

**REPORT TO
BOWEN ISLAND MUNICIPAL COUNCIL
PREPARED BY THE
CIVIC FACILITIES TASK FORCE
OCTOBER 11, 2005**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW 2
 Terms of Reference 2
 Task Force Membership 3
 Meetings 3
 Public Information Sessions 4
 Previous Work 4
 Proposed Soccer Facility 4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 5
 Timing 5
 The Arts Community 5
 The Recreation Community 5
 Municipal Offices 5
 Facilities Concepts 6
 Capital Costs 6
 Funding 6
 Pre-referendum Preparation 7
 Conclusions and Recommendations 7
FURTHER WORK AND TIMING 8
 Task Force within the Terms of Reference 8
 Future Focus 8
ARTS COMMUNITY NEEDS 9
RECREATION NEEDS 10
QUESTIONNAIRE DATA 10
THREE FACILITIES CONCEPTS 12
 Concept One – One Building 12
 Concept Two - Campus of Multiple Buildings (2 or more) 13
 Concept Three – Two Buildings on Two Sites 14
CONCLUSIONS 15
 The Concepts 15
 Pre-Referendum Preparation 15
 Referendum Amount 15
 Timing of Referendum 16
 Land 16
CLOSING 16

APPENDICES ATTACHED

Civic Facilities Task Force Terms of Reference Appendix “A”
 Task Force questionnaire Appendix “B”
 Questionnaire data report Appendix “C”
 Lists of reports considered by the Task Force Appendix “D”
 PERC report commissioned on behalf of the Task Force Appendix “E”

OVERVIEW

Terms of Reference

In June 2004, Council authorized the creation of the Civic Facilities Task Force (the “Task Force”) and established its Terms of Reference, a copy of which is attached as Appendix “A”.

The Terms of Reference include:

- the purpose of the Task Force is, “...to provide Council with information on the development of a multi-use civic facility for use by various user groups on Bowen Island”;
- an obligation “...to involve arts, recreational and municipal stakeholders” in the process of gathering information, “... on the construction of a multi-use community centre to house the arts programs, recreation programs and municipal offices”;
- to consider budget, costs and revenue generation;
- a direction to, “...research and provide in depth information on costs associated with a civic facility on Bowen Island...” using the June 2, 2004 *Bowen Island Community Centre* report prepared by Don Nicolson of the BTY Group “...as a basis for the type of facility being proposed”;
- consideration of costs is to include:
 - capital construction costs and future capital costs and the impact these costs would have on the Bowen Island taxpayer;
 - costs associated with each phase and consideration of a phased-in construction plan;
 - costs associated with on-going operating and maintenance costs of the facility;
 - costs associated with the Task Force carrying out their work;
- research sources of funding;
- consider the tax implication for Bowen Island taxpayers and their willingness to support the facility through municipal taxes.

Subsequently, Council clarified the Terms of Reference to include consideration of other than a single building and the potential inclusion of the RCMP.

At the request of the Task Force, its mandate was extended to take into account the May 2005 Surplus Lands Referendum and to provide a greater opportunity for public consultation.

Task Force Membership

“The Civic Facilities Task Force will consist of nine (9) members, with:

- one (1) member chosen from the Bowen Island Parks & Recreation Commission,
- one (1) member chosen from the Bowen Island Arts Council,
- one (1) non-voting member of Bowen Island Municipal Council to act as a liaison to Council,
- one (1) non-voting member of Bowen Island Municipal staff to act as a resource and provide technical support to the Task Force, and
- five (5) Bowen Island community members chosen and appointed by Municipal Council.”

By early 2005, the Task Force had a full complement of members. They are: ¹

Ian Kennard - Parks & Rec.
Paul Hooson – Arts Council
Peter Frinton - Council ²
Gina Mackay and Collene Huskisson - staff
Julie Andrés - community
Murray Atherton - community
Ted Chiasson – community (Chair)
Dean Maidment - community
Blaine Rittinger – community.

Meetings

Although not fully constituted, the Task Force held an informal meeting on October 21, 2004. Official meetings began in November 2004 and continued on a regular basis thereafter.

The Task Force met regularly and was assisted greatly by staff and the participation of Councillors Frinton and Cotter.

¹ Until December 2004, Kate Raynor also was a member of the Task Force. Her brief, but very helpful, contribution is acknowledged with thanks.

² Initially, Councillor Leigh was Council’s representative, but after being elected in a by-election, Councillor Frinton was appointed alternate representative and attended regularly at Task Force meetings.

Public Information Sessions

Three public information sessions, which included conceptual renderings and models, site maps and cost projections were held on the following dates:

- July 1, 2005 (Canada Day celebrations)
- August 6, 2005 (Open House at Bowen Island Community School)
- August 27, 2005 (Bowfest).

The public sessions were preceded by the publication of information submitted to *The Undercurrent* by Task Force members. *The Undercurrent* also provided very helpful news coverage.

Several hundred people participated in the public sessions and other consultations. The public was invited to complete questionnaires, a copy of which is attached as Appendix “B”. Approximately 165 questionnaires were completed. The data from them was collated and taken into account by the Task Force. A copy of the collated data report is attached as Appendix “C”.

Previous Work

The Task Force members benefited greatly from work done by others, including the contemporaneous “Business Plan” prepared by the Community Hall and Arts Centre Committee, a sub-committee of the Bowen Island Arts Council. A list of reports considered by the Task Force is attached as Appendix “D”.

At the request of the Task Force, Council authorized the retention of a consultant, Professional Recreational Environmental Consulting (“PERC”) to examine sources of funding. PERC also considered current recreational needs and examined costs. A copy of its report is attached as Appendix “E”

Proposed Soccer Facility

As a result of a reference from Council, the Task Force also met with Mr. John Reid and his architect and was apprised of Mr. Reid’s plans for an indoor soccer facility. The development of such a facility has the potential for many other uses and is compatible with the overall mandate of the Task Force.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Timing

There is interest, support and momentum in the community for the development of civic facilities to house arts and recreational activities. It is recommended that Council instruct staff to undertake studies to address specific issues which are identified in this report as necessary to be considered in advance of a referendum, with the possibility of obtaining the assistance of consultants and a group of interested community members

It is suggested that proceeding to referendum in 2006 would be desirable and that consideration be given to protecting appropriate land parcels. (Discussed in detail under “Further Work and Timing” below)

The Arts Community

The core need of the Arts Community is well defined – a performing and public presentation facility.³

Consideration must be given to the requirements of facilities to support the performing arts – for example, rehearsal space – and visual arts space such as venues for painting, pottery and weaving. These activities cross the definitional boundary between Arts and Recreation and might be housed with the recreational component of a civic facility rather than with the performance component.

Although there are benefits to combining the infrastructural needs and interests of Arts and Recreation activities, it must be recognized that the focus of some of the activities, their physical requirements and the ambience that suits them differ. (See “Arts Community Needs” below.)

The Recreation Community

The needs of the Recreation Community are more changeable than those of the Arts Community and can be addressed appropriately with a phased development.

There appears to be significant support for a swimming pool on the Island. It is not recommended as a stand-alone facility at this time, but should be factored into the long-term recreational plans of the community. (See “Recreation Needs”)

Municipal Offices

The inclusion of municipal offices has the advantage of providing additional capital and operating funding and of being a source of convenient and core usage.

³ It is recognized that such a facility also would be used for larger meetings, municipal and others.

Facilities Concepts

For the purposes of the public information sessions and this Report, the Task Force developed three concepts using two sites. (They are discussed below in the section “Three Facilities Concepts”.) The concepts all envision a theatre, recreation facilities, municipal offices and possible RCMP use. The sites are used as examples because they presently are available: 10 acres to the north of the Bowen Island Community School (Parcel 2) and land to the north of the present RCMP facility on Millers Road (Parcel 3).

The three concepts are: Concept One – one building on a single site; Concept Two - two buildings on a single site, campus style; Concept Three - two buildings on two separate sites. For discussion purposes, Concepts One and Two would be housed on Parcel 2 and Concept Three would involve both Parcel 2 and Parcel 3 with the theatre and municipal offices component being on Parcel 3.

Capital Costs

*	Concept One	approximately \$6,163,300
*	Concept Two	approximately \$6,838,600
*	Concept Three	approximately \$6,920,200

Funding

The estimated costs should be less because there are sources of alternative funding; for example, if Municipal offices were included, the Municipality has a possible reserve of \$1.1 million that could be a contributing factor.

Operating costs are an important issue, but they cannot be addressed in detail at this time. Some assessment of operating costs has been made, but there are important offsets, which include: user revenue and the redirection of costs currently being incurred. For example, presently Parks and Recreation spends \$60,000 annually on facilities, which would be applied to a new facility and the Municipality pays an annual rent for its offices of \$73,000, plus utilities.

In addition, it is usual for there to be government programs that provide funding, but the extent of support and the specific programs change and must be addressed at the time of referendum.

Although the data are not extensive, there was clear support in the questionnaires for funding the facilities through municipal taxes. (See data in “Questionnaire Data” and in Appendix “C”.)

It is anticipated that some private funding would be available. The Arts Council is prepared to undertake fund-raising and the Reid proposal is an example of other sources of potential private funding.

Pre-referendum Preparation

In preparation for a referendum, the following matters must be addressed in some detail:

- capital cost
- operating costs – revenue and offsets
- public sources of funding
- private sources of funding
- taxes
- phased development, particularly of recreational components such as a gym
- sound separation and acoustics
- compatibility of activities and facilities
- Snug Cove development
- future expansion – for example, a swimming pool
- environmental issues

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Task Force does not recommend Concept One.

Campus-style buildings (Concept Two) and a separate site for a performing arts facility and municipal offices (Concept Two) meet the needs of the community, but Concept Three is favoured slightly.

The matters listed in Pre-referendum Preparation should be undertaken as soon as feasible.

At the end of the day, the final choice between Concepts Two and Three will depend on the specific circumstances then extant and a balancing of the factors listed in Pre-referendum Preparation.

Council should proceed on the basis that any referendum would seek sufficient funds to undertake Concept Three.

It is the consensus of the Task Force that there is currently significant momentum in support of Community Facilities and that Municipal Council should move forward to referendum in 2006.

The Task Force suggests that land for the facilities be protected as soon as possible.

The above matters are discussed more fully in the “Conclusions” section below.

FURTHER WORK AND TIMING

Task Force Focus within the Terms of Reference

The Task Force focused on its core mandate: ascertain the interest of the community in a civic facility; consider the type of facility that likely would meet the needs of the community; determine the order of magnitude of capital and operating costs; consider funding options, including municipal taxes.

Some tasks envisioned in the Terms of Reference were considered by the Task Force to be premature and not feasible at this stage of the process. These include many of the items listed in Pre-referendum Preparation, above.

Future Focus

It is known that there are public sources of funding for projects like a civic facility. They may differ depending on the focus or components of the facility: arts, recreation, municipal offices and policing. Although very early in its deliberation the Task Force identified this as an important avenue of inquiry and asked Council to authorize the retention of a consultant to advise on sources of funding, the information available largely is generic and subject to change. A clear picture of sources of funding is likely to emerge only once the parameters of the project are established in a form suitable for a referendum. Examples of recent funding in four municipalities are provided in the PERC report at page 21. (Appendix “E”)

A careful assessment of the environmental and aesthetic implications of the project is required, a task best done by experts, including staff. What the Task Force has done is ascertain that there is significant interest in both the environment and aesthetic implications of the project that, if ignored, will heighten the risk of a failed referendum.

Repeatedly, members of the community asked Task Force members: “Is this now really going to happen”? The members of the Task Force were surprised by the interest shown by members of the community at the three information sessions. People not only came to the information booth, but also carefully studied the data available and the model, asked questions and made comments. Many people stayed for 10 to 15 minutes or longer.

It would be most unfortunate if this apparent momentum were lost.

The time for action on civic facilities is now.

ARTS COMMUNITY NEEDS

At the core of the needs of the Arts Community is a theatre and public presentation space that could accommodate a variety of cultural and municipal activities. Several detailed studies have been undertaken dealing with size, components, capital and operating costs and revenues.

A high level of support for performing arts and community events exists. The Cultural Master Plan (listed in Appendix “D”) identified a large percentage of community members who feel personally that arts and culture is important, who regularly attend arts events and who believe that the arts are a viable part of the Island’s economy.

Bowen Island is home to many performers and artists who hope to perform and market their talents on the Island, but who find it increasingly difficult to find adequate venues for their work. This lack is seriously limiting the number and type of events that can occur on Bowen Island. There is also evidence that more off-island performers would come to the Island if there were a proper performance space.

The users of a community hall-style Arts Centre would include local performers and presenters, as well as off-island touring events, conference and educational programmers. Community use of such a venue for meetings, exhibits and fundraising events could be significant. It is also envisioned that the theatre would fulfill the needs of public meetings when a large space is required.

As Bowen Island’s population continues to grow, so does the demand for community space. Many venues previously used for performance and community gatherings are no longer available or are heavily booked. The growth in population has also meant an increase in audience size and in the number and quality of performances and events.

A community facility would ideally provide a space designed specifically for performance and community events with staging, seating, lighting and sound equipment, located and stored on-site. An integrated rehearsal and multi-purpose room could also be well used.

It is imperative to ensure appropriate acoustics for diverse activities such as plays, voice and instrument performances. Sound separation from other activities is essential and there is concern that combining a theatre with physical recreational facilities will compromise the ambience of arts performances.

The Task Force considers that these issues can be addressed and that it will be essential to do so generically when a referendum is undertaken.

A theatre in or contiguous to Snug Cove could become the core for other arts activities such as exhibits, crafts and workshops.

The combination of a performing centre and municipal offices is likely to provide significant economic benefits to businesses that are close at-hand. This is likely to be particularly true if Concept Three were selected.

RECREATION NEEDS

At present, the recreational needs of the community are accommodated at the Bowen Island Community School and in a number of other makeshift facilities – for example, Tae Kwon Do practices in Cates Chapel. Its sessions are followed by the practices of the Artisan Squires men’s choir. Many BIPRC fitness and dance classes are held at the Youth Centre or at the private dance studio at Artisan Square. BIPRC yoga classes are also held at a private yoga studio.

The school gym is booked heavily and exercise facilities are at a premium. The only weight and fitness facility beyond the tiny one at BICS has just closed to the general public, presently without a replacement.

There is a significant exodus of residents to off-Island exercise facilities, with the concomitant inconvenience, extra cost and loss of revenue.

Other needs which cross definitional boundaries include space for crafts and senior’s activities.

The development of the proposed indoor soccer facility likely would provide a venue for many other physical activities and take some load off the present school gym. Development of a civic recreation facility proximate to an indoor soccer facility would tend to concentrate recreational activity in one area and facilitate gradual and incremental development.

Because the focus of recreational activities tends to change, a phased approach is feasible.

QUESTIONNAIRE DATA

Support for the concepts was as follows: Concept One, 63 or 38%; Concept Two, 55 or 33%; Concept Three, 36 or 21%.

The theatre received the most support by a large margin. Many respondents chose it as the most important component and, on average, other respondents selected it second or third as their choice of facility most desired.

The gymnasium received the next greatest level of support and also was selected by many as the most important component and, on average, between fourth and fifth by other respondents. A proper weight room and meeting rooms followed closely behind.

The following chart lists all the facilities in descending order ranging from the one with most public support, to that with the least. The smaller the average ranking number, the greater the level of support. The “Average Ranking By Respondents” column is the mathematical average, rounded to one decimal, of the ranking as provided by all respondents. For more details, please see Appendix “C”.

Questionnaire Data, cont.

The smaller the average ranking number, the greater the level of support.

<u>Facility</u>	<u>Average ranking by respondents</u>
Theatre	2.7
Gymnasium	4.8
Weight room	5.2
Meeting Rooms	5.5
Kitchen/Bar	6.2
Seniors Activity	6.2
Playcare/Childcare	6.8
Craft Rooms	6.9
Lounge	7.3
Swimming Pool	7.7 ⁴
Gallery	8.9
Municipal Hall	9
Indoor Courts	9
Meditation/Yoga Room	9
Music Rehearsal	9

The following chart illustrates the support for funding through municipal taxes.

0-100	35
100-150	44
150-200	34
200-300	15
300+	15
Don't support	4

In summary, 108 out of a possible 165 total respondents – not everyone answered this question – or approximately 65%, supported a tax increase of over \$100. Approximately 47% of the respondents supported a tax increase between \$100 and \$200.

⁴ Swimming pool figures were write-in suggestions.

THREE FACILITIES CONCEPTS

As new facilities are contemplated, it is extremely important to remember that they must connect with the community and create space where people will want to take part in activities. There must be flexibility in design to allow for changing needs, multi-purpose activities and multi-generational use.

The Task Force set criteria for assessing the merits of each Concept for the purpose of determining which is likely to garner widest support from the community at large. The qualities used to compare the Concepts are: “ownership”, forest disturbance, phase-ability, capital and operations costs, compatibility among user groups, design and aesthetics, economic impact on Snug Cove.

Concept One – One Building

Parcel 2 of the Surplus Lands is used as an available example for this concept. The square footage of the facility is the same as the Community School and requires a significant single-footprint land base. Parcel 2 is sufficient to accommodate the single structure and parking needs as well as future expansion to meet evolving community needs.

There would be a significant disruption of the forested area behind the school. Based on discussions at the public information meetings, the size of the structure and disruption of the forest will likely be a concern to some members of the community.

This location is close to the school, seniors and is within walking distance from the Snug Cove. The community shuttle also could serve this facility.

A single structure housing arts, recreation, and municipal offices is a “one stop shopping” facility. This concept is the least costly choice overall.

Although Concept One is ideally a “build all at once concept”, phased development might be feasible, but likely would carry a phasing premium for re-mobilizing, selective demolition and temporary service disruption of utilities and programming.

An access road from Millers Rd. and another from Mount Gardner Rd. would be essential for emergency and public vehicular traffic. At this point in time no access from Mount Gardner Rd. adjacent to School District 45 property is available. The Municipality would have to engage in negotiations with the GVRD to obtain a right-of-way to address this problem. Parking could be shared among all users.

Concept One on Parcel 2 is likely to have little effect on Snug Cove development per se, but the Performing Arts Centre could still have a positive economic impact on Snug Cove and Artisan Square merchants as such a facility will attract visitors to the Island for events, workshops and conferences. An increase in recreation facilities will also bring off-island recreation-related events. A potential economic benefit could accrue to the B&Bs, restaurants and retail shops if they were to develop packages to market to these visitors.

A single facility would be less costly to operate than a campus of facilities or facilities on separate sites. Savings in terms of staffing, utilities and efficiency in operations would be gained. Greater convenience for the public may result, in that recreation, municipal business and arts activities could be undertaken without having to travel to a separate location.

There is a benefit to integration of visual arts and recreation programming in a single facility, as ancillary rooms can accommodate uses for both constituencies, but the integration of recreation and performing arts clientele (say, mingling on a Friday evening in the lobby) would not be desirable. Municipal offices could be a buffer between the arts and recreation sections of the facility.

The issue of cultivating distinct profiles for fundraising for the performing arts and recreation groups could be more problematic in a single facility. Corporations who may give to the arts may not wish to support an athletic complex and *vice versa*. Corporate support is a form of advertising and companies often have policies concerning the activities to which they will donate.

SUMMARY OF CONCEPT ONE: Lowest capital and operations costs; design and operations challenges; least phase-able option; accessibility to full range of municipal activities; unlikely to directly aid Snug Cove economy; overall economic benefit; high level of forest disturbance.

Concept Two - Campus of Multiple Buildings (2 or more)

This Concept could also be housed on Parcel 2 of the Surplus Lands by way of example. It is similar to Concept One, but with multiple buildings situated around a common courtyard (as with the Cates Corner complex or Artisan Sq.).

Operating and capital costs are approximately 10% higher than Concept One due to duplication of services and utilities. There could be a more moderate outlay of initial capital costs with a phased approach to development, and consideration would have to be given to the implications of obtaining grant contributions from senior levels of government.

A campus of facilities has less disruption of utilities, services and programming during expansion. Again, substantial disruption of the forested area behind BICS could be an issue. A phased approach to development would likely allow for more local contractors to bid on the construction of separate buildings. Developer amenity packages could be used for different buildings. Due to a sequential approach, a unified design among buildings would likely not be necessary and could allow for diversity and designs that better meet the future needs of the community.

Programming and services can evolve to effectively meet the future needs of the community.

This Concept is close to the school and seniors and would impact Snug Cove development and overall economics in much the same way as Concept One.

Separate buildings allow for two distinct facilities - a Recreation Centre and a Performing Arts Centre - with the two very different components having their own unique profiles. Supporters of both can concentrate on fund-raising for their respective needs and it may be easier to sell naming-rights to individual buildings or rooms to corporations and philanthropists. Various user groups can cultivate a stronger feeling of ownership.

Municipal offices easily could be included in either the recreation or arts component without compromising their distinct flavour, although the most likely combination would be the performing arts facility coupled with municipal offices. The Municipal offices could again be a buffer between the arts and recreation facilities. Parking could be shared, as with Concept One.

SUMMARY OF CONCEPT TWO: Higher capital and operating costs; initial costs could be lower; potentially more fundraising opportunities; more phase-ability; less design challenges; accessibility to

full range of municipal activities; unlikely directly to aid Snug Cove economy; overall economic benefit; high level of forest disturbance; separates arts and recreation; higher “ownership” factor.

Concept Three – Two Buildings on Two Sites

Surplus lands Parcel 2 and Parcel 3 are envisioned for the Recreation and Arts Centres, respectively, establishing two distinct hubs on separate sites. Municipal offices could again be included in either the recreation or arts component without compromising the distinct flavour of each, but likely would be best located with the performing arts facility.

An Arts Centre would be well served by locating closer to Snug Cove (Parcel 3). This site is within easy walking distance of the ferry and the majority of restaurants and other businesses. It would have a major impact on Snug Cove, both aesthetically and economically. This Concept allows for a uniquely designed Arts Centre that creates a landmark building, which could be treasured by the community for years to come.

The Recreation Centre could be housed on a portion of Parcel 2, close to the school, the current hub of recreation on the Island. Proper design and location of the recreation facility would have the benefit of ample space for future expansion such as a pool, expanded playing field, athletics track, ice rink, etc. The recreation component does not need to be housed in a high profile location.

It is desirable for the performing arts facility to have a high profile location.

Separate Arts and Recreation Centres would not raise a concern with integration of design. Multiple local contractors could bid on construction. Developer-driven amenities could be used to phase in facilities. Operating and capital costs for Concept Three are the highest of the Concepts (approximately 13% more than Concept One) due to duplication of amenities, parking and staffing, but money potentially could be saved by constructing the recreation component more for function, whereas the arts component probably would benefit from a design with landmark appeal.

Concept Three provides a community focus for recreational activities separate from arts and municipal activities. The location next to the present RCMP facility may facilitate the integration of policing into an arts and municipal complex.

Forest impacts are an issue at all sites, but Concept Three has less of an impact due to the two centres having a smaller individual **footprint** at each site.

SUMMARY OF CONCEPT THREE: Highest capital and operating costs; highest economic benefit to Snug Cove; overall economic benefit; highest ‘ownership’ factor; most design flexibility; least forest disruption; highest landmark appeal potential; focal point for municipal and other community activities; potential integration of policing.

CONCLUSIONS

The Concepts

The Task Force considers that the advantages of Concept One do not out-weigh its disadvantages. In particular, this Concept involves the building of a major single structure with a conglomeration of potentially incompatible uses under one roof. Phased development for this Concept is likely to be more disruptive and costly than for the other Concepts. Although less expensive at the outset, there is a concern that this would sacrifice long-term benefit for short-term gain

Concept Two has considerable support in the community (a significant number of respondents to the questionnaire chose Concept Two) and provides an opportunity for some segregation of activities and good prospects for a phased development. The concentration of activities on a single site has some advantage as a focused area of community activity, while obtaining some of the economies of shared infrastructure and operations.

Concept Three, which places municipal offices and an arts centre next to the present RCMP operation, is likely to provide significant economic spin-off for Snug Cove and may facilitate more readily the integration of policing needs.

Concept Three recognizes the distinctive requirements of a performing arts centre and makes it a special place on the Island. Potential problems interfacing recreation uses and performing arts uses are avoided.

As noted, the final choice must balance a number of factors and requires consideration of the matters listed in Pre-referendum Preparation in the Overview section of this report.

Pre-referendum Preparation

The items listed have been addressed. They point to essential information required to balance the advantages and disadvantages of the Concepts.

Referendum Amount

The Task Force recommends that Council seek funding to accommodate Concept Three because this will provide the greatest flexibility for the future.

The difference in the cost of Concept Three over Concept Two is not great. It is the opinion of the Task Force that an estimated increase of approximately \$100,000 should not constrain the flexibility to provide the most appropriate facility if it were decided that Concept Three is the best choice.

Timing of Referendum

This has been addressed, but the Task Force emphasizes that failure to move forward in a timely way will be viewed cynically by a significant number of members of the community. It would be consistent neither with the great deal of work that has been undertaken over the years nor with Council's initiative of creating the Civic Facilities Task Force.

Land

When the Task Force began its mandate, the Surplus Lands were not available. Now they are. These lands represent an incredible opportunity to realize the dream of civic facilities. Council is encouraged to move quickly to protect whatever land it considers potentially to accommodate these civic facilities. To fail to do so would be a retrograde step and put the development of civic facilities in jeopardy.

CLOSING

The Task Force members consider themselves privileged to have the opportunity to work on this important initiative and thank Council for this opportunity. It has been a rewarding and revealing experience to meet with members of the public and to have the benefit of sharing ideas with them.

The assistance and support of staff and of councillors Frinton and Cotter has been much appreciated.

BOWEN ISLAND, BRITISH COLUMBIA, SEPTEMBER 28, 2005

Ian Kennard - Parks & Rec.

Paul Hooson – Arts Council

Gina Mackay and Collene Huskisson – staff

Peter Frinton – Council

Julie Andrés – community

Murray Atherton – community

Ted Chiasson – community

Dean Maidment – community

Blaine Rittinger – community.

Ted Chiasson (Chair)

BOWEN ISLAND MUNICIPALITY

2004-05 CIVIC FACILITIES TASK FORCE Terms of Reference

PURPOSE

The purpose of the Civic Facilities Task Force is to provide Council with information on the development of a multi-use civic facility for use by various user groups on Bowen Island. The final report is to be provided to Council no later than September 19, 2005.

ROLE OF TASK FORCE

The role of the Civic Facilities Task Force is:

1. To involve arts, recreation, municipal stakeholders, community groups and interested parties in researching and providing information on the construction of a multi-use community centre to house the arts programs, recreation programs and municipal offices.
2. To undertake to ascertain a project scope (i.e. budget and uses) that is likely to enjoy the widest support from the community.
3. To research possible operating schemes (including revenue generation) that have potential application to this project with a particular interest in gathering information from successful programs in other jurisdictions.
4. To collect and share information with other members of the Task Force for inclusion in the final report to Council.
5. To report regularly to Bowen Island Municipal Council on the information being gathered and act in an advisory capacity to Council regarding a civic facility.

The main focus of the Task Force is to research and provide in depth information on costs associated with a civic facility on Bowen Island. The June 2, 2004 "*Bowen Island Community Centre*" report prepared by Don Nicolson of the BTY Group will be used as a basis for the type of facility being proposed. The civic facilities costs should include but not be limited to:

- capital construction costs, and future capital costs and the impact these costs would have on the Bowen Island taxpayer,
- costs associated with each phase and consideration of a phased-in construction plan,
- costs associated with on-going operating and maintenance costs of the facility,
- costs associated with the Task Force carrying out their work.

The Task Force is to research funding sources to determine ways to alleviate the impact on the taxpayer—whether through grants, private donations or other mechanisms. If private donations are anticipated, a proper protocol to determine how this could work needs to be developed.

The Task Force should identify the tax implications for Bowen Island taxpayers for the various options identified. The Task Force needs to gauge community appetite for the tax burden to support this project. Looking at the broad picture and anticipated increases in funding for other municipal services, how much will taxpayers agree to bear?

Research into projected use load limits and the impacts of the civic facility on other community facilities needs to be carried out.

A prospective detail business plan is to be developed by the Civic Facilities Task Force and a final report on information on the development of a multi-use civic facility for use by various user groups on Bowen Island is to be provided to Council no later than September 19, 2005.

TASK FORCE STRUCTURE

1. The Civic Facilities Task force will consist of nine (9) members, with:
 - one (1) member chosen from the Bowen Island Parks & Recreation Commission,
 - one (1) member chosen from the Bowen Island Arts Council,
 - one non-voting member of Bowen Island Municipal Council to act as a liaison to Council,
 - one non-voting member of Bowen Island Municipal staff to act a resource and provide technical support to the Task Force, and
 - five (5) Bowen Island community members chosen and appointed by Municipal Council.
2. The five community appointees will be appointed by Council because of their special skills or abilities to represent the community-at-large rather than as advocates of special interests. Preference will be given to people with the following expertise: accounting or financial budgeting, civic facility/theatre design and construction, engineering or architecture, project management, marketing, public relations, and fundraising.
3. The Chair shall be elected by the members, failing which, Council will appoint the Chair.
4. Decisions of the Civic Facilities Task Force shall be made by consensus.
5. A quorum shall be four voting members.
6. Conduct at meetings will be as outlined in the "*Bowen Island Municipal Council Procedure Bylaw No 111, 2004*", or failing that by *Robert's Rules of Order*.
7. The Task Force will be dissolved once they have delivered their final report to Council. Council will determine whether or not the proposal moves forward to the referendum stage.

TASK FORCE MEETING PROCEDURES

The Task Force will meet as required, at a minimum on a monthly basis. The Chair of the Task Force will advise the Deputy Clerk of the Municipality as to the time, date and place of each meeting as least 48 hours in advance of the meeting, so she can prepare a notice advising the public about the meeting.

Support for the Task Force will be provided by the Island Community Planner, or in her absence, by the Chief Administrative Officer.

A minute taker will attend meetings of the Task Force and provide copies of minutes to the Deputy Clerk of the Municipality and Task Force members within 5 working days following a Task Force meeting.

All meetings of the Task Force will be open to the public.

REPORTING RELATIONSHIP

The Task Force will report to Bowen Island Municipal Council.

BOWEN ISLAND CIVIC FACILITIES

PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE – July 1, 2005

COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRE

During the past seven months, the Civic Facilities Task Force, a local committee appointed by Municipal Council, has been investigating the possibility of constructing new Civic / Recreational / Cultural facilities on Bowen Island. The information you have seen today represents input the committee has received from a variety of sources, including residents, artists and arts groups, recreation and sports groups, architects and consultants retained to assist with the project.

Your assistance in completing the questions below would be very helpful in determining whether or not we have addressed all of the interests of local residents.

Once you have completed the questionnaire, please leave it in the box, or if you wish more time, take it home and drop it off **before July 8th** at the Chamber of Commerce at 432 Cardena Rd., the Parks and Recreation office at BICS or the Municipal Hall. If you care for an electronic version you can email murray.a@shaw.ca and a copy will be emailed to you to fill in at your convenience.

Thank you very much for your involvement.

1. Of the three Options presented, which do you prefer? (Please circle one number)

1. OPTION ONE – One Building / All Uses / One site
2. OPTION TWO – Two Buildings / Campus Style / One Site
Capital costs expected to be 10% more than Option One
3. OPTION THREE – Two buildings / two sites
Capital costs expected to be 15% more than Option One
4. NONE OF THE ABOVE

2. Why do you prefer the Option you have selected?

3. Each of the Options includes Municipal offices, meeting space, and generally the following features. Please indicate the features you favour the most (rank from 1- 10 with 1 being the feature you favour most).

- _____ THEATRE
- _____ GYMNASIUM
- _____ KITCHEN / BAR / CONCESSION
- _____ LOUNGE
- _____ CRAFT ROOMS
- _____ MEETING ROOMS
- _____ PLAYCARE / CHILDCARE ROOM
- _____ WEIGHTROOM / FITNESS AREA
- _____ SENIORS ACTIVITY ROOM
- _____ OTHER _____(Please specify)

4. Every effort has been made to ensure that all of the interests of Bowen Island residents have been addressed. Are there any features that we may have overlooked?

5. Are there any features that you feel are not necessary?

6. It is anticipated that the capital costs for construction of these facilities would be a combination of Federal and Provincial grants, local fundraising and borrowing. Please indicate what amount you would be prepared to accept in terms of an increase to property taxes for the capital expenditures.

_____ 0-\$100

_____ \$100 - \$150

_____ \$150 - \$200

_____ \$200-\$300

_____ \$300+

_____ I do not support an increase in taxes to pay for these facilities.

* PLEASE SEE DISPLAY FOR ADDITIONAL TAX IMPLICATION INFORMATION

Do you have any other comments regarding the proposed facilities?

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR INPUT!

For our information:

Number of persons in your family who live with you _____

Bowen Island is principle residency yes no

Local groups/activities you are affiliated with

Summary of the “Bowen island Civic Facilities” Public Open House Community Questionnaire

We received and tabulated 98 Questionnaires during our first open house and an additional 68 during our other 2 demos, totaling 166 completed.

Questions 1: Of the three concepts presented, which do you prefer?

	First Demo	Succeeding Demos	Total
Concept 1	40	23	63
Concept 2	37	18	55
Concept 3	17	19	36
None of the above	2	4	6
No response	2	4	6

Question 2: Why do you prefer the concept you chose?

There were not a lot of responses to this question. Most revolved around cost, convenience and functionality. There were conflicting views as to what the advantages of the various concepts were.

Question 3: Please indicate the features you favour the most.

I have ranked the responses according to the support they received. If a concept received a ranking of one, it was awarded one point, if second it was awarded 2 points. If an item was unranked, it got a score of 9. The lower the score, the greater the desirability of the feature.

Theatre	215	186	401
Gymnasium	366	351	717
Weight room	410	363	773
Meeting rooms	459	357	816
Kitchen/bar/lounge	520	399	919
Seniors Activity	496	430	926
Play care/Childcare	564	454	1018
Craft rooms	557	468	1025
Lounge	609	477	1086
Swimming Pool	638	511	1149
Gallery	740	590	1330
Municipal Hall	739	612	1351
Indoor Courts	739	612	1351
Meditation/ yoga	740	612	1352
Music rehearsal	881	618	1499

Question 4: Features overlooked?

Pool	6	14	20
Ice Rink	3	0	3
Fields	1	1	2
Music practice	1	3	4

Question 5: Stuff we don't need?

Weight room	2	1	3
Gym	5	6	11
Lounge	5	3	8
Play care		2	2
Nothing	84		

Question 6: How much would you pay?

0-100	17	8	25
100-150	31	14	45
150-200	17	20	37
200-300	8	7	15
300+	8	7	15
Don't support	0	4	4

Question 7: Number of people in family with you?

1	4	5	9	
2	22	11	33	
3	24	18	42	
4	22	13	35	
5	8	8	16	
6+	4	3	7	

Question 8: Residence on Bowen?

Yes	77	50	127
No	4	2	6

Summary of Comments from Questionnaires:

- I don't care, just do something.
- A single, multi-level block of facilities should be situated on the slope between the school field and the Museum.
- Any financing of the Capital Construction costs should be amortized over a long period of time- multi-generational shouldering of the financial burden.
- Ferry traffic and the main street should be improved.
- Retail space and catering should be included.
- Too hard to make a decision re: ferry, water, and housing density.
- Any form of taxation should not be tied to the assessed value of individual properties.
- Development Cost Charges Bylaw must be reviewed and amended. Cost charges for new development should be able to go to new civic facility development.
- Good idea.
- It's about time. Let's do it.
- Let's get going. Costs are only going to go up.
- Keep the 1940's heritage look.
- Good Luck.
- We need them.
- Exciting.
- How many Gyms does this island need?
- I don't want my taxes to go to something that I, as a summer resident, don't use.
- Develop space that is elegant, well designed, aesthetically pleasing, not the cheapest, but the best.
- Traditional aesthetics in the building would be very suitable.
- Make the design of the structure/s more in keeping with current trends.
- Make a decision, and get on with it.
- Let's try to keep our island an island life community.
- This is necessary, and it can be financed. Let's do it.

Local Groups and Activities:

The following groups were represented in the responses we received. There is no order or ranking of the number of respondents affiliated with each group.

Gym
Soccer
Dance
Tennis
Tir na nOg
BICS
Swimming
Piano
Guides
Council committees
Preschool
B.I. Eco-Alliance
BILLS
BISCAC
IPS
TBCA
BI Arts Council
BIPRC
BI Supported Home Learning
United Church
Garden Club
Cape Roger Curtis Trust
Bowen Island Carvers
Nota Bene
Bridge
Recycling
Stream Flow management
Book Club
BIHORA
TOTI
BI Historians
BI Heritage Preservation
Yoga
Libraray
Bowen Island Fish and Wildlife Club
Community Choir
Artisan Squires
Water Board
Sustainable Community
Xenia
Sun Run
Abbeyfield
Golf
SKY

Appendix D

Reports considered by the Civic Facilities Task Force

- Bowen Island Community Hall and Arts Centre
Community Hall and Arts Centre Committee
(a sub-committee of the Bowen Island Arts Council)
November 2004
- Bowen Island Community Centre
Cost Estimate
BTY Group
June 2004
- Bowen Island Community Centre
Proposed Space Program
Nicholson Tamaki Bernd Hormanski Architects
June 2004
- Bowen Island Cultural Master Plan
Bowen Island Cultural Master Plan Committee with
assistance from Bernie Jones, Associates in
Community & Personal Development, and Yates, Thorne
and Associates
January 2003
- Bowen Island Recreation Facilities Needs Assessment
E. Lees & Associates Consulting Ltd. and Professional
Environmental Recreation Consultants Ltd.
December 1999
- Bowen Island Community Centre
Feasibility Study
Nicolson Tamaki Bernd Hormanski Architects
January 1999