULT**  
Explore with Independent and public schools potential bookings or partnerships for recreational facilities.

**CONSULT**  
Explore a joint Pemberton /Whistler Minor Hockey and Adult Hockey Associations; use of field house for Pemberton and Whistler Soccer Associations training and/or camps and Pemberton Gymnastics the potential for gymnastics and trampoline.

**DECISION**  
Subject to the action items noted above, a long term facilities program be determined for the Pemberton area\*

**DECISION**

Subject to the action items noted above, a long term facilities program be determined for the Pemberton area\*

**RECREATION PARTNERSHIPS**

**ACTION**

Establish agreements for all partners in the new recreation facilities

**FACILITY SELECTION**

**CONSULT**

Form a community/ stakeholder advisory group to assist with the planning and construction options for proposed recreation facilities

**CAPITAL FUNDING**

**NEW INFORMATION**

Develop a sound financial plan for new recreation facilities that identifies available capital funds (government reserves, amenity funds, private partnerships, sponsorship, etc.) borrowing and ongoing operating costs.

**ON GOING OPERATIONS**

**ACTION**

Establish in agreements for all organizations that will operate or utilize the new recreation facilities

**SITE ACQUISITION**

**ACTION**

Master Plan the site to complement surrounding uses including but not limited to the private school, residential and commercial development (also subject to an ALC exclusion), natural environmental features and the Friendship Trail.

**NEW INFORMATION**

Prepare shelf ready funding applications selected recreation facilities

**CONSULT**

Provide opportunities for the community to learn about and provide comment on the financial plan for a new recreation facility. Any borrowing will require a referendum which will ensure public consent.

Note that as the process unfolds, additional actions will be identified