

RECREATION FACILITIES QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

Questions #1, #2, #3 and #4 - DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTER																																																	
Participation	The questionnaire was completed by 352 people in the Pemberton/Area C/Lil'wat Nation area. Although residents of the Lil'wat Nation were welcome to participate, no hands-on promotion of the questionnaire was undertaken in their community.																																																
Place of Residence	The majority of respondents (69.6% ¹) indicated that they lived in the Village of Pemberton. 8% of respondents that were not within the Village boundary but lived in close proximity to the developed areas of the Village (Pemberton Fringe). Including the fringe areas but excluding Lil'wat Nation, approximately 76 respondents were from Area C or 28.4%. Residents of the Lil'wat Nation/Mount Currie/Xit'olacw comprised 2% of the respondents. The 2013 population is estimated at approximately 2445 persons for the Village, and 1773 persons ² for Area C, being a ratio of 58:42. The respondents of the Village and Area C (removing the Lil'wat Nation respondents) had a ratio of 71:29.																																																
Family Size (at current place of residence):	The family size ranged from one to six person(s), with concentrations focused on two, three and four person households as 29%, 23% and 31.3% respectively. Canada Census indicates that the average family size for the Village and Area C in 2011 was 2.8 persons per household while the questionnaire indicated 3.0 persons per household.																																																
Age:	The respondents ranged from between 10-14 years to 80+ years. The highest response rate was from individuals between 40-49 years (34.9%), followed closely by 30-39 years (33.5%). The response rate, when compared to the age breakdown for the Village and Area C from the 2011 Census indicates that the questionnaire respondents were representative ³ .																																																
Age Distribution:	<p>The following table compares the 2011 Census age distribution with family ages (total respondents minus Lil'wat Nation) of the questionnaire respondents. The red shading identifies where there is over representation in the questionnaire and the yellow indicates where there is under representation.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #cccccc;"> <th></th> <th>Census</th> <th>Questionnaire</th> <th>Difference</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr style="background-color: #f4cccc;"> <td>0-4 years</td> <td>7.60%</td> <td>10.0%</td> <td>+2.4%</td> </tr> <tr style="background-color: #f4cccc;"> <td>5-9 years</td> <td>6.40%</td> <td>9.4%</td> <td>+3.0%</td> </tr> <tr style="background-color: #f4cccc;"> <td>10-14 years</td> <td>5.30%</td> <td>9.1%</td> <td>+3.8%</td> </tr> <tr style="background-color: #fff2cc;"> <td>15-19</td> <td>4.80%</td> <td>3.3%</td> <td>-1.5%</td> </tr> <tr style="background-color: #fff2cc;"> <td>20-29</td> <td>11.50%</td> <td>4.7%</td> <td>-6.8%</td> </tr> <tr style="background-color: #fff2cc;"> <td>30-39</td> <td>24.30%</td> <td>20.9%</td> <td>-3.4%</td> </tr> <tr style="background-color: #f4cccc;"> <td>40-49</td> <td>18.90%</td> <td>27.4%</td> <td>+8.5%</td> </tr> <tr style="background-color: #fff2cc;"> <td>50-59</td> <td>11.60%</td> <td>9.4%</td> <td>-2.2%</td> </tr> <tr style="background-color: #fff2cc;"> <td>60-69</td> <td>6.40%</td> <td>3.9%</td> <td>-2.5%</td> </tr> <tr style="background-color: #f4cccc;"> <td>70-79</td> <td>2.50%</td> <td>1.4%</td> <td>+1.1%</td> </tr> <tr style="background-color: #fff2cc;"> <td>80+</td> <td>0.90%</td> <td>0.4%</td> <td>-0.5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Census	Questionnaire	Difference	0-4 years	7.60%	10.0%	+2.4%	5-9 years	6.40%	9.4%	+3.0%	10-14 years	5.30%	9.1%	+3.8%	15-19	4.80%	3.3%	-1.5%	20-29	11.50%	4.7%	-6.8%	30-39	24.30%	20.9%	-3.4%	40-49	18.90%	27.4%	+8.5%	50-59	11.60%	9.4%	-2.2%	60-69	6.40%	3.9%	-2.5%	70-79	2.50%	1.4%	+1.1%	80+	0.90%	0.4%	-0.5%
	Census	Questionnaire	Difference																																														
0-4 years	7.60%	10.0%	+2.4%																																														
5-9 years	6.40%	9.4%	+3.0%																																														
10-14 years	5.30%	9.1%	+3.8%																																														
15-19	4.80%	3.3%	-1.5%																																														
20-29	11.50%	4.7%	-6.8%																																														
30-39	24.30%	20.9%	-3.4%																																														
40-49	18.90%	27.4%	+8.5%																																														
50-59	11.60%	9.4%	-2.2%																																														
60-69	6.40%	3.9%	-2.5%																																														
70-79	2.50%	1.4%	+1.1%																																														
80+	0.90%	0.4%	-0.5%																																														
Significance:	The demographics of the respondents, for the most part indicate that the questionnaire responses were a good representation of Pemberton and Area C as far as household size and age. The questionnaire, however, does over represent Village of Pemberton residents by approximately 13%.																																																

¹ This also includes Pemberton Plateau/Hillside/Industrial Park and two "Other" responses that stated The Peaks and The Benchlands which are both in the Village.

² This assumes that the local jurisdictions' population growth at the same rate as between 2006-2011, which was 1.6% per year for the Village and -0.86% for Area C.

³ Note that the following table removes respondents 19 years and younger (as they were often represented by a parent responding) and Lil'wat Nation respondents

Ages	2011 Census				Recreation Questionnaire	
	Village	Area C	Total	% for 20 yrs+	Responses*	% Response
20-29	295	175	470	15%	19	5.5%
30-39	675	315	990	32%	118	34%
40-49	450	320	770	25%	123	35%
50-59	135	340	475	15%	51	14.5%
60-69	100	160	260	8%	24	7%
70-79	30	70	100	3%	10	3%
80+	10	25	35	1%	3	1%

* Yellow highlight indicates where response rate was within 2% of the actual age distribution

RECREATION FACILITIES QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

Questions #5 – FACILITY USE

The questionnaire listed a wide array of recreational activities that would require the development of facilities. Respondents were asked to indicate those activities that your family would participate in if the required facility was offered in the Pemberton/Area C/Lil'wat area. The amount of participation was pre-set to pick one of the following options: Frequently (2-3 x/week), Often (3-4 x/month), On Occasion (1 x/month), Rarely (1-3x/year) and Never.

To focus the results the findings were divided into indoor and outdoor facilities and focused on the very frequent/often users and the never/rarely users only. Appendix A contains several tables that compare the responses which provide a more detailed analysis of the key findings noted below.

<p>Most Popular Types of Recreation</p>	<p>If facilities were provided locally, the respondents indicated that <u>indoor</u> swimming activity (leisure, lessons and spa facilities) and skating would be most utilized, while leisure swimming, soccer, skating, swimming lessons, spa facilities and a wading pool would be the most utilized <u>outdoor</u> activities. In comparing the same activity in either an indoor or outdoor facility, leisure swimming was by far the most popular activity followed by skating, swimming lessons and spa facilities. Soccer was the second most popular activity outdoors and fifth most popular if held indoors.</p> <p>The respondents were also asked to add any activities that were not identified in the question. The following were identified: bowling, climbing wall, wave pool, slow pitch, indoor/outdoor fitness, dance, paddling, mountain biking, volleyball, shooting, martial arts, yoga, paragliding (handling field), xc skiing, walking, hiking, tai chi, short track speed skating, racquet ball/squash, horseback riding, diving, shooting, and pickle ball.</p>
<p>Least Popular Types of Recreation</p>	<p>If facilities were provided locally, the respondents indicated that they would be less likely to participate in the following activities if provided indoors or outdoors: broomball, baseball, football, lacrosse, figure skating, and roller derby. The responses to these activities seem to relate less to indoor or outdoor facilities, but rather the popularity of the actual activity.</p>
<p>Significance:</p>	<p>The respondents would recreate if the appropriate indoor and/or outdoor facilities were provided. It appears that a pool, rink and playing fields would be most utilized. Indoor facilities would increase the level of use for the swimming and skating activities.</p>

RECREATION FACILITIES QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

Question #6 - OPINIONS ON RECREATION FACILITIES	
<p>The question asked respondents to indicate whether they felt that certain statements reflected their opinions about the provision of additional recreational facilities in Pemberton.</p>	
<p>Recreation Opinions</p>	<p>The following summarizes the key findings: At least 60% of the respondents favoured the following statements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Provide more recreational activities and opportunities in the area (66.6%)</i> ▪ <i>Reduce the amount of driving to whistler, or other recreational facilities not provided in Pemberton/Mount Currie (67.2%)</i> ▪ <i>Make the community an even more desirable place to live (65.4%)</i> <p>The majority (between 50-59%) of respondents also agreed with the following statements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Retain families in our community in the long term (residents leave due to lack of recreational facilities) (59.5%)</i> ▪ <i>Provide a community gathering place encouraging and embracing opportunities for social interaction around sports and leisure (55.1%)</i> ▪ <i>Provide more recreational activities during the winter/poor weather (53.7%)</i> ▪ <i>Provide opportunities to learn to swim (52.5%)</i> ▪ <i>Drive business opportunities in the area (51.3%)</i> <p>There were also statements related to the provision of facilities for new opportunities to learn other sports, facilitate athletic excellence and ensuring priority access; however these received less than majority support.</p> <p>It should be noted that 12.6% supported the statement “Do not want new recreation facilities”. The respondents were also given the opportunity to provide any comments regarding the statements contained in the question. The detailed comments are provided in Appendix B, while the highlights are listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Other reasons identified to support recreation not already mentioned in the statements included reducing the driving for Darcy/Birken residents by providing recreation services at Gates and to drive more employment and the economy in the area, notably young adults/youth.</i> ▪ <i>Of those that did not want recreation facilities comments included the desire not to have change, to improve the Gates facility, use what we have more effectively, and focus on the outdoors.</i> ▪ <i>There were also many comments about the inability of the community to be able to pay for the facilities</i>
<p>Significance</p>	<p>The respondents seemed to want recreation facilities for the overall health of the greater community, while just over 12.6% indicated that they did not want any new recreation facilities. Any new development will need to address these concerns and the implications for the constituents.</p>

RECREATION FACILITIES QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

Question #7 - FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF NEW RECREATION FACILITIES

<p>Tax Implications</p>	<p>The question asked respondents to provide their opinions related to seven (7) statements which considered the implications to residential property taxes or parcel taxation. The following provides a summary of the responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 21.4% of respondents indicated that they did not want an increase in their residential property taxes. The same respondents, however, also agreed with other cost implication statements listed in the question: supported increase in property taxes less than \$150 per year (20.5%), supported an increase between \$150-300 per year (5.5%), and supported recreation facilities regardless of impact on property taxes (1.7%). · 35.5% of respondents indicated that they would support an increase in their residential property taxes of less than \$150 per year. The same respondents, however, also agreed with other cost implication statements: supported no tax increase (13%), supported an increase in residential property taxes between \$150-300 per year (16.5%), supported an increase in residential property taxes between \$301-500 (3%) per year and supported recreation facilities regardless of impact (4%) on property taxes. · 29.6% of respondents indicated that they would support an increase in their property taxes of between \$150-\$300. The same respondents, however, also agreed with other cost implication statements: no increase in property taxes (4%), increase in residential property taxes of less than \$150 per year (19.8%), increase in residential property taxes between \$301-\$500 per year (11%) and support for recreational facilities regardless on the impact on property taxes (9%). · 7.3% of respondents indicated that they would support an increase in their property taxes of between \$301-\$500. The same respondents, however, also agreed with other cost implication statements: no increase in property taxes (4%), increase in residential property taxes of less than \$150 per year (16%), increase in residential property taxes between \$150-300 per year (44%) and support for recreational facilities regardless on the impact on property taxes 20%). · 14.7% of respondents indicated that they would like recreational facilities regardless of the impact on property taxes. The same respondents, however, also agreed with other cost implication statements: supported no tax increase (2%), supported an increase in residential property taxes less than \$150 (10%), supported an increase in residential property taxes between \$150-300 per year (20%), and support an increase in residential property taxes between \$301-\$500 (10%). · 8.8% of the respondents do not pay property taxes · 10.6% supported a one-time payment per property address for capital costs (to avoid ongoing costs of borrowing) <p>The question provided an opportunity for additional comments. The following summarize the direction of these responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · <i>Difficult to answer when you don't know what kind of dollar figure you are looking at and over how many years</i> · <i>Depends on what recreation facility is considered</i> · <i>Consider corporate sponsorship and grants to reduce costs</i> · <i>Renters, but also they indirectly pay property taxes in their rent</i> · <i>Think outside the box! work together</i> · <i>Why should we all pay now for the future residents</i> · <i>Base the rate per household size like property taxes.</i> · <i>We do not have the tax base to entertain spending money on a recreational facility</i> · <i>I pay property taxes in my rent</i> · <i>Tax increase for set number of years only</i>
--------------------------------	---

RECREATION FACILITIES QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

Significance	<p>To enable flexibility of the respondents, the question allowed more than one response. As a result the analysis had to filter the results to determine the cumulative level of support or non-support for each option. The following table has indicated the maximum level of support for each tax increase. For example if an individual supported all levels of increase only the "no limit to increase" was counted. Similarly the "no increase" responses were not counted if the responded also indicated support for any level of increase. The analysis is detailed in Appendix "C", but in the end it appears the respondents support is as follows:</p> <table border="1"><thead><tr><th>Response</th><th>Cumulative Support Percentage</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>No Increase</td><td>17%</td></tr><tr><td><\$150 Increase</td><td>28%</td></tr><tr><td>\$150-300 Increase</td><td>27%</td></tr><tr><td>\$301-\$500 Increase</td><td>9%</td></tr><tr><td>No Limit to Increase</td><td>19%</td></tr></tbody></table>	Response	Cumulative Support Percentage	No Increase	17%	<\$150 Increase	28%	\$150-300 Increase	27%	\$301-\$500 Increase	9%	No Limit to Increase	19%
Response	Cumulative Support Percentage												
No Increase	17%												
<\$150 Increase	28%												
\$150-300 Increase	27%												
\$301-\$500 Increase	9%												
No Limit to Increase	19%												

RECREATION FACILITIES QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

Question #8 - FUNDAMENTALS OF A NEW FACILITY	
	<p>The questionnaire asked for the respondents support for certain statements that were fundamental in the development of new recreation facilities. The directions most supported by the respondents considered two main themes: partnerships for sharing capital and operating costs and building design.</p> <p>Cost Sharing;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The most popular response to cost sharing was the Village sharing the capital and operating costs with Area C and Lil'wat Nation (76%), followed by Village sharing with private interests such as an independent school, land developer, sponsorship, etc (58.5%). The other options to share with Area C or Lil'wat Nation independently were less popular at 34% and 27%, respectively. <p>Design Considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The most popular response considering the character of the building supported that the facilities be functional first and foremost (69%), followed by that the facilities accommodate long term recreation facility expansion for new indoor facilities (52%). The other options included accommodating the long term recreation facility expansion of outdoor playing fields (47%), incorporate green building, energy efficient technology provided it does not significantly increase capital costs (45%) and incorporate green building, energy efficient technology (27%). <p>Comments:</p> <p>Cost Sharing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · <i>Concern with ability of local government partnerships given past record or lack of record</i> · <i>Concern with partnerships with private interests</i> · <i>Capital costs should be shared</i> · <i>The VOP has an abysmal record of partnering with SLRD and Mt Currie has no reason to partner with the VOP.</i> · <i>Do not have tax base, even if costs were shared among jurisdictions</i> <p>Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · <i>Green building methods will pay for themselves in the long run, the building needs to have character</i> · <i>Be forward thinking as far as expansion needs for the future</i> · <i>Function of the building and facilities should carry much weight over subjective aesthetic design.</i> · <i>Consideration for traffic impacts, parking, bus service, shuttle service</i>
Significance	<p>The results indicate that the community believes that the costs of new recreation facilities should be shared by the regional populations and corresponding governments and that the buildings should be functional and efficient to ensure it will be cost effective. It also appears that a significant number of respondents would like private partnerships to be pursued to assist in off-setting the capital and operating costs. The comments indicate that many respondents are concerned with the ability of the Village and the regional jurisdictions to support such facilities given past experiences.</p>

RECREATION FACILITIES QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

Question #9 - LOCATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

The questionnaire asked that the respondents prioritise certain locational characteristics for future recreation facilities. As outlined in the Appendix D, the top three priorities of the respondents (in order) were:

1. Direct Trail Access (more than half of the respondents identified this as one of their top 3 priorities)
2. Close to Neighbourhoods
3. Accommodate Recreation Needs for the next 20-30 years

The characteristic with the lowest priority were:

1. On School Board Property
2. Not in Agricultural Land Reserve
3. Site Preparation Costs of Reasonable

	Top 3	Bottom 3
close to Neighbourhoods	139 (2)	18 (9)
close to Downtown	97 (5)	63 (6)
Direct Trail access	183 (1)	18 (9)
Not in ALR	56 (9)	107 (2)
Land Value is Nominal	109 (4)	27 (8)
Site Prep are Reasonable	84 (7)	35 (7)
On School Board Property	13 (10)	162 (1)
Close to Village and Mount Currie	92 (6)	92 (3)
Accommodate Rec Needs for 20-30 yrs	102 (3)	76 (5)
Accommodate Outdoor Playing Fields	79 (8)	88 (4)

Significance:

The previous consultation session on the Recreation identified the following sites: They stack up against the community priorities as follows:

	Direct Trail Access	Close to Neighbourhoods	Rec Needs for 20-30 yrs	Other Considerations
Gravel Pit Site (north of Plateau subdivision)	Indirect Singletrack and Forestry Road, proposed with Friendship Trail and Bridge	Plateau Proposed Hillside Neighbourhood	Yes	Village currently has a 3 year lease and option to purchase (\$1) In ALR, but currently being reviewed for proposed non-farm use
Former Mainroad Site (Lil'wat Properties)	Yes, could has some safety enhancements	The Peaks Pioneer Junction The Glen Crabapple/Arbutus	Large Site but privately owned	Private ownership, will need to purchase (valuable development site)
Old High School Site	No	Clover Road Benchlands	Yes	School Board Property, currently contains bus barn and playing fields
High School Lands	Yes	Aspen Fields/Poplar Downtown The Glen	No	School Board Property
Arbutus Lot (Next to Waterpark)	Yes	Aspen Fields/Poplar Downtown The Glen	No	Private ownership, will need to purchase (valuable development site)
Community Centre Greenspace	Yes	Aspen Fields/Poplar Downtown, The Glen, Arbutus/Cottonwood	No	Compromise existing green space

RECREATION FACILITIES QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

Question #10 - STANDALONE FACILITIES

The respondents were provided a description of three possible standalone facilities: Arena, Fieldhouse and Pool. The following provides the responses on their support for any of the three proposed facilities:

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Single Surface Arena	49.7%	37.2%	13.1%
Field House	52.1%	32.5%	15.4%
Pool	42.8%	46.2%	11%

In the respondents that supported the arena, 65.9% supported the fieldhouse and 57.1% supported the pool.

In the respondents that supported the fieldhouse, 61.4% supported the arena and 41.7% supported the pool.

In the respondents that supported the pool, 67.8% supported the arena and 53.6% supported the fieldhouse.

The respondents were also asked to identify any financial aspects of the proposed standalone facilities that were of concern. As this was an open ended question, the responses are provided in Appendix B but summarized below:

- More than a quarter of respondents indicated concern with costs, notably debt service, increased taxes, not enough population base and share costs
- Desire to Consider an Outdoor Pool
- Concerns with Costs of a Pool
- Explore other funding sources such as grants, subsidies, private interests, Area C and Lil'wat partnerships
- Explore a more basic functional arena
- Concern with Track Record /Learn from Mistakes
- Concern with Operating Costs
- Field House duplicating existing facilities in fields, schools and community centre
- Standalone Facilities are not Cost Effective in Longer Term
- Concern with Existing Debt

The respondents were also asked to identify any aspects of the programming of the proposed standalone facilities that were of concern. As this was an open ended question, the responses are provided in Appendix B but summarized below:

Arena

- Summer use for field house function
- Reduce number of change rooms and common lobby space
- Add Curling rink, food service and refreshments and international ice size
- Arena could be much more modest - a small town prairie community model
- Multiuse room

Pool

- Add wave pool, steam room and/or sauna and hot tub
- Remove therapeutic pool
- Down scale all facilities
- Outdoor heated pool with basic building which houses washroom/change room facility.

Field House

- The field house should accommodate baseball and softball with multiple options. portable pitchers mounds, different base length options, fencing for home runs, etc
- smaller to reduce the costs to build/operate
- area and pool need additional facilities to attract the public: workout gym, basketball court, yoga space. Squash courts
- If you build a Field House you need good fields
- Spectator viewing, change rooms and storage
- Gymnastics space

RECREATION FACILITIES QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

- Quonset hut only
- Horse riding arena

Nothing Fancy

- nothing fancy, very simple facilities to keep costs low

Outdoor Fields

- we do not need this caliber of stuff, we are not Whistler
- needs outdoor soccer fields

Reprogram

- Get a real gym at the community center and keep the fields at the old school in good shape.

Too Much/Use Existing Recreation Opportunities (Outdoor)

RECREATION FACILITIES QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

Question #11 - COMBINED FACILITIES

Combined Facilities

The respondents were provided a description of three possible combined facilities: Arena/Fieldhouse, Arena/Pool and Arena/Fieldhouse/Pool. The following provides the responses on their support for any of the three proposed facilities:

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Arena/Fieldhouse	38.5%	48.7%	12.8%
Arena/Pool	38.7%	49.8%	11.5%
Arena/Fieldhouse/Pool	32.5%	53.1%	14.4%

- In the respondents that supported the arena/fieldhouse, 44.7% supported the arena/pool and 47.1% supported the arena/fieldhouse/pool
- In the respondents that supported the arena/pool, 46.3% supported the arena/fieldhouse and 67% supported the arena/fieldhouse/pool.
- In the respondents that supported the arena/fieldhouse/pool, 61.2% supported the arena/fieldhouse and 83.1% supported the arena/pool.

Financial Considerations - The respondents were also asked to identify any financial aspects of the proposed combined facilities that were of concern. As this was an open ended question, the responses are provided in Appendix B but summarized below:

- Too expensive and risky to construct and finance
- Serious Tax Implications/Costs
- Village needs to share costs of the facilities
- Retire Existing Debt First
- Make the Facilities more basic in their function
- Governance Model Considerations
- Operating Costs Need to be Addressed
- Consider an Outdoor Pool
- Need alternative funding sources

Programming Considerations - The respondents were also asked to identify any financial aspects of the proposed combined facilities that were of concern. As this was an open ended question, the responses are provided in Appendix B but summarized below:

Facilities

- Squash courts
- Wave pool to bring residents and tourists from Whistler.
- sauna, hot tub, steam room
- Remove therapeutic pool
- keep the facilities functional - don't over build, basic structure, not an architectural showpiece
- add a gym area arena with indoor / outdoor convertible pool remove pool
- less necessary for 6 change rooms in the arena.
- sleeping/tournament area with a bathroom for tournament/event sleeping
- curling rink
- gymnastics/trampoline
- horse riding arena
- outdoor pool

Financial Partners for Cost Sharing

- users pay their share

Approach

- Start small and expand.
- Start with arena/field house with option to add on pool "if" affordable in the future

RECREATION FACILITIES QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

- Make the community centre work
- marketing made a priority

Object

- Fieldhouse is duplication of existing facilities
- cost too much per household
- pay off the community centre first
- what about a pool/field house
- facilities too expensive

RECREATION FACILITIES QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

Question #12 - FIELDS

The respondents were provided a description of three possible field facilities: soccer/lacrosse/football field; softball/baseball field and all weather field. The following provides the responses on their support for any of the three proposed facilities:

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Soccer/Lacrosse/Football Field	73.5	14.4	12.1
Softball/Baseball Field	54.9	25.7	19.4
All-Weather Field (synthetic turf)	23.7	56.7	19.6

Respondents that supported one type of field also supported other options:

- In the respondents that supported the soccer/lacrosse/football field, 71.6% supported the baseball/softball field and 26.3% supported the all-weather field.
- In the respondents that supported the baseball/softball field, 94.7% supported the soccer/lacrosse/football field and 26.7% supported an all-weather field.
- In the respondents that supported the All Weather Field, 83.1% supported the soccer/lacrosse/football field and 66.1% supported the softball/baseball field.

Financial Aspects of Fields

- Estimated cost of playing field and the baseball field is to be the same which does not seem plausible
- We don't need anything fancy
- All weather fields need replacement every 10 years –
- A couple of additional soccer and softball fields are acceptable, but no indoor facilities.
- soccer tournaments happen in Pemberton... offer great playing venue then this would be a win-win for the community... could help pay for the additional costs as well as boost the overall economy of Pemberton.
- need seating! Sod some fields for soccer! Not all weather fields! Soccer is used a lot.
- We need to retire the current debt before embarking on new debt.

Approach

- Need to prioritize what is most important
- Afford this more than the arena and pool
- fields are needed as well as trails
- co-op with schools

Operating Costs

- financial costs for operation seem fairly reasonable.
- how much are you charging users? not something people will be able to pay
- cost of fields seem high and all weather need to be replaced every 10 years @ \$500,000
- All- weather synthetic turf is too expensive and it's hard on athletes joints, even kids
- user pays
- all weather would extend seasons
- rules for operations

Financial Concerns

- all weather field very costly
- only support one facility due to financial issues.
- synthetic turf too expensive, not good use if you have a field house
- Improve existing fields
- Everything is too expensive for a town with no tax base.

Governance

- clearly articulate roles and responsibilities to avoid issues such as the current community centre and SLRD issues

Partnerships

- Need to partner with the school to reduce duplication and increase use
- I support all only in a cost sharing scenario between the Village, Area C and Lil'wat

RECREATION FACILITIES QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

Programming Considerations

- Lighting
- joint soccer/football/baseball
- 400meter track
- BMX - sheltered place for racers, concrete starting ramp made
- We need enough surfaces to host tournaments for both soccer and softball
- Fencing
- Cheaper to upgrade existing
- Seed not sod
- Fieldhouse, washrooms and storage
- 3 field minimum

RECREATION FACILITIES QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

Question #13 - SATELLITE FACILITY

The questionnaire asked whether there was support for a proposed satellite recreation facility to serve as a recreation hub in the Poole Creek to D'Arcy area. The respondents indicated the following support for the option:

Yes 26.7%

No 54.1%

The findings indicated that 19.1% of the respondents did not know how to respond to the question.

Respondents

Of the respondents that were from Poole Creek to Darcy 64% (8) supported with 14% (2) objecting and 27% (3) skipping the question. the facility but did not add any additional information on programming.

Village of Pemberton residents

- 54/245 Yes (22%)
- 112/245 No (45.7%)
- 46/245 Don't Know (18.8%)
- 33/245 Skipped (13.5%)

Area C Residents

- 19/92 - Yes 20.7%
- 48/92 - No 52.2%
- 12/92 - don't Know 13%
- 13/92 - Skipped 14.1%

The following financial considerations were identified in an open ended question:

Concern with the capital and operating costs

- we cannot support the facilities we already have
- Already have current facility in our Pemberton Community Centre complete with kitchen
- too much money for too few people
- Population numbers require that all three communities work together no matter what we build/ maintain. Area C residents do use ALL village facilities and need to focus on a bigger scope
- VOPs estimates. Capital costs were determined by council without consultation with the SLRD.
- Need actual operating costs
- Costs will rise over time

New Facility

- We already have the community centre.
- facility would take away from the community centre programs
- folks who do live up there are way overdue for such a facility
- too far

Facility Programming

- small community gathering place with room for a baseball field/ soccer field. Lakefront property is ridiculous and expensive.
- space for kids/youth to come and do indoor activities like pool, board games, lounge area, movie night...
- kitchen or be staffed.
- how about a park with washrooms then slowly look at a building and facilities
- boat launch, boat storage
- Reduce the size/impact

RECREATION FACILITIES QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

Governance

- work more collaboratively towards solutions for all
- process needs more transparency
- Area C can purchase and run
- Let's focus our funds on creating one space that provides for all of our needs.

Approach

- if it affects the chance of getting one central facility that all users of village, Area C and Lil'wat Nation can use, then I am definitely against this project

Question #14 - OTHER RECREATION FACILITIES

The following are recreation facilities that the respondents indicated that they would like that were not already identified:

- dance studio
- equestrian facilities
- horse riding facilities
- open all dykes for non-motorized traffic
- A properly designed community centre with a full size gym that does not have glass walls and poor sound insulation between rooms that negatively affects the possible programs that can occur as currently happens with the existing Pemberton Community Centre
- full time staff and rejuvenation of energy at PVCC
- Soccer Fields sodded
- Racquet ball
- Outdoor pool
- Squash
- smaller scale arena than is currently proposed
- outdoor playing fields
- Tennis practise wall
- Climbing wall
- x-country trails
- curling rink
- running track
- stage/theatre
- cross country ski trails near village
- one mile lake - paddling
- gymnasium
- sauna/steam room
- stage/theatre
- Winter grooming for XC skiing.
- Outdoor ice rink
- indoor public equestrian arena - removable sides for summer
- Rec facility in Birken
- trails and bridge connector
- sports fields
- more trails for walking/biking
- curling rink
- tennis courts
- hiking/ walking trails
- Bike Lane - Meadows Road
- Yoga

RECREATION FACILITIES QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

- Community kitchen
- International sized ice surface
- enhanced lake access (Mosquito? Echo?)
- Wind of change trail
- programming rather than structures
- indoor track
- One Mile Lake be improved
- Could Jackrabbits be expanded?
- Tennis courts
- Outdoor fields that would support hosting tournaments in Pemberton
- Permanent Gymnastics Facility

Question #15 - REJECT RECREATION FACILITIES

The respondents were asked whether they would reject all types of development of new recreation facilities in the next five to ten years:

Responses:

Yes 13.6%, why?

- Cannot afford
- existing debt
- increased taxes
- don't have the population or economic affordability to sustain as the facilities
- too expensive to maintain.
- sort out how we are going to pay for the existing community centre and for the Gates Lake facility
- need solid commitment to not wasting my money like you have on the community centre, not support such an investment
- decision makers need to understand we are small and want to stay small
- recreation needs are very simple, a few walking trails and a good dog.
- need to focus on building on what we already have.
- Pemberton area needs more higher paying jobs, industry, to keep people here.
- We currently have a facility that's been open for 5 years and is still not complete, is not making enough money to cover its operating costs, and yet it's perfectly located in the heart of the village
-

No 75.2%

The findings indicated that 11.2% did not know how to answer the question.

Question #16 - OTHER ALTERNATIVES TO FACILITIES

The questionnaire also requested support for alternatives that may increase recreation offerings but not require the construction of additional recreation facilities:

53.5% supported the contribution to RMOW to ensure registration priorities

44.1% supported the introduction of a recreation shuttle to Pemberton facilities

57.6% supported the introduction of a recreation Shuttle to Pemberton and Whistler facilities

RECREATION FACILITIES QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

Question #17 - PRIORITIES

The questionnaire requested that the respondents prioritise the facilities offered. The table below indicates the order of priority. Note the number in the far right column indicates on average the score rating of the facility in the statistical analysis (the lowest number indicates the highest priority).

1	Standalone Single Surface Arena	5.12
2	Standalone Fieldhouse	5.17
3	Outdoor Soccer/Lacrosse/Football Field	5.49
4	Single Surface Arena and Fieldhouse	5.93
5	Single Surface Arena and Pool	6.36
6	Standalone Pool	6.28
7	Combined single Surface Arena, Pool and Fieldhouse	7.27
8	Outdoor Baseball/Softball Field	7.31
9	Outdoor All Weather soccer Field	8.35
10	Satellite Facility at Poole Creek-D'Arcy	10.8
11	Contribution to Whistler for Priority Registration	12.37
12	Recreation Shuttle to Pemberton and Whistler Facilities	12.73
13	Recreation Shuttle to Pemberton Facilities	12.96
14	No New Facilities	14.34
15	Other*	

**Other facilities – refer to Appendix B – Question #14*

Indoor Recreation	Very Frequently	Often	Combined
Leisure Swimming	92	114	206
Swimming Lessons	68	97	165
Whirlpool Sauna Steam	76	84	160
Skating	56	80	136
Soccer	49	59	108
Gymnastics	39	54	93
Wading Pool	41	48	89
Organized Adult Hockey	40	44	84
Trampoline	36	45	81
Organized Minor Hockey	47	37	84
Swimming Training and/or Competitions	38	30	68
Drop In Hockey	28	38	66

Outdoor Recreation	Very Frequently	Often	Combined
Leisure Swimming	71	81	152
Soccer	76	56	132
Skating	51	73	124
Swimming Lessons	43	61	104
Whirlpool Sauna Steam	47	55	102
Wading Pool	41	42	83
Drop In Hockey	30	41	71
Organized Adult Hockey	26	42	68
Tennis	32	35	67
Organized Minor Hockey	27	33	60
Trampoline	28	30	58
Basketball	23	23	46
Baseball	16	32	48

Indoor Recreation	Never	Rarely	Combined
Broomball	158	26	184
Baseball	157	21	178
Football	161	19	180
Lacrosse	153	26	179
Organized Figure Skating	147	19	166
Roller Derby	136	31	167
Indoor Rehab Swimming	98	52	150
Basketball	113	36	149
Organized Minor Hockey	130	14	144
Curling	99	48	147
Indoor Swimming and/or Competitions	113	33	146

Ball Hockey	115	26	141
Tennis	114	27	141
Badminton	98	43	141
Organized Adult Hockey	113	24	137

Outdoor Recreation	Never	Rarely	Combined
Broomball	160	21	181
Football	148	22	170
Roller Derby	141	29	170
Lacrosse	141	19	160
Rehab Swimming	117	39	156
Badminton	117	32	149
Gymnastics	129	20	149
Curling	106	39	145
Ball Hockey	123	22	145
Organized Minor Hockey	132	11	143
Indoor Swimming and/or Competitions	116	27	143
Basketball	110	32	142
Basketball	110	32	142
Baseball	120	19	139
Trampoline	113	22	135
Organized Figure Skating	114	19	133
Organized Adult Hockey	114	19	133

Appendix B – Verbatim Comments (Open Ended Questions):

1. Where do you live (Other)?

- Sea to Sky Hwy on Mt. Currie border
- benchlands
- Peaks
- Area C
- Lillooet Lake Road

5. From the list below, indicate those activities that your family (living in your household) would participate in provided the appropriate facility was offered in the Pemberton/Area C/Lil'wat area.

- dance studio - frequently
- dance studio - frequently
- horseback riding
- horse trails - frequently horse arena - frequently
- horse facilities
- horse arena - frequently
- horse back riding and trails
- More horse trails and facility for horses
- outdoor Horse Arena - frequently
- Racket ball
- Diving (high dives)
- Squash courts would be a low maintenance addition if we were going ahead with a racquets facility
- Outdoor tennis practise walls
- Bowling. Climbing wall. Wave pool[could surf in it and would bring people up from Whistler.] Archery for kids.
- outdoor slow pitch 2 X /wk
- indoor and outdoor fitness classes 2/3 times a week
- Our kids when they were younger took regular swimming lessons, played hockey and we were very regularly utilizing the recreational facilities in Whistler.
- indoor dance classes e.g hip hop,tap,ballet,acro,musical theatre,jazz etc...
- If outdoor pool must be heated and convert to indoor In the winter time.
- paddling - frequently mountain biking - frequently
- volleyball
- shooting range - frequently
- shooting - frequently indoor rifle range - frequently
- martial arts - often
- public community equestrian covered arena - or indoor arena
- Yoga - often
- Volleyball indoor
- outdoor Ground Handling paragliding field - often
- walking, bike riding, paddling
- x-country ski trails - often
- walking and hiking on trails daily, bike riding, outdoor x-country ski trails
- Alpine Skiing - frequently Seniors exercise at Lions Villa - on occasion
- road biking trail - frequently and hiking trail - frequently
- senior fitness - frequently
- volleyball outdoor - on occasion
- Tai Chi, and Yoga
- We can't afford a skating rink or a pool. Don't be bullied by the entitlementists.
- indoor squash
- Short Track Speed Skating - indoor/outdoor often

- Short Track Speedskating indoor/outdoor 2 - 3 times per week
- raquette ball, squash
- squash
- Although I would use a pool I would rather continue using Meadow Park rather than my taxes increase and an already debt riddled facility loses yet more money.
- pickle-ball! indoor, recreational hockey (not serious - minor and adult)
- Indoor table tennis if available
- Indoor Workout Gym, Marshal Arts classes

6. Which of the following statements best reflect your opinions about the provision of additional recreation facilities in Pemberton.

- do not want recreation facilities unless they are really inexpensive. We cannot afford more taxes. Think like the prairies little quancets for skating and curling outdoor pool in the summer. Little cost.
- Can't afford more tax
- Provide a running track
- provide more recreation for older teen teams in winter
- reduce the amount of driving for Darcy/Birken residents by providing rec services at Gates
- we will move if nothing is built
- I understand that people want these things but I like the way Pemberton is right now.
- I like more recreation but we don't have a big enough tax base to pay for these new huge facilities. We can't pay for the community center as it is. They got rid of the gym that could generate \$.
- improve lake facility, we have no \$\$\$\$!!!
- use what we have more effectively
- what about trails??
- #1 - provide more recreational activities and opportunities in the area
- focus on natural outdoor splendor!!
- We must not go into debt. To pay for new facilities.
- Provide another way to waste money.
- I would use the Gates Lake facility
- provide more programs for young children on weekends not just after school
- Improved soccer fields and take care of what we already have
- Provide Youth/Adult Employment Opportunities
- Why wish for what we CAN NOT AFFORD
- drive more employment and economics in the area
- Work with Whistler to use its facilities

7. Which of the following statements best reflect your opinion with regard to possible cost implications of new recreation facilities on your property taxes/parcel tax?

- We are old age pensioners and can't afford to pay more taxes.
- Noone can presently afford their taxes. Many are leaving Pemberton.
- Whatever it takes
- PAY MORE PER USE. LESS DRIVING TO WHISTLER MEANS SAVINGS ON GAS.
- we pay enough already
- Difficult to answer when you don't know what kind of dollar figure you are looking at and over how many years
- i'm a renter ...
- possibly the last option depending on what that would be
- Depends on what it's for.
- corporate sponsorship and grants depending on how much.
- I rent- however, i think if there is a need that we can logically sustain, we should do it
- Depends what option. Not for an ice rink, but yes for a pool
- Because people want these things, I wouldnt be one to whine about a tax increase
- concerned there will constantly be ongoing costs and financial recovery

- use what we have - think outside the box! work together
- why should we all pay now for the future residents - NO
- Say no to the pool and rink people.
- depends on what the facilities are.. if it reduces the driving to whistler for hockey then I'd gladly pay \$150-\$300 more per year
- Must be PER FAMILY living in a HOUSEHOLD ex: SUITES!
- Base the rate per household size like property taxes. Size of house/ # of people per house p
- what happens to people who can't pay extra taxes - they move out! putting even extra cost on taxpayers staying.
- We do not have the tax base to entertain spending money on a recreational facility
- I pay property taxes in my rent
- Tax increase for set number of years only

8. Which of the following directions are fundamental in the development of new recreation facilities?

- don't exclude equestrian rec
- horse riding arena
- create more trails for horses
- Lots to do here already,if you want City activities go Back to City!
- the cost is too extreme for these facilities.
- We cannot afford new recreation facilities
- Who cares what it looks like as long as there is a place to go to that is affordable!
- The building needs to appeal to generations to come. "Green building methods" will pay for themselves in the long run, the building needs to have character
- If you build a Field House you need good fields
- Be forward thinking as far as expansion needs for the future(maybe we can't afford everything now but account for it down the road)
- Pemberton Youth Soccer needs additional fields to accommodate all levels of play
- keep it plain and simple less cost so that you can have any kind of sport using the floor and you are not scared of damages. no fancy schmancy just plain and simple and durable
- provide rec services to everyone. not just in pemberton. i have friends in darcy who cant drive into pemberton all the time for services
- Village on their own
- Function of the building and facilities should carry much weight over subjective aesthetic design.
- Partnership with private companies can be a VERY slippery slope. But it can be done cautiously. I think that the aggressive development of Pemberton would absolutely destroy what most people love it for, Including older residents. Farms have to be a # priority for common sense as well as for looks for the village.
- look into indoor / outdoor pool, often used across Europe where sides can be removed during warm months and replaced during cold months. This is a very common type of facility in England.
- The community centre was constructed way to expensive and not user friendly, ie NO GYM!!! or kitchen that is usable, and expensive to maintain and outward design expensive.
- covered and dismountable outdoor recreation for families/picnics
- capital should be shared but this is not realistic
- don't want to sell out for something we can't afford to maintain, no examples of working relationship between VOP, Area C, or Lil'Wat today. Large risk
- trails development
- #1 - be functional foremost
- #1 - be functional first!
- look for simple buildings
- Stand up and say no to people who demand something we can't afford.
- function over design, the "new" community centre is a white elephant, it costs us money & it doesn't support indoor sports

- Just build it, dont make some fancy useless building like the community centre. 4 walls, 2 doors, a SLANTED roof and some windows
- DO NOT build another TAJ MAHAL!
- Lets be reasonable we need efficiency not beauty!
- We do not have the tax base to support even sharing costs
- The VOP has an abysmal record of partnering with SLRD and Mt Currie has no reason to partner with the VOP.
- don't trust area C person in charge
- Village tax payers can not afford further captial expenditures for recreation use whistlers
- Consideration for traffic impacts, parking, bus service, shuttle service

11. Are there any financial aspects of the proposed standalone facilities that concern you, specify:

- arena and pool should be considered an expansion project when supported by community growth/tax income. I am concerned about maintenance costs. Arena could be downsized a bit ie lobby etc could be added later when area growth/taxes/school contribute more \$\$\$\$
- the initial costs to all tax payers is going to be high - could be a struggle, but Pemberton needs these amenities. (Pool + arena would be our preference - option #5
- For me to truly lend my support, they would need to be able to expand to being combined facilities NOT 3 standalones
- only if they can expand in future to accommodate additional facilities. As much as I want a pool, the cost to use it on top of our tax increase to pay for it in the first place might make it utterly too expensive and unaffordable to many. 6 change rooms is not necessary in an arena, nor is the proshop.
- too expensive for what it is
- very expensive. not first choice
- The cost of a pool concerns me, I feel that it will cost more than anticipated unless we can get a partnership with a school
- increased taxes
- need to review costs carefully
- We do not have the Tax base or any industry to speak of,how in the hell do you expect to pay for all of this.Let's not make the same mistakes other bankrupt towns have made.Maybe when we have a tax base of 20,000 +.
- We need the village to share the costs. 100% village share is too much of a financial burden
- We do not have the population to support the costsof building and maintaining any of these facilities.
- A population base of 5800 people does not leave much room for error with respect to cost overruns, ongoing debt servcing and maintenance. The financial risk is substantial.
- Cost to tax payers and operational costs
- Noone can afford any more than they already pay for in taxes.
- The pool seems like too much debt to be responsible for each year. The ice rink is also. I see a field house as the best option.
- How will the cost incurred with any of these ventures be divided amongst the surrounding comunities? What is the individual tax burden per house hold
- I am concerned that these buildings will be big fancy building like the community center (that don't really fit in, in the community) that would be costly
- Most people in pemberton don't understand how expensive pools ans arenas are to operate long term 10-20 yrs.
- Not interested in having an indoor pool... as i dont think we can support... but it would be interesting to know the cost of a BASIC outdoor community pool that could be used from MAY to SEPT.
- I am entrusting in the research
- I support the concept of new facilities, but I don't believe that the current proposal has actually considered the functionality over the aesthetics. I believe a pool is not a reasonable option due to costs, however a simple arena would be possible, particularly if it was scaled down in size and spectator capacity. The current model is pretty much the same as whistler...that is much more arena than this community needs, let's look at a simple, smaller facility that suits our limited budget and smaller

population. There are many quanset huts and small arenas around the province that provide adequate space for a number of recreation programs including figure skating, hockey, lacrosse, roller derby, and concerts and fairs even. Let's get back to the basics.

- cost to up keep
- The facilities need to have a budget that is ADHERED to, unlike the community centre fiasco. A independant contractor that is responsible for costs . I E has a budget to build with not a moving target. Do not allow government to be the general contractor.
- Nope
- unfortunately an indoor pool is too expensive for our community at this time and would be the worst option if we could only have one of these things
- I think that the costs of the facilities maybe high as it does not need to be an architectural structure. My other concern is whether an grants or subsidies have been taken into consideration when calculating the cost to the taxpayer. I do not think our taxes should take the full burden. I think the taxes that used to pay for the OLD community centre should be earmarked for the construction of a new facility.
- The pool is expensive but has no sauna or steamroom listed.
- I don't feel a pool would generate enough returns through use to justify the costs. i would support a pool if the previous statement were to be false.
- Yes, as always it seems we are trying to make Rogers arena when all we need is a sheet of ice. Do you really need seating for 200 and a 2000 sq foot lobby?
- Is the estimated cost based on energy efficient technology or not? If not, would the annual operating cost be brought down?
- yes i'm very conscious of the cost of stand alone facilities and the operating costs and the annual cost of tax paying for the faciliities. 8 million dollars for the arena seems a little bit ridiculous
- I would love to see a pool in Pemberton but I'm concerned with the costs associated with it.
- The operating costs concern me. If we had the ice rink and swimming pool that would be about \$545 for the family of 3 to support each year (taking into account about 5,800 people are in the area. If that number could be brought down to \$300/year I would support it.
- summer time use
- cost
- seems like it would be more realistic to do a combination of the two or three than a 'stand alone' but something is better than nothing...
- too expensive
- I don't think that Pemberton has the population base to support a pool or indoor arena
- the operating and debt servicing costs
- Op: income, rink will need some additional income Ex: bar attached
- priority should be given to acquiring FREE land
- wary of multiple government partnerships given current state
- cost to carry debt with other projects
- cost too much
- pool is much too expensive
- I strongly believe that if Area C + Lilwat don't pay a tax increase, they should pay MORE to use the facilities
- they are very expensive - too much
- it would be cheaper to build it all at once, building it piece-meal would cost more
- not sure stand alone is feasible
- explain to people properly what they are getting into, don't scare them with this survey
- costs are obviously on the high side and will scare most people who fill this survey out. this survey is unrealistic and shows numbers and facilities far beyond what this town needs. Disappointing therefore I have stopped having my say!
- I think a pool should only be outdoor
- net operating cost - being too low
- Why not build an out door pool with a bubble. This has got to be more cost effective. Pemberton would benefit from an outdoor pool in the summer.

- same as 11.2
- cost overruns
- Yes the cost of a pool and the annual costs - do not see how the area can support that on the base of the number of residents in the area
- Are these costs based on a contractor operating the facility or local gov't operating the facility?
- a basic pool is all that we need. No play pool, no therapy pool, just a 6x25
- VOP cannot go forward without financial commitment from Area C, Lil'Wat and future developers and private schools
- operating costs
- I don't think we can afford our community center as it is, and I already pay really high taxes. I don't want to pay even more.
- Increase in property taxes,
- Sustaining operating costs with current population base. Who will run, and will the organization be transparent
- Costs of programming as we currently see in present facilities are beyond what most families can afford and are well above other communities in BC
- It's outrageous to think that a community of 5,823 people could support the total annual combined costs for any one of these proposed facilities. I sincerely hope we don't burden this wonderful community with this.
- I didn't realise cost. This information helps me
- cost of pool, cost of operating
- Field house is the most affordable and serves the most people
- Replacing Field??? After 10 years is that within the operating cost as it needs to be replaced in 10 years at cost of \$500,000
- we cannot afford these things
- THE COST!!!! Not affordable on current tax base
- We can not afford these facilities and that is based on the numbers proposed. As the Community Centre shows, we went way OVER budget. What is to say these facilities wouldn't??
- we have no money!!
- capital cost / operating costs
- the cost of any new facility when we are clearly struggling to pay for our current facilities
- unreasonable for our population base. 1 field in field house means we can't hold a tournament
- We have yet to be able to pay for the 'fancy' community centre installed prior to 2010. Let's pay that off first before we take on any more debt.
- No
- debt service per year
- cannot afford a pool. Not sure we need a NHL size rink with 6 change rooms, why not a regular community size rink
- Would be nice to have all this but we (VOP, SLRD) have no money. Even if we raise taxes we can't pay for this..... Let's keep dreamin.....
- surface of arena able to convert to use for other facilities than ice
- operating costs
- costs
- I don't live in Pemberton
- Cost. Shrinking tax base(growth projections accurate?) Who pays in the long term? Will other groups dependant on tax funding suffer due to maintaining debt servicing on a new facility? (facilities)
- Taxes
- Must have function as primary design.
- Yes, too rich for Yes, too expensive.
- 1.5M for a pool? Are you insane?
- annual debt service? and increase in taxes
- no
- No we should share the cost of this

- I think the estimates would turn out to be low and therefore far more expensive than we think.
- The expense of a pool.
- How do we afford it in the long run. The facility we have cost a lot of money, does not serve our needs and money is still needed to finish it.
- the pool operating costs are too high to be supported by the small Pemberton tax base
- Has Area C agreed to participate in the cost sharing
- Steep tax increase
- No
- We have many soccer fields already, why not use one of them. Add a rooftop and retracting walls for summer use.
- Pool cost to run/maintain
- No
- Considering we are still paying for the community centre, I feel we can only attempt to afford the field house at this time. Do we have an available site with existing service connections and that requires little site prep?
- Field House - concerns that we already have 2 schools with these similar facilities. Not Necessary to build this if we can make the school properties more affordable to use.
- We are still trying to pay for our current recreation centre.
- not affordable
- With almost 2 1/2 million yearly costs and only 5800 residents this would cost on average \$500 dollars extra taxes, which most normal families can't cover.
- yes, Tax hikes
- That the VOP would even consider spending more money, when the White Elephant of a community centre operates at a loss and has to close on Sundays due to lack of use/expense to run.
- Whistler has a far greater population and yet is unable to have a profitable leisure facility, the Pemberton Community Centre runs at a loss and is only open 6 days a week, how would a new facility be able to survive?
- Pemberton does not need a whistler styled rink. Metal siding and a roof, bare bones would be under 2 mil
- I feel a pool is the most important as swimming is a life skill, yet the pool operations cost overtake both arena and field house annual cost combined and I fear will be cut out for the sole reason of cost.
- Yes I would like to see a more future plan for a facility that can be built in stages with added events and hosting opportunities available.
- We're already servicing the debt load of the community centre which went over budget by more than 40 per cent.
- My first priority is an arena....with the ability to add onto the arena and build a field house (2nd) and pool (3rd). A pool is not huge on my personal wish list but it would be a great addition to the community.
- have you done costing for a pool that is operational in an inflated bubble and above ground so it could be used from april to October and then in time it could be put under full time building coverage
- A pool alone would raise my taxes our taxes over 25%. More people would move away than it would attract.
- why is there not an option for a outdoor pool?
- yes, these estimates are exceptionall high. we need only a simple block and metal truss building. no fancy designs like the waste of space of a community centre. you could have built a pool and an arena for the same cost
- A report the district of Squamish had done indicated a population of 20 000 was required for a rink or pool. We have nowhere near enough of a tax base to support any expenditures such as these.
- It should be understood that the community does not need aesthetically fancy architectural design. A quonset hut style facility would be fine for all three.
- People in Pemberton can hardly afford to live here as it is. They will be paying for this for years. We already have a community center that we cannot afford. There are significant costs associated with all of these recreation facilities. Whistler is only a 25 minute drive away - not unreasonable and low cost really to Pemberton and Mount Currie when you consider the alternative.

- Substantial tax increases over a long period. Important to secure private investor, like proposed private school.

12. Are there components of the facility programming (amenities) that you would like to see altered, added or removed? (specify)

- it doesn't mention seating/spectator viewing or change rooms on the field house description. I would assume they are included but they are mentioned on the other 2 facilities.. The field house should include a gymnastics space with appropriate equipment storage. There only needs to be 2-4 change rooms and less "other" space in the arena.
- added - curling rink to arena. Bar added, alcohol service!
- horse-riding ring
- Don't build anything,keep taxes low,this town is fine the way it is.Go swim in a lake,we have lots here.Go skate on them in the winter,this is ridiculous.
- all removed - too expensive
- Would like to see a running track around the field, workout area available if possible.
- Yes have the community centre facilities open 7 days a week
- install refrigeration lines in the slab under the future farmer's market covered structure to provide a winter arena
- I think a private partnership is the only business model that could likely work; however, how will public access be impacted?
- Look at the option of an outdoor pool, solar heated which is only operational mid May to Septembet
- Can't afford anything.
- IS there an stand alone out pool option?
- It would be nice to see money spend on just a simple rink or pool. Not a fortune on a big fancy building. A quansit hut is what some communities have as a rink and it works just fine.
- not sure existing community centre are run efficantly. existing fields poorly maintained.
- Squash courts are easily maintained and should be considered if we go ahead with a field house
- see above.
- no pool or ice rink
- No I don't even understand the question
- I think that it needs to be considered of having anchor tenants in the building to help support the cost of the building. Start building it small and enable it to expand over time.
- I feel a hockey rink could be build with the possibility of adding a field house at a later time. Hockey rinks that i have visited in ontario (i played hockey in southern ontario for 16 years and visited lots), usually had multi use rooms on a second floor in the arena or above the change rooms. perhaps arena can be use as a field house during summer months when not in use.
- I love the idea of these concepts but have no idea on whether Pemberton could carry the debt
- Wave pool to bring residents and tourists from Whistler.
- if a ice skating rink in would you be taking the ice out in the summers to facilitate roller skating and programs for roller skating ?
- I would get rid of the therapeutic pool - only because I don't personally need that - but if that's a good revenue generator for the facility then maybe it makes sense?
- support for Gates
- Pool- add steam room and/or sauna and hot tub
- Not sure why we would need 6 change rooms there when only a few teams would play at once and why we need space for offices, a 2000 sq.ft, lobby. Cold reduce the size and cost of this facility by stripping it down a bit.
- The field house should accommodate baseball and softball with multiple options. portable pitchers mounds, different base length options, fencing for home runs, etc
- Therapeutic pool. You can use the regular pool for that use
- I would cut the indoor courts from the field house and build a more basic facility with room for expansion.

- yes - curling rink with area
- addition of refreshment facility to add revenue
- fields first!!! then fieldhouse, let HILL/SUNSTONE build rink, stands for FIELDS/WASHROOMS
- re-purpose PCC if changes are made
- does the arena need 6 change rooms?
- I think Area C should be included in the village up to Hurley and out to Industrial Park to grow the tax base. Then facilities like these can happen jointly
- could the field house be made smaller to reduce the costs to build/operate
- nothing fancy, very simple facilities to keep costs low
- sauna should be added to the pool
- you don't have to spend this insane amount of money to have some of these amenities
- we need fields. we need outdoor play. we need to stop relying on others to entertain our kids
- simplify everything - we do not need this caliber of stuff, we are not Whistler
- pool/skate rink
- curling rink, smaller rink?
- needs to be close to centre of town
- look into indoor / outdoor pool or if the proposed budget is really unreachable just a simple outdoor pool that will close in winter
- Each option provides and covers all aspects required for each facility. Would change pool to not be so big. Do we need 6 lanes? Reduce size, provide a minimum amenity
- outdoor pool only
- Get a real gym at the community center and keep the fields at the old school in good shape.
- Down scale all facilities - I would rather have opportunity to utilize one or all of the facility on a smaller scale rather than none or one of the proposed 'regulation sized' or 6 lane pool with separate therapeutic pool. Given whistler is available for those who want to progress to a professional level within the support, can Pemby get away with facilities which simply meet basic needs i.e. a facility to learn to swim which can double up as a therapeutic pool. Outdoor heated pool with basic building which houses washroom/change room facility.
- arena - too much
- We need to pay for the facility that we have. I don't want any of these things. Our Community centre is \$8 million over budget! Let's pay that elephant off first!!!!
- Arena could be much more modest - a small town prairie community model
- What would be the costs for an outdoor pool facility?
- No
- too early in the game
- Yes, open pool for 4 months a year (outdoor) then close rest of year. Money used to develop x-country trails in winter.
- There are 3 existing recreational amenities(or could be if there was an investment) - Hwy 99 + meadows Road needs a bike lane, One Mile swimming lessons + children's programs. The Dyking system could be a trail system between Mt Currie + Meadows. Could be used for X-Country skiing, biking, and hiking. Why are we building facilities when we have such awesome natural features in the area? Leverage the great outdoors!
- smaller size field house
- Build a simple field house
- Basketball has been one of the most popular sports - no longer have a gym.
- I would like to see removed the plan for the pool, the field house and the rink.
- no
- A gym too
- I think that hockey programming would be problematic. I can't imagine any of the Whistler drop-inners coming up to Pemberton for drop in when they can play in Whistler, for example. Also, I don't think too many of the Whistler women would want to travel all the way up to Pemby for games. Basically, I think a Pemby rink would cannibalize the Whistler rink, and what's the point of that?

- Look at Incremental cost of providing International sized rink rather than NHL sized. Larger sheet has ability to facilitate a wider range of activities and greater skill levels in hockey.
- A hot tub at the pool
- why would the ice rink needs offices and concession and six change rooms? we JUST NEED AN ICE RINK and four change rooms.
- No
- Where are outdoor fields in the above? Pemberton really needs outdoor soccer fields. It's the most popular sport for kids in the community. We should foster and support the growth of soccer in Pemberton.
- squash and courts racket ball
- Remove Pool
- The buildings don't hve to be this elaborate. See Sunshine Coast first Arena. Pool does not have to have 6 lanes. ets.
- this is not the right time for additional costs
- Removed, completely.
- A 2000 sq foot lobby is not necessary, could probably do well with 4 dressing rooms.
- Not interests in a field house. This is bc, learn to play inthe weather. Additionally, field games required teams and structure, other participants and no opportunities for self directed fitness. The area and pool need additional facilities to attract the public: workout gym, basketball court, yoga space. Indoor veiled games can e played in a court
- I would like to see an arena first with a field house attached then plans made for a future pool. With revenue plans for hosting tournaments and events to add to the cost.
- I would like to see all of recreation, with the exception of trails, parked until the community centre is paid off.
- do we need a therapeutic pool, the 25 m pool can be used for therapy
- Pemberton has a greater need for better outdoor fields and one with an artificial surface. The school board can not be depended on. Their fields are shit.
- outdoor pool
- All of them taken off the table. Complete the white elephant we already have.
- Consider smaller facility as expansion to existing community centre, like outdoor pool. Consider overalp and/or over-provision of facilities in the area, as well as possible compatibility with other facilities in the area for tournaments.

14. Are there any financial aspects of the proposed combined facilities that concern you? (specify)

- Building costs may initially be less, but maintenance and upgrades may be/ will be too expensive for our area to support.
- Without Government grants and outside funding, I think it is out of reach for Pemberton at the present time.
- The prohibitive cost of building and maintaining the pool will increase taxes and make the user fees phenominal
- still expensive
- operating costs of a pool concern me regardless of what its paired with
- combined arena/field house/Pool would be best but the construction costs and operating costs of a pool are way too high.
- increased taxes
- cost overruns
- Yes,all.
- Village must share the costs. 100% village is too much burden.
- Yes, we do not have the population to support the building and maintenance of these facilities.
- If you can't staff a community centre properly now, how on earth are you going to afford staffing new facilities. The community centre has become a ghost town due to repeated closures.
- same as above - these are large capital projects for a small tax base.
- Costs

- How are these proposals being funded!
- A cost efficient design would be nice
- These a low ball estimates that could increase
- HOw to give an answer... not sure what the tax implications would be as I live in the SLRD and there is no figures to show that based on my current assessment.
- Taxes will have to go up to maintan any of these facioities.
- cost too much ice rink used by 16 % of the community and every other community with a pool can't afford it
- The operation cost associated with pools and arenas are very high.... And our community is small... How on earth can this be done? Especially considering the debt from the other community centre and the fact that Meadow Park in Whistler requests funding from Pemberton and Squamish to help with operation cost as well!
- No
- Again do not overburden the Village taxpayers
- same as question 10.2
- yes the initial cost, operating costs and tax payer costs
- cost
- All in one would be amazing but I don't think Pemberton and taxpayers could sustain the cost
- cost
- again cost
- It seems like a lot of money for Pemberton/ Area C / SLRD / Lil'Wat to do afford the 'all-in-one'... that being said, it could be SO WORTH IT. To attract, people, give people jobs, give the youth and kids things to do without the parents having to run around and drive them everywhere (whistler, squamish) bring people to Pemberton. It could really keep people in Pemberton. It could be sooooo AMAZING to have this opportunity in Pemberton. I would love it, personally.
- cost
- too expensive
- population base is too small
- cost of taxes to go up for property and business servers. Our taxes are now quite high and if taxes were to increase, it would make Pemberton too expensive to live in
- we don't have the tax base in VOP. Without confirmation of \$\$\$ partners or population/tax base - slow down
- Too much expense for community in combined model
- too much \$\$\$\$\$
- too expensive
- too much debt for the small tax base of Village residence
- its all very expensive, its nice in theory but doesn't seem financially feasible
- I am concerned with who pays the costs. (village only, vs. Area C vs. Lil'Wat) and who will ultimately use the facility. The cost should be shared equally based on use - user fees etc...
- the SLRD need to contribute, Lil'Wat needs to contribute
- too expensive..... come on.. be realistic with proposed ideas
- It doesn't have to be a fancy architectural award-winning structure! Cinder blocks and a rectangular prism shaped building would do the job!
- needs vs. wants we are NOT Whistler and don't want to be!
- same as #10
- too expensive
- ability to pay and deal with debt or repair
- The current recreation governance model - ie management by the SLRD and the defunct PVUS structure
- seems the most reasonable and achievable
- our population cannot support these
- Yes. Tax Implications per household too high for VOP residents
- too expensive, all at once
- Way too expensive.

- Increase in property taxes
- If ongoing operating costs of a combined facility are less than the costs of a free standing - it is preferable.
- The actual costs of programming as seen in present programming are well above what many families can afford and are significantly higher than other BC communities.
- too expensive - Like all-in-one
- tax cost of pool
- None of the above are good examples of Partnership as we at present day can't agree on anything together and when money comes up it gets risky
- the cost
- THE COST!!!! not affordable on current tax base
- all aspects
- cost, capital cost running costs impact on our taxes
- We need to understand what the financial model looks like with a long term commitment from the Hill Academy.
- see 10a
- no gain in efficiencies when we can't afford even 1
- Same comment from 10.2
- No
- increase in property taxes
- again; why NHL size Rink?? Do we NEED 6 change rooms? Same for Field House - Is this a basic facility or 'all the bells and whistles'?
- no money in the coffers is my concern
- Purchase of land nor being included. Sabre lands look good!! Area C MUST participate
- operating costs
- not sure we have the population base here yet
- costs
- I'm a pensioner
- Yes! Concerned about long term debt servicing + costs associated to Arena and Pool. Field House stand alone seems most reasonable in cost + projected use.
- as a senior, I can't afford any
- Taxes
- Way too much money for a community our size.
- no
- No
- Too much money for us!!!! Get real.
- I like the idea of an outdoor pool that would be used in the spring, summer and fall. The lakes in the area are OK for swimming but not ideal. In Europe you see busy outdoor pool in most towns. I would think that these facilities would be much less expensive to build and operate. Build can be basic. Can be attached to an indoor arena. In the summer months kids can to swim and take lessons in an outdoor environment. Swimming is a summer sport. In the winter they can take to the indoors and skate!
- I will be paying for it and won't be using any of them until I have kids
- All too expensive.
- Yes. Over \$2million a year is huge for our small town.
- The cost to build and operate over the long haul.
- operational costs of arena and pool will be high.
- Too costly. We already spent too much on the community centre.
- Yes! If this happens ALL COMMUNITIES need to be paying for this. Everyone from town to meadows from town to Darcy and all First Nation communities also.
- No
- Without a sizable investment from outside sources, I can't see how we could sustain anything more than the arena/field house in the next ten years. My hope is that choices are carefully made and money carefully spent/saved so that we can have all three facilities within the next 15 to 20 years. Please, please,

build these facilities for function rather than for aesthetics! Imagine where we would be financially if our community center was built on the Ullus model...

- Sure it concerns me, but we need the facilities to keep young families here and to get more to move here. A lot of young families are leaving Pemberton and moving to Whistler for the facilities and because the cost of Gas to drive their Children back and forth to the facilities in Whistler.
- not affordable
- taxes are already to high, I have not seen a pay rise in 8 years, but cost of living has multiplied every year.
- Could we afford all this
- See above
- Pemberton does not need a whistler styled rink/pool. Metal siding and a roof, bare bones would be under 4 mil
- I support all only in a cost sharing scenario between the Village, Area C and Lil'wat.
- This town cannot support these kinds of facilities without an industrial tax base.
- I would love a pool but the cost maybe more than our tax base can support unless we can secure a host education facility that would rent it! Eg. Elite athletes training facility or international host training facility. It would help with jobs and tourism for business.
- See previous answer.
- My top priority is to see an arena/field house. It would be great to have the foresight to build with the ability to add on to this facility if a pool is financially feasible down the road.
- A combined facility is so far beyond the reach of this community.
- Can not afford capital and maintenance costs
- again, these numbers are based on a ridiculous design im sure
- All of them. Government has to live within its means. Expenditures such as these will bankrupt us.
- see 10.2
- Again - cost. Who is going to pay for this!

14. Other Recreation Facilities

- dance studio
- dance studio
- horseback trails
- horse riding arena
- equestrian facilities
- horse riding facilities
- trails for horses
- open all dykes for non-motorized traffic
- agricultural Arena
- Horse Arena/ Trails
- A properly designed community centre with a full size gym that does not have glass walls and poor sound insulation between rooms that negatively affects the possible programs that can occur as currently happens with the existing Pemberton Community Centre
- full time staff and rejuvenation of energy at PVCC
- Soccer Fields sodded
- Racket ball
- Out door solar pool
- Squash
- smaller scale arena than is currently proposed
- out door playing fields
- Tennis practise wall
- squash courts
- Climbing wall
- happy with whatever we get
- x-country trails
- curling rink

- curling rink
- running track
- stage/theatre
- outdoor pool
- cross country ski trails near village
- one mile lake - paddling
- gymnasium
- sauna/steam room
- stage/theatre
- Continuous access to the dyke non-motorized traffic summer and winter. Winter grooming for XC skiing.
- Outdoor ice rink
- indoor public equestrian arena - removable sides for summer
- Rec facility in Birken
- trails and bridge connector
- 2 lane curling rink
- outdoor pool
- sports fields
- better trails
- more trails
- No
- more trails for walking/biking
- curling rink
- x-country trails
- tennis courts
- hiking/ walking trails
- hiking/ walking trails
- curling rink
- Bike Lane - Meadows Road
- gymnasium
- Yoga
- Community kitchen
- International sized ice surface
- Gymnasium
- enhanced lake access (Mosquito? Echo?)
- outdoor pool
- Wind of change trail!!!!
- I would like to see money put into programming rather than structures
- Outdoor (summer) pool
- indoor track
- I wonder what the opportunity cost of investing in a facility is? For example, could One Mile Lake be improved? Could trails be improved? Could Jackrabbits be expanded? Etc.
- Cross country trail network in the dykes
- Tennis courts
- good weather pool, i.e simple outdoor pool
- Outdoor fields that would support hosting tournaments in Pemberton
- outdoor pool
- Expanded cross country skiing
- Permanent Gymnastics Facility

15. Are there any components of the facility programming (amenities) that you would like to see altered, added or removed? Please specify

- I would like to see a gymnastics/trampoline space in the field house. A trampoline training area would see a lot of use from other sports athletes crossing over - ie ski/skate/bike. less change rooms(4) would be fine in the arena, and I question the need for a pro-shop etc.
- include curling
- curling rink added, bar added
- horse riding arena
- n/a
- Keep the community center open and get some new program leaders in.
- Same as above
- Pool and Arena
- cannot afford anything.
- Is the community center not supposed to be used for the indoor sports?
- Squash courts!
- No
- possible outdoor pool with arena/fieldhouse
- Start small and expand.
- What is the purpose of the field house when we have a great high school facilities. Why not let the public have access to that which could serve the same purpose
- Wave pool to bring residents and tourists from Whistler.
- if i had to travel to get to the 3 combined facility then i would. i do understand that there wouldn't be a space for the 3 in one close to downtown and that we might have to have it out of town
- same as above with pool- (sauna, hot tub, steam room)
- Remove therapeutic pool
- let financial partners bear the \$\$\$ more
- keep the facilities functional - don't over build, basic structure, not an architectural showpiece
- add a gym area if possible
- start over please
- n/a
- arena with indoor / outdoor convertible pool attached on the side would be great!
- I think this combined option (Arena/Field house) would be a great option to start with - have the option to add on pool "if" affordable in the future
- not ready to say.
- none are good and cost too much per household
- no, I do not want these
- remove pool
- No
- ???
- marketing made a priority
- what is the additional cost of a curling rink added to the arena?
- see previous
- simple building not fancy
- no
- Again, the amenities don't have to be so elaborate. Simple is cheaper and sometimes better. We just want to see the facility, forget about offices and concessions. those are luxuries and pare down the dressing room numbers.
- They don't have to be so elaborate.
- facilities too expensive
- See above
- yes, the 2000 sq foot lobby. esp. if there's a field house - you would have space for large gatherings already. In this config. it would be even less necessary for 6 changerooms in the arena. Perhaps a sleeping/tournament area w. a bathroom where visiting teams could throw sleeping mats down?

- I would like to see an arena/ field house set up so we could add on a pool if the taxes can't support it right now.
- Again, I would like to see recreation parked until we pay off the white elephant known as the community centre.
- what about a pool/field house
- All taken off the table.

17. Are there any financial aspects of the proposed field developments that concern you? Please specify.

- the all weather field is expensive but with where we live, it would appear to be the most useful thing to spend on.
- no, fields are a great addition to the community and are well utilised. For the cost of a synthetic field, I don't feel it's worth it. That money would be better utilised in a fieldhouse.
- Users should pay the operating costs, it's only fair.
- n/a
- Will these compromises meet a need or will they be under-utilized?
- Costs
- cannot afford anything.
- These field should have a Field House or Smaller Building to house W/C, snack bar and storage
- Would loved to see soccer tournaments happen in Pemberton... if we could offer a great playing venue then this would be a win win for the community... could help pay for the additional costs as well as boost the overall economy of Pemberton.
- In support but we need to prioritize what is most important, and make it financially viable for everyone. We cannot afford to have all of these things at once. I think a pool and ice rink is top priority in most peoples minds to get us through the winter and get our kids swimming.
- No
- financial costs for operation seem fairly reasonable.
- what we have now seems to be working. i'm for all seasonal facilities right now not just the summer facilities. i feel eventually it would be great to have better field facilities however i'm not a user and do understand that the folks who are field users would want this to happen sooner than later
- all weather field very costly considering it would be covered in snow for half the year
- only support one of the 2 due to financial issues.
- clearly articulate roles and responsibilities to avoid issues such as the current community centre and SLRD issues
- cost!
- too much \$\$\$\$ for synthetic turf
- is an all-weather field a good use of money when you have a field house
- needs vs. wants sustained fees/ community size
- too expensive
- how much are you charging users? not something people will be able to pay
- same as 11.2
- Gaming funds available for development of fields. Would be nice to have All-weather-fields. but if there is the option to have more playing fields, baseball, then I think there would be more benefit to having more fields. Better options for tournaments etc
- don't we have fields in the community now? School fields?
- the all-weather not needed currently
- no - want to do ASAP
- cost of fields seem high and all weather need to be replaced every 10 years @ \$500,000
- need seating! Sod some fields for soccer! Not all weather fields! Soccer is used alot.
- Estimated cost of playing field and the baseball field is to be the same which does not seem plausible
- I don't agree with the costs presented here for the playing fields. They have different needs and requirements and should not be budgeted for the same amount of \$\$
- Whistler is struggling to pay for their facilities, how will we even pay for ours???

- All weather fields need replacement every 10 years - is that factored into \$??? Need understanding of location - if in VOP then feasible 10 min tournaments
- A couple of additional soccer and softball fields are acceptable, but no indoor facilities.
- No
- we can probably afford this more than the arena and pool
- fields are needed as well as trails
- I do feel that fields (outdoor) are important so however that can be facilitated - acquiring land?, co-op with schools??
- No Concerns - no brainer
- Taxes
- no
- No
- Still too much!
- All- weather synthetic turf is too expensive and it's hard on athletes joints, even kids
- why would the synthetic turf cost so much to run per year? Wouldn't it cost more to maintain a grass or gravel field?
- All weather cost of replacement/lifespan
- No
- I don't know that this is priority as we already have usable field space, granted there do seem to be scheduling issues due to the demand.
- too expensive
- Between the elementary and high school do we not already have many of these facilities?
- I support all only in a cost sharing scenario between the Village, Area C and Lil'wat.
- We don't need anything fancy!
- Everything is too expensive for a town with no tax base.
- Need to partner with the school to reduce duplication and increase use
- We need to retire the current debt before embarking on new debt.
- Where will they be located? What is the cost of the land?

18. Are there any components of the proposed field development that you would like to see altered, added or removed? Specify.

- It would be key to have the turf fields have some appropriate bathroom facilities.
- horse riding arena
- n/a
- can the soccer and baseball fields be combined for multi-use?
- cannot afford anything.
- Why would we need to spend money on more field when we already have them? Or is this just to reduce what is already in town?
- All weather Field could bring in Whistler Teams for rep. Soccer and also Tournaments
- We have a number of fields in the community already, the old community centre, the highschool, and the elementary school.
- No
- We already have fields at Signal Hill, high school and the old community center area. We need to look after them, use them and keep agreements in place to make sure they are available to the sport groups.
- what we have seems to be working for now so definitely the costs and operation costs and the tax payer cost to pay for something i wouldn't necessarily use
- There are already multiple fields - high school, elementary school and old high school
- can a sodded field/fields be built which would accommodate soccer, softball/baseball fields? Is lacrosse popular in Pemberton? is it a vision?
- 3 field minimum
- night lighting included?
- joint soccer/football/baseball

- 400meter track around soccer field close to downtown - similar to new facility at Mount Currie new site school
- can one combine the option for playing fields& baseball?
- BMX - sheltered place for racers, concrete starting ramp made
- Fields - joined together for tournament
- look at costs more closely
- needs to cost less
- changing facilities
- The fields could be seeded not sodded. This would reduce the cost, it would not be playable as quickly but overall would be a better choice
- No
- no
- not sure
- we don't need any more outdoor fields..we have enough. we really need to focus on indoor recreation facilities!
- no
- Put fencing around the synthetic turf.
- Field sports don't interest me.
- No
- Why would we need all weather fields? We get a lot of snow. We already use our fields from April to November...
- Against added cost of all-weather fields. We aren't a big enough community to make good use of all-weather turf (like vancouver). We have to "make do" with our sports and weather sometimes!
- Should these not already be available or be in coloboration with the schools in the area -- Highschool has a soccer field/football field. Elementary school has baseball diamone and field.
- there are fields already dont' need more
- I am not an expert
- Would it not be cheaper to upgrade existing facilities?
- it would be great to have the softball booze away from the kids playing soccer:)
- Lets consider the weather aspect of the field play. We need to have an indoor facility mostly. Then it could be used year round. We still have the soccer fields at the school and at the old community center site.
- My families number 1 priority is soccer fields.
- We need enough surfaces to host tournaments for both soccer and softball IN PEMBERTON.
- No.
- There seem to be a number of new fields in Mt. Currie, Whistler and Squamish...do we need another one in Pemberton...need/cost ratio benefits?

20. Are there any components of the facility programming that you would like to see altered, added or removed? Specify?

- too far. not our area. Let them come to us and support our facilities. They don't have the population for this.
- I would like to see actual operating costs. Don't think these numbers are correct
- we do not want to pay for this facility in our taxes!!!! If we wanted to drive 20 mins to use a pool we would drive to Whistler. Let the residents in that area pay for their facility. Or, have ONE facility only closer to the village of Pemberton and EVERYBODY pays for it!!!
- too much money
- costs
- n/a
- green building
- Why should the Village of Pemberton Tax payers pay for this?
- cannot afford anything.
- The cost of Buiding and Operating could increase

- I just think we should be focusing on getting a facility in Pemberton first although I do realize this is the SLRD not the Village
- No
- It should be a small community gathering place with room for a baseball field/ soccer field. Lakefront property is ridiculous and expensive.
- We already have the community centre. I dont see what purpose this serves in addition to this
- don't know. i don't live up there so not sure if i would ever use facility. the folks who do live up there are way overdue for a facility like this.
- Just get on with it and stop playing politics.
- no no no
- maybe something smaller. Have t okeep in mind it is a remote rural area and that should colour what you expect for servicing
- this facility would take away from the Pemberton community centre programs, operations buiding
- how about a park with washrooms then slowly look at a building and facilities
- as a tax payer I don't want to pay for Susie Gimes facility in Birken
- need to focus funds in Pemberton for all area residents
- WE (Area C/VOP) should work more collaboratively towards solutions for all
- just figure out what needs are, focus should be on a centre that can offer more ie. Pemberton
- too much wasted money up there in the past 2 years. Gates lake facility
- boat launch, boat storage
- the numbers!
- Pool the funds for more complete facilities
- the facility is far larger than that community can sustain. Reduce the size/impact as my tax dollars will be grossly misused
- too much money for too few people
- we cannot support the facilities we already have
- Already have current facility in our Pemby Community Centre complete with kitchen
- too much money for too few people
- Proposed is good. The house purchase was WRONG! No input, not suitable and a waste of money
- leaveit the way that it is and put all ideas and money towards VOP proper. For all of Area C as it also includes the meadows up to Geese Rd
- maybe better decision making on what is bought with tax payer money
- THE COST!! As a resident of Pemberton, I do not want to pay for sattelite facilities as well as facilities in my community
- As a tax payer in the Village of Pemberton, I am not interested in a tax increase to cover the cost of this facility. User fee - yes! Increased taxes - NO!
- Area C should pay for this. I don't want to pay for it
- process needs more transparency
- The cost, proximity to town, lake access due to train tracks, highway proximity.
- Unless we partner with Area C, I would not support VOP paying for a facility outside of immediate area. Area C should build and we pay user fees. Would be popular with VOP since we want lake access.
- I don't see how Area C needs such a facility. It really just amounts to a meeting space more than anything else. Doesn't seem very useful.
- A thermal Park (thermoludism), that attracts local, sports & tourism - this is a big outdoor Recreation Community and we would all enjoy it. Many pools, kids welcome, massage jets, sauna, etc, (Bains de Saillons - Switzerland - as an example - would attract different tourism
- Very concerned. Need more information, we can't afford to duplicate when many Birken people support Pemberton Facility. Glad new site has lake access. Much more suitable , would support some kind of community facility but would need more info
- money seems to be spent without plan... develop something that works for the PEOPLE of the Birken area!
- Population numbers require that all three communities work together no matter what we build/ maintain. Area C residents do use ALL village facilities and need to focus on a bigger scope

- Population (including tax payers) not high enough to support this!
- don't think Area C needs facility. the funds should be combined with Village to maximise success of new facilities in Village proper!
- don't know
- too expensive for what I would expect to be small usage.
- Doesn't make sense for cost, use projections + location (not central)

21. Are there any financial aspects of the proposed satellite facility that concern you? Specify.

- Is there enough usage and tax base to support it without crushing/ burdening taxes on home owners and small businesses. Its already expensive and prohibitive for many to live in this area.
- too much money
- n/a
- cannot afford anything.
- Don't waste money on getting one in Birken until we have a building in Pemby that is fully functional and meeting all the needs of the community. Then go and do one in Birken
- Lots of Vandalism in Area
- Small number of people using the facility... think funds could be better spent.
- My concern is how everyone in the community can afford both facilities. The SLRD has already forwarded the water debt onto its residents and how much more is this facility going to cost us?
- No
- if it affects the chance of getting one central facility that all users of village, area C and Lilwat nation can use, then I am definitely against this project
- SLRD was given money from the WedgeWoods development and various other projects to pay for a recreation facility. It should have no bearing on the Village taxpayers.
- i don't believe that this is a feasible plan when examining the number of residents who actually live in the area and contribute to the tax base. i feel use of the facility would be low and therefore would not support. if the local area were to grow and tax base from the local area could support the costs, i would support.
- paying for something i wouldn't necessarily use but would enjoy seeing the folks who live up there have access to a community facility hub
- Yes. VOPs estimates. Capital costs were determined by council without consultation with the SLRD.
- Only if Village residents are given equal access to that given "Area C" residents, with NO priority booking schedule.
- not sure where money comes from - servicing a very small area
- the total overall capital costs and the debt service annually, and operating deficit
- consideration of a satellite library facility
- The cost vs. the # of people served. SLRD + joint partnerships currently are fractured and strained
- previous decisions seem to have been made in haste, what are the needs, unfortunately it doesn't make sense to spend a ton when you can drive 30 mins
- \$\$\$\$ wasting
- not at this time
- community pool (indoor or outdoor) is more important
- the minimal population seems there would be more viable to have facilities in Pemberton most people are coming in to shop or school for their children
- Cost! Management - operational & administrative
- me paying for it
- Yes, SLRD cannot support current facility which does not meet current needs, therefore does not make sense to have ANOTHER facility which is not utilized by residence of VoP
- no to any community facility as the facility should be in VOP for all residents of area
- District C should pay for it. and Pemberton could pay user fees. If you want it that bad
- Distance from VOP - not sustainable, encourages additional driver/vehicle usage.
- impact on our Taxes
- Should focus VOP tax\$ in and around VOP for users to be close - bike/walk etc

- It's a lot of money for a simple meeting space with a kitchen. They can come to the new facility in Pemberton if they need that.
- increase of property taxes which have doubled already in the last 10 years
- N/A
- any money is too much
- need more info
- Debt is a big concern - operating costs are often under estimated - that would also be a concern.
- no
- No
- I suppose it would cost more than we think, but for some reason I really like the idea of swimming in the lake in the summer. In the same way that I love visiting the library in the existing community centre in Pemberton so I am resigned to being taxed an extra \$150 per year to keep it going.
- I don't think the location is ideal for the mass population in the area.
- Much too expensive when we can't afford and provide enough services here in town. The satellite area isn't large enough at this point to fund it themselves - so they should wait. We can't do everything and need to be fiscally responsible.
- no
- Let's focus our funds on creating one space that provides for all of our needs. There will always be people who have to drive to the recreation center. It doesn't seem feasible to use part of our limited funding on small satellite facilities when we are looking at long term planning for the development of a centralized recreational hub. I can understand the benefits of small centers for such communities but we can't have both at this point in time. Perhaps this is where that shuttle comes in?
- Would it really be used enough to cover the running costs?
- The population base doesn't support this facility. Plus, all of those residents utilize Pemberton for shopping, athletics, social. This is just siphoning resources from a regional facility.
- See above.
- The facility would be nice however an ice rink and playing fields closer to town are required first.
- The SLRD has done nothing to deserve the Village of Pemberton's support for recreation outside of the Village. See Water bill, Fire Department support and willingness to come up with money for the community center for examples.
- At over \$110 000 the cost seems excessive.
- VoP cannot afford to support the operational costs of this facility.

15. In the next five (5) years would you reject all types of new recreation facilities in the Pemberton Area?

- Taxes are getting too high, stop spending my money for me.
- We don't have the population to support these facilities.
- Our property taxes are high now, and we can not afford to operate the current community centre cannot afford.
- We can not afford to run the existing community developments & are still paying debt service for them due to increase taxes
- cant afford it right now
- depends what it is, whether there is a need use for it and is it too fancy and to expensive and not practical and affordable with affordable running costs
- Build them!!!!
- decision makers need to understand we are small and want to stay small
- I have a hard time paying my property taxes now. I cannot afford any rate increases. My recreation needs are very simple. A few walking trails and a good dog.
- I moved here 15 years ago because I fell in love with Pemberton. Not the facilities it doesnt have.
- I think you need to look at what we have already and make it more viable as new things in our area cost too much money and we need to be able to pay for these things.
- Pemberton area needs more higher paying jobs, industry, to keep people here.
- I don't think we have the population or economic affordability to sustain as the facilities costing too much

- new fields are the only thing we maybe able to afford.
- depends on whether the community tax base has grown sufficiently to be able to afford the facilities
- depends on the cost to taxpayers
- except fields
- need to focus on building on what we already have.
- We are a small community that can't afford another indoor recreation facility (eg pool or ice rink). These are nice to have facilities not must haves. Recreation can take on many forms and with Pemberton's weather we can easily recreate outdoors.
- maintain soccer field!
- let's see if projected growth is going to go up. Population seems to be shrinking - not growing.
- Unaffordable - we live in an outdoor recreation paradise - use it.
- We really need to sort out how we are going to pay for the existing community centre and for the Gates Lake facility, which I think we are also saddled with. This must happen before we can look at building anything new.
- As lovely as new facilities would be, I am very concerned that we may not be at a point yet that we can afford to do anything. We are still a small tax base and need to be responsible. Taking on large debt does not make sense to me.
- Development during periods of austerity must be limited. We aren't doing too badly, but borrowing money must be limited. Let's pay off the 'sturdy-mahal' first. Then let's talk about borrowing.
- too expensive to maintain.
- not enough full time work, can't cover any rise in taxes, community centre was a waste of time and money
- Until Pemberton has a growth plan in place which will generate full time jobs such as encouraging businesses at the Industrial facilities there is no point in creating a tax burden for the people of Pemberton and surrounding areas. There is no work to keep people in Pemberton, creating pretty recreational facilities in Pemberton will not encourage people to live here. Job creation (not just short term construction jobs and a few recreational jobs) and sustainability will attract people.
- We currently have a facility that's been open for 5 years and is still not complete, is not making enough money to cover its operating costs, and yet it's perfectly located in the heart of the village. I would rather the next 5 years was spent fixing this problem before we spend more money on another one.
- Because we're broke as a community and borrowing to build would be ludicrous.
- Can not afford more facilities with small population - partner and use RMOW
- unless I could see a solid commitment to not wasting my money like you have on the community centre, I would not support such an investment
- Lack of money.
- Again, who is going to pay for this?

18. Do you have any other ideas or comments you would like to share?

- It's a catch-22 situation - "build it, they will come" (more business/schools/residents), and "build as the tax base grows + make it possible to properly maintain + support the structures. We currently have indoor gym space at all of the schools & the community centre & Ullus Centre. Are they being fully utilised? Would available transportation help use the space more? Would duplicating a pool & arena here devastate the Meadow Park facilities? Build with expansion in mind - long range goals as the community grows & can support it without bankrupting the town. Why don't we have an outdoor rink where the horse corral was - beside the new BMX track? Question #16 makes sense. If Whistler's Meadow Park facility would face even more financial upkeep difficulties by losing many of their users to ours, why burden every area with more debt and higher taxes?? Especially in these uncertain economic times.
- I would love a pool but I have concerns about the cost. I wonder if an outdoor (covered) pool is an option? I think an arena combined with pool or field house would significantly help with financially supporting the facility and help pay for itself, if it were a standalone facility.
- Simple, user friendly facility with safe pedestrian access ie bike, foot path. Does not need to be in downtown Pemberton.

- Please consider the horse community in recreation planning. I believe promotion of equestrian could be a big draw to the community & tourism
- I think that the equestrian community has been totally left out and is a big part of Pemberton/slrld/lil'wat history, and an even bigger part of our future with the big barns moving into town. And the amount of horses that call Pemberton home.
- question #17 answered up to #2 only
- more trails needed in Pemberton that are horse friendly. The riders in this community have been pushed off many trails which we helped to build. Community Centre is needed in this town that offers what the people want. Not just a pretty building.
- Please stop this, you are ruining this Town.
- I am definitely in favour of the outdoor fields as they are not too expensive. They would be a great addition to the community. The pool and arena would be great if the cost sharing keeps costs low. But there is no point in building those facilities far away from the village. I would support an arena and pool if costs are kept low by sharing and the facilities are close to the village. Otherwise they don't make sense.
- no
- Staff the community Centre. Make it the hub of the village again as it was when Linda Brown ran it.
- Pursue the option of an outdoor pool, lap and wading that is solar heated and only open for the summer months. Currently we can not afford to operate the existing disfunctional community centre. We should not be exploring any options until the debt for this building is paid. I do not trust any partnerships with other governments, first nations or private developers. The Village of Pemberton needs to get costs and property taxes under control. We are already paying \$ 150.00 extra for the next 2 years.
- cannot afford
- Use the potential revenue from the Pemberton Creek IPP to fund these projects. Or even better, use the generated virtual power to heat and run the buildings (simmilar to Fitz Creek and WB)
- Last Sunday noticed none of the Fields wer being used. Sat. lots of soccer on the ol High School fields that If we build facilities... lets keep them simple... nothing over the top like our current community centre...
 - 1) build structures that are user friendly, no wasted space. All rooms and areas to be used. Make facilities multi purpose.
 - 2) plan with the future in mind so that if we need to expand in 15 years... there are options
 - 3) low cost to maintain. i.e. fancy glue lam beams need to be maintained every few years.
 - 4) Don't make it an architecture statement.
 - 5) Keep the plans simple... would rather get the facilities than not due to overspending on fancy buildings I Mentioned an outdoor pool earlier in the survey... where I grew up ... they built cinderblock type pools... change rooms where the same.... the water was always very cold but the pools were always filled with kids. Could use solar heating to change that now.
- To simplify: Pool, Ice Rink top priority(with everyone I know). Everything else is great but let's start there and plan for the growth down the road.
- I have heard a lot of discussion about how we need facilities of a certain calibre in order to attract and host tournaments to the community. It makes me wonder if we're chasing a red herring a little bit. Hockey tournaments are regularly hosted in very basic arenas with fewer dressing rooms and fewer spectator seats and less glamour. I'm not sure it's realistic to focus on having high capacity multi-surface facilities to hose a handful of tournaments that will provide limited revenues. Let's compare the revenue from tournaments we could host with small simple facilities versus the ones we could host with expensive, larger facilities...is it really worth the extra costs? or the costs at all?
- I never want to do another recreational needs study for this community again, 4 is enough. Build something!!! Why was facilities for water sports not included. Presently there are over 100 kids plus many adults involved in canoeing, dragon boating, outrigger. Some are competing at the international level. How long would it be before this area had a skater, swimmer, hockey player , baseball player, football player soccer player competing at this level !!
- though a pool would be nice, dont think we can afford it, lets try to start with arena, fieldhouse and outdoor playing fields
- See 10.2 and 10.3
- Thank you for soliciting feedback! It would be great if a partnership could be arranged with the possible private school that is interested in pemberton to held fund the facilities.

- I think there should be more access to facilities that already exist (eg High school) which locals can create community based activities. Indoor soccer, outdoor soccer, basketball etc. This happens in Whistler on their fields and works well. Engage the public, give them access and they will organize.
- I think it is important to build something that will bring people from other areas; such as the wave pool. It will bring more money and business into the community, not just keep the people here happy.
- Get a workout area in 1 mile lake. Pull-up bars, dips bar, agility runs drills similar of the ones in Europe . Cheap alternative exists!
- I think we all feel bitten by the last experience with the community centre. It is too expensive and the great room is useless.
- basic recreation services are needed for all - not just Pemberton
- I think that the opportunities for Pemberton are endless. We need to remember that and take advantage. Let's bring people and jobs to Pemberton. We might have to spend some money to make it back.... Let's keep our community here and keep them happy. Activities will keep them happy and keep them here.
- Important to make realistic goals for the community based on financial position and population
- Co-op structure, have intended users share in profit/loss of a private facility
- just do something!
- We've had 20 years of surveys - we want recreation! Build it and residents will stay and more will move here
- we need to have sustainable facilities or at least aspire to lower our wants. Maybe making building smaller scale pool or a field just to maintain and support local recreational needs? Our wants are big, but needs are not
- start over with everything
- indoor and or outdoor pool, soccer/baseball fields and a indoor equestrian arena are top of my list.
- Fieldhouse with several outdoor playing fields and baseball fields attached to attract tournament play, soccer, softball, baseball, football. Economic generator
- a new public beach.
- Get rid of the buildings purchased for Birken recreation. I don't think we can afford to look after them.
- We need to be able to pay for and afford to use what we currently have. The costs to use the current facility are already too high. I am strongly against building more recreation in D'arcy as the SLRD has failed to contribute to our existing facility appropriately. I in support of basic structures being built in our community that are based on functionality and not unused wasted space and poor planning as our current facility has. It is important to consider the annual income of the community and an important question to ask is what is the current average community family budget for recreation.
- Area C to be notified/ shared/ included
- Thank you Village for this initiative! Would have liked that SLRD had participated in feasibility study
- I am concerned that Area C isn't working with the village & Lil'Wat. Do they not want to use these new proposed facilities? Do they want to pay more and take a back seat when a facility is in place?
- it is unfortunate that Area C and Lilloet areas did not partake in this feasibility study
- Going through this booklet, I have come to my own conclusions that the cost to provide a single indoor field is too much and not a good fix for recreation in our area. But, if we had all communities on board with providing services for D'Arcy through to Geese Rd, we might be able to provide a nice facility. But, 1 field is not the answer.
- The Village needs to encourage & promote new businesses into the area in order to bring a new and greater tax base, in order to be able to afford new/bigger facilities. Without a larger tax base, this proposal is NOTaffordable or sustainable
- we don't have enough of a tax base to support any new/additional facilities. Lets focus on what we have and work towards making these facilities feasible.
- . We need to pay off what we owe now, and install just 2 grass sports fields as these are the only cost effective option. NO POOL< NO ARENA
- rethink the arena. Should be much more modest family tax hit. Do support importance of activities for the community.

- I would have been interested to hear what combinations would be best from a business perspective - that would affect my opinion. What kind of tournaments, camps etc could the village attract and revenue impact that could have.
- I am wondering how these surveys are going to be evaluated and if there is any way to ensure that the responses are representative of the entire population (1 survey per person) I have been invited to attend several feedback sessions and have filled this out. Will my views be counted 3 times?
- I am very concerned about attempting to pay for new facilities through monies raised by "partnerships with private schools, industries, IPP's etc. Do not dangle carrots to convince people.
- Need to focus on existing community centre and how we can afford this rather than adding new amenities. Relationships with Area C/Lil'Wat not currently smooth, adding large scale projects seems very risky.
- We must remember that Pemberton and surrounding area entails a very small tax base and cannot support additional fees. There are many people that are in arrears for their property taxes and adding to their tax bills for additional recreational options (which are nice to have's not must have's) is not a proactive move for the community. Let us pay off the existing community centre before we spend any additional funding. Also based on the current information put forth in the info for this survey, the current rec centre is not being utilized to capacity. Let's be creative on how to maximize useage of our existing facilities. Also as a Pemberton resident with grown children, we as a family do not have a need for additional facilities. We are comfortable going to Whistler and using Meadow Park. If you want to create a new outdoor ice surface (eg at Signal Hill) utilize the existng structure at Signal hill, cover it and put a refrigeration system in, but DO NOT create a whole new indoor facility that will cost millions of \$'s. We can't afford these luxuries. Many other communities (cities for that matter) rely on government subsidies to run their community centres and they have much larger population bases. Also let's not waste too much tax payer money on conducting this survey. We could put this money towards existing programming. Another thought - dredge One Mile Lake so that it is nicer to swim in and kids can take summer swimming lessons there and make it into a tourist destinatio. Many of us learned to swim and skate outdoors.
- Pemberton desperately needs to attract new industry to town and The Hill Academy is a huge opportunity for us all. Pemberton has a rich history of screwing up great opportunities for one reason or another. Don't mess this one up too. The Hill Academy needs a commitment from the VOP for a single sheet of ice to be built. Let's get this done and welcome The Hill Academy to town with open arms. Pemberton needs this.
- Generally, we do not use indoor rec facilities but we would use indoor swimming pool in winter. I support it for future generations and believe it is important for our community - A field , Arena or else. Public transport is very important, driving to exercise makes no sense - staying "green" is important
- I hope this is a long-term thing and that nothing will happen without extremely well thought out plans. We have so much outdoor activities in our area, we do need some indoor facilities but not at any cost.
- Big cost for few people!!!
- all options too expensive. Given present population, and proposed increases and what I know about use and interest in outdoor recreation, I generally recommend support for that type of recreation ie. trails, x-country trails - that bike park is well used, eh??????? Any new facility in the future should ideally be a modest project. How about partnering with the Parks + keep the gate to Nairn Falls parking lot open so we (not just Nordic Club) can ski in the winter!
- get rid of sattelite community space - waste of money!!!!!!
- make all Buildings 'plain Jane' types. No Whistler style!
- A Multi-Functional Field House shared by Field Sports and rink-skating. Is a kitchen necessary - I don't think so, A pool is costly to maintain and I doubt it would be used enough to warrant.
- Thanks for the opportunity to provide feedback. Good Luck.
- Dont do it if you are not going to do it right.
- Urban expectations lead to unbearable tax burdens, this is rural BC - get used to it.
- Purchase mosquito lake, enlarge parking and enhance trails, enlarge parking on the Duffey lake road for winter ski touring groups.

- Let's wait until the recession is over and then consider possibly an outdoor pool, open for 4 months of the year. There isn't anything else that is fiscally responsible.
- Should we be a little more careful about who we accept money from? For example, Innergex has generously sponsored a number of initiatives in our community and they might be also proposing a power project on the local creek. perhaps we should consider asking tax-payers to pay for things like Winterfest and Tourism Pemberton (which are excellent amenities). The power companies are different from logging and agricultural companies, which have provided long term jobs for ages. the power companies provide only 1-2 long term jobs. I just think we should think twice about it, that's all.
- We don't really need a pool but if this won't happen without the pool, I will swim to vote yes.
- Don't put in Poole creek stupid stupid idea
- I really think we are getting ahead of ourselves in thinking we can afford any new facilities. I think that the Gates Lake facility is also going to have to be paid for with a contribution from the village so we need to face the fact that we are simply strapped for cash. And a power project on Pemberton Creek to pay for it is not an option I would support.
- Consideration for making 1 Mile lake more swimmer friendly near the beach by dredging the bottom and maintaining the beach area.
- I think the facilities should be focused in the pemberton/mt. Currie area and the comm. centre in d'arcy should be scratched. Most of those people are in town frequently and so are their kids. Supporting a second facility will take away from the main need which is closer to town.
- It would have been nice to have a choice of Fieldhouse/pool combination as well.
- I believe that the costs associated with running the current community center (which very few people use) could be put to better use by using them for a new arena/pool facility. I would vote to close current community center in favor of a new facility that better served families in Pemberton. I also think sharing the costs with a 3rd party such as a private school is a great idea! This would keep our taxes lower and bring another positive development to our community.
- good job so far! keep it up! Bean Craig Question #17 only answered up to preference #4
- Real useful reliable transit would be a start. We can't just build new stuff with money we don't have because what we have doesn't suit us/is inconvenient.
- When I moved to this town 23 years ago there was a promise of an arena within 1 year. Still Waiting. Whistlers pool is too far away for winter evening driving to Birken. Pemberton has waited long enough. People in Birken or outlying areas never expected facilities outside of Pemberton and everyone I have talked to says they should be in Pemberton as everyone goes to Pemberton for something. A vast majority of parents work in Pemberton and having the facility in Pemberton would facilitate having kids participating after school so they can be picked up by parents instead of bussing.
- The current community is an expensive waste of money. The activities are too expensive and double the cost in the city. It's called the Pemberton tax. We don't need a director and an assistant director. Somebody needs to go. I can't afford to use the community center in my own community and I have a good job. We need shade for our current water park. Will the village charge admission the the water park this year? I wouldn't put it past them with all the nickle and diming around here.
- Question 17 only answered up to #9 Field House, single surface arena, and outdoor all weather Turf for soccer/baseball/football field
- Ignore the SLRD and get on with it
- While the cost sharing/shuttle etc. to Whistler may be more cost efficient, that facility is already over burdened by the number of people who use it, especially the arena. We need another arena in this corridor! Pemberton seems like the logical choice. What kind of grants are available to help with these costs? Unfortunately, the tax estimator website is currently down so I was unable to specifically look at how my taxes would be affected by my choices.
- Recreation is key to our children. Don't make this a community with the statement " we'll there us nothing for them to do". Keep our kids busy and our RCMP not busy !!!!
- I feel we need these facilities so that young people stay here and more will come if they know the facilities are here. The cost to transport children to facilities in Whistler could be used to offset the tax increase.
- now is not the time for spending more than we can afford.

- Learning how to Swim is a life skill, it's so important and having the facility to teach children to swim is vital. I'm way more interested in a Pool & Field house as this gives the opportunity for affordable sports programs. I am not interested in an arena because programs like hockey, ringette & figure skating are way too expensive for most parents to afford anyways. I consider the ice sports "rich kid" sports. Swimming & Soccer are great sports for kids of all ages, affordable for families and offer so much growth, confidence & team building
- we need more jobs in Pemberton, rather than relying on Whistler for low paid hotel work etc.
- Fiscal responsibility - do not spend more than the electorate wants to pay for. Do not leave Pemberton paying for under utilised, over budget facilities.
- I found question 17 confusing in format, and gave up.
- 1. I think that the community needs a dose of realism when it comes to the cost of facilities. I would like to see the discussion of Pemberton Creek IPP revenue potential linked to the recreation discussion. They are connected because the population cannot support a large expansion of facilities without an increase in non-taxpayer funded revenues. 2. I think that more discussion should go into spending similar amounts on non-facility recreation. How could investment in cross-country trails and sport be supported. How could investment in bike trails be supported. How could investment in One-Mile...etc. The valley has plenty of natural recreation opportunities. Rather than focus on what we don't have, can we think about making investments in our natural assets? How could Pemberton become "the mountain bike capital of Canada" for example. How can One-Mile become our swimming pool? Etc.
- A recreation and community gathering center is key to helping Pemberton achieve positive growth. Learning sport and fitness is a life skill and needs to be available to us. Design is secondary to function.
- I would like to see an outside posting board of events for advertising outside the facility ie hockey arena hosting game advertising ie. event hosting ads. I would also like to have the facility used for coaching clinics and seminars etc. so maybe have a small room allotted for small meetings etc. or sports rehabilitation medical first aid. or even a future cafeteria in the arena.
- This survey is clearly biased in favour of a positive outcome for enhanced recreation services. This survey also doesn't work well as question 17 can't be used correctly as it doesn't allow for respondent ranking of services. I think recreation is great, but we're a struggling community, with no economic development, an enormous municipal payroll and a debt commitment to a relatively useless community centre that should have incorporated field house components such as a gym.
- I would love to see the "moving forward" of an arena and field house. With these amenities, Pemberton will be more attractive to young families and we can move forward with the Hill Academy Private school which will be an amazing addition to our community. Please help move this along so we do not miss out on this opportunity.
- no
- Most kids and families cannot afford to put kids in more than one or two recreation activities at a time. Kids have lots to do and not enough time or money to do more. It is similar to spending 10 million on a ski hill on Mt. Currie so we don't have to drive to Whistler. Use the 10 million for improved roads, water, sewer etc. which will cut down on maintenance costs. Subsidize or reduce costs for existing facilities not build more.
- Do not like question 17. Please omit.
- Frustrating that tax estimators are not working. Feels like I can't properly answer the survey without them
- We are building this for the Community of Pemberton, it doesn't have to be fancy and all glass covered, ahem. What makes sense is getting the basics now to build onto down the road, when the population can support it
- No

Appendix C - Cummulative Support
for Property Tax Change

	No Increase	<\$150 Increase	\$150-\$300 Increase	\$301-\$500 Increase	No Limits	Total Responses	Sole Support Percentage (370)	Cummulative Support (increase-no increase)	Cummulative Support Percentage
No Increase	73	15	4	1	1	94	20%	73	17%
<\$150 Increase	15	121	20	4	5	165	33%	121	28%
\$150-\$300 Increase	4	20	101	11	10	146	27%	117	27%
\$301-\$500 Increase	1	4	11	25	5	46	7%	40	9%
No Limits	1	5	10	5	50	71	14%	84	19%
	94	165	146	46	71	522	100%	435	100%

Recreation Feasibility Online Workbook









1. 1. Where do you live:

		Response Percent	Response Count
Village of Pemberton		62.8%	221
Lil'wat Nation Mount Currie/Xit'olacw		2.0%	7
Pemberton Plateau/Hillside/Industrial Park area		6.3%	22
Pemberton Fringe East (Clover/Fraser/Airport Rd)		3.1%	11
Pemberton Fringe North (Collins to Guthrie area)		4.8%	17
Ivey Lake/Reid Road/Walkerville		4.0%	14
Pemberton Meadows		10.5%	37
Birken/Gates Lake/Poole Creek		3.7%	13
D'Arcy/Devine/Birkenhead		1.4%	5
Owl Ridge		1.4%	5
	Other (please specify)		5
answered question			352










skipped question

0

2. 2. How many people in your immediate family currently live in your household?

		Response Percent	Response Count
1		9.1%	32
2		29.0%	102
3		23.0%	81
4		31.3%	110
5		6.5%	23
6		1.1%	4
7		0.0%	0
8		0.0%	0
9		0.0%	0
10+		0.0%	0
		Other (please specify)	0
		answered question	352
		skipped question	0

3. 3. What is your age?

		Response Percent	Response Count
5-9 years		0.0%	0
10-14 years		0.3%	1
15-19 years		0.9%	3
20-29 years		5.4%	19
30-39 years		33.5%	118
40-49 years		34.9%	123
50-59 years		14.5%	51
60-69 years		6.8%	24
70-79 years		2.8%	10
80+ years		0.9%	3
		answered question	352
		skipped question	0

4. 4. What are the ages of the family members (other than you) that currently live in your household?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Rating Count
0-4 years	73.8% (76)	22.3% (23)	3.9% (4)	1.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	103
5-9 years	75.8% (69)	18.7% (17)	4.4% (4)	1.1% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	91
10-14 years	76.9% (60)	23.1% (18)	2.6% (2)	1.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	78
15-19 years	63.3% (19)	36.7% (11)	3.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	30
20-29 years	88.5% (23)	15.4% (4)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	26
30-39 years	80.4% (78)	19.6% (19)	1.0% (1)	1.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	97
40-49 years	82.4% (108)	14.5% (19)	4.6% (6)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.8% (1)	131
50-59 years	93.8% (45)	4.2% (2)	0.0% (0)	2.1% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	48
60-69 years	80.0% (16)	20.0% (4)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	20
70-79 years	100.0% (11)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	11
80+ years	100.0% (5)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	5

Other (please specify) 0

answered question 316

skipped question 36

5. 5. From the list below, indicate those activities that your family (living in your household) would participate in provided the appropriate facility was offered in the Pemberton/Area C/Lil'wat area (check all that apply):

	Frequently (2-3 x/week)	Often (3-4 x/month)	On occasion (1 x/month)	Rarely (1-3 x/year)	Never	Rating Count
indoor swimming lessons	24.0% (68)	34.3% (97)	5.7% (16)	7.4% (21)	28.6% (81)	283
indoor rehabilitation swimming	8.6% (19)	10.5% (23)	12.7% (28)	23.6% (52)	44.5% (98)	220
indoor swimming training and/or competitions	16.3% (38)	12.9% (30)	8.2% (19)	14.2% (33)	48.5% (113)	233
indoor leisure swimming	30.0% (92)	37.1% (114)	15.6% (48)	7.8% (24)	9.4% (29)	307
indoor wading pool	17.6% (41)	20.6% (48)	10.3% (24)	8.6% (20)	42.9% (100)	233
indoor whirlpool/sauna/steam room	27.0% (76)	29.9% (84)	16.7% (47)	11.0% (31)	15.3% (43)	281
indoor skating	19.1% (56)	27.3% (80)	20.5% (60)	17.1% (50)	16.0% (47)	293
indoor organized minor hockey	19.4% (47)	15.3% (37)	5.8% (14)	5.8% (14)	53.7% (130)	242
indoor organized figure skating	9.2% (21)	9.6% (22)	8.3% (19)	8.3% (19)	64.5% (147)	228
indoor organized adult hockey	16.8% (40)	18.5% (44)	7.1% (17)	10.1% (24)	47.5% (113)	238
indoor drop in hockey	12.6% (28)	17.1% (38)	15.8% (35)	7.7% (17)	46.8% (104)	222
indoor ball hockey	6.3% (14)	13.8% (31)	17.0% (38)	11.6% (26)	51.3% (115)	224

indoor broomball	1.9% (4)	1.0% (2)	7.8% (16)	12.6% (26)	76.7% (158)	206
indoor curling	5.6% (13)	15.0% (35)	16.7% (39)	20.5% (48)	42.3% (99)	234
indoor soccer	19.4% (49)	23.4% (59)	11.9% (30)	7.5% (19)	37.7% (95)	252
indoor football	4.8% (10)	4.3% (9)	4.8% (10)	9.1% (19)	77.0% (161)	209
indoor basketball	13.0% (30)	12.6% (29)	9.6% (22)	15.7% (36)	49.1% (113)	230
indoor baseball	1.9% (4)	8.6% (18)	4.3% (9)	10.0% (21)	75.1% (157)	209
indoor lacrosse	2.8% (6)	6.6% (14)	6.1% (13)	12.3% (26)	72.2% (153)	212
indoor gymnastics	15.7% (39)	21.7% (54)	9.6% (24)	7.2% (18)	45.8% (114)	249
indoor trampoline	14.9% (36)	18.7% (45)	15.8% (38)	8.3% (20)	42.3% (102)	241
indoor tennis	11.1% (26)	14.0% (33)	14.9% (35)	11.5% (27)	48.5% (114)	235
indoor badminton	9.6% (22)	10.5% (24)	18.3% (42)	18.8% (43)	42.8% (98)	229
indoor roller derby/skating	3.8% (8)	6.2% (13)	10.0% (21)	14.8% (31)	65.1% (136)	209
outdoor swimming lessons	18.2% (43)	25.8% (61)	11.4% (27)	8.9% (21)	35.6% (84)	236
outdoor rehabilitation swimming	3.8% (8)	8.2% (17)	13.0% (27)	18.8% (39)	56.3% (117)	208
outdoor swimming training and/or competitions	10.9% (22)	6.5% (13)	11.4% (23)	13.4% (27)	57.7% (116)	201
outdoor leisure swimming	26.8% (71)	30.6% (81)	18.5% (49)	9.8% (26)	14.3% (38)	265
outdoor wading pool	18.1% (41)	18.6% (42)	7.5% (17)	8.8% (20)	46.9% (106)	226
outdoor whirlpool/sauna/steam room	19.9% (47)	23.3% (55)	12.3% (29)	11.9% (28)	32.6% (77)	236








outdoor skating	19.8% (51)	28.4% (73)	23.0% (59)	13.6% (35)	15.2% (39)	257
outdoor organized minor hockey	12.4% (27)	15.2% (33)	6.5% (14)	5.1% (11)	60.8% (132)	217
outdoor organized figure skating	6.5% (14)	9.3% (20)	8.8% (19)	8.3% (18)	67.1% (145)	216
outdoor organized adult hockey	11.8% (26)	19.1% (42)	8.6% (19)	8.6% (19)	51.8% (114)	220
outdoor drop in hockey	13.2% (30)	18.1% (41)	15.4% (35)	12.3% (28)	41.0% (93)	227
outdoor ball hockey	6.7% (14)	10.5% (22)	13.4% (28)	10.5% (22)	58.9% (123)	209
outdoor broomball	1.5% (3)	3.0% (6)	5.0% (10)	10.5% (21)	80.0% (160)	200
outdoor curling	5.6% (12)	9.8% (21)	17.2% (37)	18.1% (39)	49.3% (106)	215
outdoor soccer	29.2% (76)	21.5% (56)	7.7% (20)	8.8% (23)	32.7% (85)	260
outdoor football	6.7% (14)	4.3% (9)	7.7% (16)	10.5% (22)	70.8% (148)	209
outdoor basketball	10.4% (23)	10.4% (23)	15.3% (34)	14.4% (32)	49.5% (110)	222
outdoor baseball	7.5% (16)	15.0% (32)	12.2% (26)	8.9% (19)	56.3% (120)	213
outdoor lacrosse	2.6% (5)	4.7% (9)	9.4% (18)	9.9% (19)	73.4% (141)	192
outdoor gymnastics	7.6% (15)	7.6% (15)	9.6% (19)	10.1% (20)	65.2% (129)	198
outdoor trampoline	12.3% (28)	13.2% (30)	15.0% (34)	9.7% (22)	49.8% (113)	227
outdoor tennis	13.9% (32)	15.2% (35)	17.4% (40)	14.3% (33)	39.1% (90)	230
outdoor badminton	9.1% (20)	7.8% (17)	15.1% (33)	14.6% (32)	53.4% (117)	219
outdoor roller derby/skating	3.1% (6)	3.6% (7)	6.6% (13)	14.8% (29)	71.9% (141)	196







Other (please specify) 46

answered question 343








skipped question 9

6. 6. Which of the following statements best reflect your opinions about the provision of additional recreation facilities in the Pemberton area (check all you support):








		Response Percent	Response Count
Provide more recreational activities and opportunities in the area		66.6%	227
Provide more recreational activities during the winter/poor weather		53.7%	183
Reduce the amount of driving to Whistler, or to other recreational facilities not provided in Pemberton/Mount Currie		67.2%	229
Ensure priority access for recreation facility bookings (unlike Meadow Park Recreation Centre)		26.1%	89
Make the community an even more desirable place to live		65.4%	223
Provide a community gathering place, encouraging and embracing opportunities for social interaction around sports and leisure		55.1%	188
Retain families in our community in the long term (residents leave due to lack of recreation facilities)		59.5%	203



Provide opportunities to learn to swim		52.5%	179
Provide opportunities to learn to skate/figure skate/play hockey		47.8%	163
Provide opportunities to learn other sports not currently offered in the area		37.2%	127
Offer recreational facilities that facilitate athletic excellence		37.5%	128
Drive new business opportunities in the area		51.3%	175
Do not want new recreation facilities		12.6%	43
		Other (please specify)	22
answered question			341
skipped question			11

7. 7. Which of the following statements best reflect your opinions with regard to possible cost implications of new recreation facilities on your payable property taxes/parcel tax (check all you support):

		Response Percent	Response Count
Do not increase my property taxes		21.4%	73
Increase my residential property taxes less than \$150 per year		35.5%	121
Increase my residential property taxes by \$150-\$300 per year		29.6%	101
Increase my residential property taxes by \$301-\$500 per year		7.3%	25
I want the recreation facilities regardless of the impact on property taxes		14.7%	50
I do not pay property taxes		8.8%	30
A one-time payment per property address for capital costs (to avoid ongoing costs of borrowing)		10.6%	36
		Other (please specify)	24
answered question			341
skipped question			11

8. 8. Which of the following directions are fundamental in the development of new recreation facilities (check all you support):

		Response Percent	Response Count
The Village of Pemberton shares the capital and operating costs in partnership with Area C (SLRD)		34.6%	115
The Village of Pemberton shares the capital and operating costs in partnership with Lil'wat Nation (Mount Currie/ Xit'olacw)		27.1%	90
The Village of Pemberton shares the capital and operating costs in partnership with Area C and Lil'wat Nation (Mount Currie/Xit'olacw)		76.2%	253
The Village of Pemberton shares the capital and operating costs in partnership with private interests such as an independent school, land developer, sponsorship, etc.		57.8%	192
Incorporate green building, energy efficient technology		27.4%	91
Incorporate green building, energy efficient technology provided it does not significantly increase capital costs (i.e. 15% increase)		44.6%	148
Be functional first and foremost (design aesthetics are less		69.0%	229

important)			
Accommodate long term recreation facility expansion for new indoor facilities		52.4%	174
Accommodate long term recreation facility expansion to outdoor playing fields		48.2%	160
		Other (please specify)	35
answered question			332
skipped question			20

9. 9. Prioritise all of the locational characteristics that future recreation facilities should have if developed to serve the community. Use the pull-down menus to the left of each option, or drag and drop the items (1 = top priority):

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	N/A	Rating Average	Rating Count
Close to residential neighbourhoods	17.9% (60)	13.7% (46)	9.8% (33)	8.9% (30)	10.1% (34)	7.1% (24)	7.4% (25)	3.6% (12)	1.2% (4)	0.6% (2)	19.6% (66)	3.75	336
Close to downtown	8.0% (27)	10.7% (36)	10.1% (34)	8.0% (27)	9.2% (31)	6.3% (21)	6.0% (20)	10.4% (35)	5.7% (19)	2.7% (9)	22.9% (77)	4.91	336
Have direct trail access for bikes, pedestrians and strollers	18.5% (62)	18.5% (62)	17.6% (59)	13.4% (45)	6.5% (22)	8.3% (28)	2.4% (8)	3.6% (12)	1.8% (6)	0.0% (0)	9.5% (32)	3.38	336
Not in Agricultural Land Reserve	7.7% (26)	3.0% (10)	6.0% (20)	8.9% (30)	6.5% (22)	5.4% (18)	5.7% (19)	6.0% (20)	12.5% (42)	13.4% (45)	25.0% (84)	6.21	336
Land value (cost) is nominal	11.9% (40)	9.8% (33)	10.7% (36)	8.0% (27)	12.2% (41)	13.7% (46)	7.1% (24)	4.8% (16)	2.4% (8)	0.9% (3)	18.5% (62)	4.38	336
Site preparation costs are reasonable (preload, flood protection and servicing)	3.0% (10)	12.2% (41)	9.8% (33)	11.9% (40)	11.9% (40)	15.2% (51)	11.9% (40)	7.7% (26)	2.7% (9)	0.0% (0)	13.7% (46)	4.92	336
On School Board property	2.4% (8)	0.6% (2)	0.9% (3)	2.1% (7)	1.8% (6)	3.9% (13)	10.4% (35)	10.1% (34)	14.9% (50)	23.2% (78)	29.8% (100)	8.07	336
Close proximity to both Village and Mount Currie (Lil'wat Nation)	11.9% (40)	7.1% (24)	8.3% (28)	6.3% (21)	7.7% (26)	6.5% (22)	9.2% (31)	12.8% (43)	8.6% (29)	6.0% (20)	15.5% (52)	5.42	336
Sufficient area to accommodate recreation needs for the next 20-30 years	14.0% (47)	10.4% (35)	9.2% (31)	10.4% (35)	7.4% (25)	6.3% (21)	6.0% (20)	7.1% (24)	11.0% (37)	4.5% (15)	13.7% (46)	4.88	336
Accommodate outdoor playing fields	3.9% (13)	9.5% (32)	10.1% (34)	9.8% (33)	10.1% (34)	5.7% (19)	7.7% (26)	5.7% (19)	8.6% (29)	11.9% (40)	17.0% (57)	5.70	336

	answered question	336
	skipped question	16

10. 10.1 Indicate whether you support any of the standalone facilities identified above:

	Yes	No	Don't Know	Rating Count
A Single Surface Arena	49.7% (148)	37.2% (111)	13.1% (39)	298
A Field House	52.1% (152)	32.5% (95)	15.4% (45)	292
A Pool	42.8% (128)	46.2% (138)	11.0% (33)	299
			answered question	313
			skipped question	39

11. 10.2 Are there any financial aspects of the of the proposed standalone facilities that concern you? Please specify.

	Response Count
	126
	answered question
	126
	skipped question
	226

12. 10.3 Are there any components of the facility programming (amenities) that you would like to see altered, added or removed? Please specify.

	Response Count
	84
answered question	84
skipped question	268

13. 11.1 Indicate whether you support any of the combined facilities identified above:

	Yes	No	Don't Know	Rating Count
Arena/Field House	38.5% (102)	48.7% (129)	12.8% (34)	265
Arena/Pool	38.7% (104)	49.8% (134)	11.5% (31)	269
Arena/Field House/ Pool	32.5% (88)	53.1% (144)	14.4% (39)	271
			answered question	304
			skipped question	48

14. 11.2 Are there any financial aspects of the proposed combined facilities that concern you? Please specify.

	Response Count
	111
answered question	111
skipped question	241

15. 11.3 Are there any components of the facility programming (amenities) that you would like to see altered, added or removed? Please specify.

	Response Count
	46
answered question	46
skipped question	306

16. 12.1 Indicate whether you support any of the combined facilities/fields identified above:

	Yes	No	Don't Know	Rating Count
Soccer/Lacrosse/Football Field	73.5% (219)	14.4% (43)	12.1% (36)	298
Softball/Baseball Field	54.9% (156)	25.7% (73)	19.4% (55)	284
All-Weather (synthetic turf) Field	23.7% (64)	56.7% (153)	19.6% (53)	270
			answered question	308
			skipped question	44




17. 12.2 Are there any financial aspects of the proposed field developments that concern you? Please specify.

	Response Count
	56
	answered question
	56
	skipped question
	296

18. 12.3 Are there any components of the proposed field developments that you would like to see altered, added or removed? Please specify.

	Response Count
	44
answered question	44
skipped question	308

19. 13.1 Indicate whether you support such a community facility:

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		26.7%	81
No		54.1%	164
Don't Know		19.1%	58
	answered question		303
	skipped question		49





20. 13.2 Are there any components of the facility programming that you would like to see altered, added or removed? Please specify.

	Response Count
	69
answered question	69
skipped question	283




21. 13.3 Are there any financial aspects of the proposed satellite facility that concern you? Please specify.

	Response Count
	52
answered question	52
skipped question	300




22. 14. In the next five (5) to ten (10) years, are there recreation facilities that you would recommend that are not listed in Questions 10-13?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Please specify #1		100.0%	70
Please specify #2		30.0%	21
Please specify #3		12.9%	9
Please specify #4		7.1%	5
		answered question	70
		skipped question	282

23. 15. In the next five (5) years would you reject all types of development of new recreation facilities in the Pemberton Area?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		13.6%	40
No		75.2%	221
Don't Know		11.2%	33
	If you answered yes, indicate why		36
		answered question	294
		skipped question	58

24. 16. The cost to develop indoor recreational facilities in the Pemberton/Area C/Lil'wat area may result in significant capital cost implications. Instead of constructing local facilities, indicate below (check all that you support) those alternatives that you may support in place of constructing additional recreation facilities:

		Response Percent	Response Count
The contribution to the Resort Municipality of Whistler towards a fair share of their operating expenses for Meadow Park Sports Centre to ensure registration priorities for our community that are consistent with the priorities granted Whistler residents.		53.5%	91
The introduction of a "recreation shuttle" that would provide residents in outlying areas improved access to the existing Pemberton facilities.		44.1%	75
The introduction of a "recreation shuttle" that would provide residents in outlying areas improved access to the existing Whistler and Pemberton facilities.		57.6%	98
		answered question	170
		skipped question	182

25. 17. All of the options identified in Questions 10 to 16 are listed below. Please prioritise each of the suggested facilities (including from Question 22) by using the pull-down menus to the left of each option, or dragging and dropping the items. (1 = top priority)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Stand Alone Single Surface Arena	11.2% (32)	18.9% (54)	12.6% (36)	14.7% (42)	11.6% (33)	7.4% (21)	4.2% (12)	2.5% (7)	2.5% (7)	1.8% (5)	3.5% (10)	1.1% (3)	1.1% (3)	1.4% (4)	2.1% (6)
Stand Alone Field House	10.2% (29)	11.9% (34)	16.8% (48)	13.0% (37)	12.3% (35)	8.8% (25)	8.1% (23)	4.2% (12)	3.2% (9)	2.5% (7)	2.1% (6)	2.1% (6)	1.1% (3)	1.1% (3)	0.7% (2)
Stand Alone Pool	6.7% (19)	9.8% (28)	12.3% (35)	14.0% (40)	11.2% (32)	10.9% (31)	6.3% (18)	6.7% (19)	3.5% (10)	3.2% (9)	1.8% (5)	1.4% (4)	2.5% (7)	2.1% (6)	2.1% (6)
Combined Single Surface Arena and Field House	10.2% (29)	6.0% (17)	9.1% (26)	10.5% (30)	17.2% (49)	13.3% (38)	10.2% (29)	6.7% (19)	3.2% (9)	2.8% (8)	0.7% (2)	2.8% (8)	0.7% (2)	2.1% (6)	0.4% (1)
Combined Single Surface Arena and Pool	10.9% (31)	9.5% (27)	7.7% (22)	6.7% (19)	8.4% (24)	13.0% (37)	11.2% (32)	10.2% (29)	7.4% (21)	2.1% (6)	1.4% (4)	2.1% (6)	1.8% (5)	0.0% (0)	2.1% (6)
Combined Single Surface Arena, Pool and Fieldhouse	11.9% (34)	6.3% (18)	3.9% (11)	6.0% (17)	4.2% (12)	11.2% (32)	12.6% (36)	9.8% (28)	9.8% (28)	7.0% (20)	2.5% (7)	2.1% (6)	2.5% (7)	1.1% (3)	0.7% (2)
Outdoor Soccer/Football/Lacrosse Field	11.2% (32)	11.9% (34)	7.4% (21)	9.8% (28)	7.0% (20)	7.4% (21)	21.4% (61)	9.8% (28)	6.3% (18)	2.5% (7)	1.8% (5)	2.1% (6)	1.1% (3)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)
Outdoor Baseball/Softball Field	1.8% (5)	5.3% (15)	6.7% (19)	4.2% (12)	8.8% (25)	7.4% (21)	5.6% (16)	27.0% (77)	15.1% (43)	9.1% (26)	4.6% (13)	1.4% (4)	1.8% (5)	0.7% (2)	0.4% (1)
Outdoor All-Weather Soccer Field	2.1% (6)	2.8% (8)	6.3% (18)	4.9% (14)	6.0% (17)	6.3% (18)	2.8% (8)	5.3% (15)	29.1% (83)	14.0% (40)	9.1% (26)	2.8% (8)	2.8% (8)	2.5% (7)	1.4% (4)
Satellite Community Space (For Poole Creek to D'arcy)	2.5% (7)	0.0% (0)	1.8% (5)	1.1% (3)	2.1% (6)	1.4% (4)	3.9% (11)	2.5% (7)	3.2% (9)	30.9% (88)	17.9% (51)	8.8% (25)	8.1% (23)	5.3% (15)	1.4% (4)

Other#1, as Specified In Q. 14	4.6% (13)	1.1% (3)	1.4% (4)	2.1% (6)	2.1% (6)	1.8% (5)	2.8% (8)	2.8% (8)	2.8% (8)	5.6% (16)	31.2% (89)	14.7% (42)	7.0% (20)	7.7% (22)	7.4% (21)
Other #2, as Specified In Q. 14	0.0% (0)	1.8% (5)	0.4% (1)	1.4% (4)	1.1% (3)	1.1% (3)	1.4% (4)	2.1% (6)	3.2% (9)	2.8% (8)	5.6% (16)	34.4% (98)	15.1% (43)	7.7% (22)	9.8% (28)
Other #3, as Specified In Q. 14	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.7% (2)	0.4% (1)	0.7% (2)	1.8% (5)	1.1% (3)	0.7% (2)	3.2% (9)	3.2% (9)	2.8% (8)	5.3% (15)	34.7% (99)	15.8% (45)	9.8% (28)
Other #4, as Specified In Q. 14	0.0% (0)	0.7% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.4% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.4% (1)	1.1% (3)	1.8% (5)	1.4% (4)	2.1% (6)	3.5% (10)	2.5% (7)	5.6% (16)	37.2% (106)	16.5% (47)
Contribution to Whistler For Priority Registration	2.5% (7)	3.5% (10)	2.1% (6)	3.2% (9)	2.8% (8)	2.1% (6)	2.5% (7)	2.1% (6)	1.8% (5)	5.3% (15)	3.5% (10)	6.3% (18)	5.3% (15)	4.6% (13)	34.7% (99)
Recreation Shuttle to Pemberton Facilities	1.8% (5)	2.1% (6)	2.8% (8)	3.5% (10)	1.8% (5)	2.5% (7)	2.5% (7)	1.8% (5)	1.8% (5)	3.2% (9)	5.3% (15)	6.0% (17)	4.6% (13)	3.2% (9)	4.2% (12)
Recreation Shuttle to Pemberton And Whistler Facilities	2.1% (6)	5.3% (15)	4.6% (13)	3.5% (10)	2.1% (6)	2.5% (7)	1.8% (5)	3.9% (11)	2.8% (8)	2.1% (6)	2.1% (6)	4.2% (12)	4.2% (12)	2.5% (7)	3.9% (11)
No New Facilities	10.5% (30)	3.2% (9)	3.5% (10)	0.7% (2)	0.7% (2)	1.1% (3)	0.7% (2)	0.4% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.7% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.4% (1)	5.3% (15)	2.5% (7)

26. 18. Do you have any other ideas or comments you would like to share?

	Response Count
	145
answered question	145
skipped question	207

27. Can we contact you for further details regarding this survey? If yes, please enter your email address.

	Response Count
	59
answered question	59
skipped question	293

28. 19. Where did you hear about this survey?

	Response Count
	103
answered question	103
skipped question	249