

# City of Port Coquitlam

## Parks, Recreation and Culture Plan



**Final Report - March 2007**

>

P E R C

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a pleasure to present the final version of the City of Port Coquitlam Parks, Recreation and Culture Plan.

The document was prepared by Professional Environmental Recreation Consultants Ltd. (PERC), in cooperation with E. Lees & Associates Consulting Ltd., Legacy Heritage Consultants, Bruce Carscadden Architect Inc. and Don Hunter Management Consultants.

The consultants would like to express our appreciation to the many interested residents and organizations who participated in the planning process, as well as the members of the Client Steering Committee, which was comprised of senior staff members. This group met with the consultants on numerous occasions, and provided valuable insights and suggestions related to the Plan's direction and recommendations.

We trust that the report accurately reflects the needs of the community, and that the implementation of the Plan will ensure the continued effective delivery of leisure services in the City.

## PARKS AND RECREATION PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE

Barry Becker, Parks & Recreation Director

Larry Wheeler, Deputy Director

Bill Granger, Manager of Parks – Planning & Design

Todd Gross, Manager of Parks & Services

Cheryl Zipper, Manager of Parks & Planning & Design (retired)

## CONSULTANTS

Professional Environmental Recreation Consultants Ltd. (PERC)

Brian Johnston / Bill Webster

E. Lees & Associates Consulting Ltd.

Erik Lees

Legacy Heritage Consultants

Warren Sommer

Bruce Carscadden Architect Inc.

Bruce Carscadden

Don Hunter Management Consultants

Don Hunter

Executive Summary	i
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Methodology.....	2
2. Background	3
2.1 Community Overview.....	3
2.2 Demographic Sources and Limitations .....	3
2.3 Growth Patterns.....	4
2.4 Age Group Distribution in 2001 Census.....	4
2.5 Population Growth Projections .....	5
2.6 Areas of Future Growth.....	6
2.7 Personal and Household Characteristics .....	6
2.8 Income and Occupation Characteristics .....	8
2.9 Implications from Demographics .....	9
3. Trends	10
3.1 Demographic Trends.....	10
3.2 Behavioural Trends.....	12
3.3 Organizational and Workplace Trends.....	14
3.4 Infrastructure Trends.....	15
3.5 Environmental Trends.....	16
3.6 Implications of Trends for Programs, Facilities and Parks .....	17
3.7 Using Trends in Planning.....	18
4. Synthesis of Public Input	19
4.1 Public Survey.....	19
4.2 Stakeholder Input.....	25
4.3 Input from Public Forum.....	25
4.4 Public Open House.....	25
5. A Basis for Planning	26
5.1 Mission Statement .....	26
5.2 The Benefits Based Approach.....	26
5.3 The Benefits .....	26
5.4 Service Objectives .....	27
5.5 Mandate/Decision Making Framework.....	31
5.6 Using the Benefits Based Approach .....	32
5.7 Other Uses of the Decision Making Framework .....	35
5.8 City Strategic Objectives.....	38
6. Issues	39
6.1 Recreation and Cultural Infrastructure .....	39
6.2 Parks and Public Open Space.....	50
6.3 Service Delivery.....	71
7. Implementation Plan	82
7.1 Additional Skills Required in the Department .....	82
7.2 Additional Investment Required to Implement the Plan.....	83

## List of Figures

Figure One	Status of Recommendations from 1988 Master Plan	1
Figure Two	Summary of Project Team Workplan	2
Figure Three	Growth Patterns by Census Year	4
Figure Four	Age Group Distribution in 2001 Census by Percent	4
Figure Five	Future Population Estimates	5
Figure Six	Growth in Visible Minority Population	6
Figure Seven	Visible Minority Groups	7
Figure Eight	Types of Families	7
Figure Nine	Household Characteristics by Percent	7
Figure Ten	Educational Attainment by 2001	8
Figure Eleven	Most Common Occupation Types	9
Figure Twelve	Importance to Household of Public Service Categories	19
Figure Thirteen	Sources of Information About Leisure Services	20
Figure Fourteen	Adequacy of Opportunities	21
Figure Fifteen	Satisfaction Levels by Amenity	21
Figure Sixteen	Satisfaction Levels Associated with Using Leisure Services	22
Figure Seventeen	Summary of Support for New or Improved Parks or Outdoor Facilities	22
Figure Eighteen	Summary of Support for New or Improved Parks or Outdoor Facilities	23
Figure Nineteen	Activities Desired in a New Ice Surface	24
Figure Twenty	Support for Options to Improve Leisure Services	24
Figure Twenty-One	Consultants' Assessment of Service Benefits –	33
Figure Twenty-Two	Service Objectives Which Most Need to be Improved	34
Figure Twenty-Three	Consultants' Assessment of Department's Services	36
Figure Twenty-Four	Swims by Pool in 2005	44
Figure Twenty-Five	Parks Area per 1000 Population	52
Figure Twenty-Six	Inventory of Parks and Open Space in 1990 and 2006	53
Figure Twenty-Seven	Summary of Implementation Plan	84
Figure Twenty-Eight	Public Investment Required	89

## Appendices

- A. Transcript of Public Input
- B. Port Coquitlam Stakeholder Interviews
- C. Results of Public Survey
- D. Public Open House Comments

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Port Coquitlam has a long history of investing appropriately in the delivery of parks, recreation and cultural services. Beginning with its first Parks and Recreation Master Plan in 1988, the City has added to its planning framework with studies related to trails, sports fields, cultural services, fees and charges policy, field allocation policy, youth services, volunteerism and facilities.

Over the past twenty years, the City has become progressively more sophisticated in planning and managing publicly supported leisure services. As a result, the consulting team retained to undertake this current ten-year plan for the integration and prioritization of needs and resources found an already well developed system which was operating at a very high level. This document, therefore, outlines refinements to an already effective system, rather than a wholesale change.

It should be further noted that although the Plan is the most recent in a series of initiatives undertaken by the Department, a number of other planning studies, such as the recent fees and charges study and the 2001 Cultural Policy and Plan, are still current. The Plan is intended to supplement and augment the Department's other planning studies, rather than replace them. All such documents should be used in conjunction with the Plan when developing annual work programs and budgets.

The Plan sets out all current needs, makes recommendations that largely endorse the existing approach to meeting them, and puts future effort into priority order. It results in a series of recommendations which have a reasonably high price tag, but many of these cost impacts have already been anticipated by the City and the Department.

The recommendations are listed below in numerical order and are presented under the following headings:

- A Basis for Planning
- Recreation and Cultural Infrastructure
- Parks and Public Open Space
- Service Delivery

## A BASIS FOR PLANNING

- 1 Adopt Decision Making Framework, Mission Statement, Goals and Objectives

## RECREATION AND CULTURAL INFRASTRUCTURE

- 2 Construct new ice surface at Port Coquitlam Recreation Complex; address type of surface required
- 3a Delay indoor pool development for at least 10 years.
- 3b Assess Centennial Pool change rooms
- 3c Develop new south central splash park to replace two existing south side pools; decommission the two pools
- 3d Develop a new splash park / washroom in Lions Park
- 3e Decommission Sun Valley Outdoor Pool and enhance existing splash park
- 4 Proceed with Phase Two renovations and improvements to Terry Fox Library
- 5 Develop new spaces at the Port Coquitlam Recreation Complex for the Wilson Centre, as well as fitness, youth and multipurpose rooms.
- 6 Upgrades to Terry Fox Theatre / confirm continued community access
- 7 Proceed with Phase Two of Leigh Square Community Arts Village

## PARKS AND PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

- 8 Secure Parkland - amend zoning and park bylaws; expand Greenway Plan; integrate Greenway Plan with other City departments
- 9 Complete Parks Classification System and Update Maintenance Standards

## **PARKS AND PUBLIC OPEN SPACE (continued)**

- 10a Continue to improve Athletic Fields, Diamonds and Pitches and upgrade Athletic Field Strategy
- 10b Upgrade infrastructure at Thompson, Evergreen, McLean & Central Parks
- 10c Construct one artificial turf surface, including a Business Case Analysis
- 10d Secure funding for replacement of existing artificial field surface to ensure its ongoing stability
- 11a Develop Shaughnessy Park in a series of phased improvements
- 11b Upgrade Lions Park
- 11c Upgrade Blakeburn Lagoons
- 11d Incorporate Marshall Lobb Park into the development plan when the City sells adjacent downtown lands
- 12 Upgrade Neighbourhood Parks with focus on quality, number and configuration; utilize universal design principles; adopt criteria regarding park priorities
- 13a Complete Upgrade of Troublay PoCo Trail
- 13b Construct washrooms and parking lot at DeBoville Slough
- 14a Undertake conceptual route planning to enhance walking and cycling
- 14b Formalize action plan for off-street trail construction and / or upgrading
- 14c Create a pedestrian access to schools program
- 15a Create an Urban Forest Management Plan
- 15b Support the Engineering Department in creation of Integrated Pest Management Program
- 15c Create an Invasive Species Control Program
- 15d Adopt enhancement programs for natural areas and sensitive ecosystems in the City
- 16a Complete a Downtown Greenways Plan
- 16b Plan and design for pedestrian movement, cultural events and social spaces
- 16c Integrate landscaping, pedestrian linkages and potential off site improvements near Lions Park
- 16d Continue ongoing infrastructure maintenance, walkway improvements, tree plantings at Gates Park
- 16e Complete a revised Central Park design to meet changing demographics
- 17a Prepare a safety and security review of Parks and Trails
- 17b Create at least two dog off leash areas and a Dog in Park Education Program
- 17c Create a community picnic area in Castle Park
- 17d Incorporate two new Community Gardens
- 18 Improve Riverfront Access (non-motorized boat launch)
- 19 Prepare Cemetery Business Case Analysis

## **SERVICE DELIVERY**

- 20 Develop new partnership Agreements with School Districts
- 21 Initiate Community Development Training Program
- 22 Ensure access by all to public leisure services
- 23 Focus on Youth Services
- 24 Add Culture to Department's name
- 25 Continue to promote community development as a way to support local organizations and special events
- 26 Create one part-time Volunteer Coordinator staff position to assist with implementation of volunteer strategy

Further detail related to the above recommendations is provided in Figures 27 and 28 of the document. Figure 27 presents each of the recommendations contained in the Master Plan document in the order that they appear; and Figure 28 presents those recommendations involving public investment; they are displayed in order of priority (i.e. short term, mid term, long term).

The consultants suggest that the Department report on the status of all of the above recommendations within its Business Planning process.

Implementing all of the recommendations and adding the staffing support to ensure they can be done, will fine tune an already well developed system, resulting in even greater efficiencies.

# 1. INTRODUCTION

In February 2006 the City of Port Coquitlam retained a team of consultants led by Professional Environmental Recreation Consultants Ltd. (PERC) to prepare a long range plan for the evolution of its parks, recreation and cultural services. The team included Don Hunter Management Consultants, Legacy Heritage Consultants, Bruce Carscadden Architect Inc. and E. Lees & Associates Consulting Ltd. PERC, together with its associates and its sub-consultants, has worked with a Steering Committee composed of senior managers within the City's Parks and Recreation Department to develop this final report.

The City's previous *Parks and Recreation Master Plan* was developed in 1988 and had a 10 year time frame for its implementation. As summarized in **Figure One**, much of what was recommended in that document has been implemented.

**Figure One  
Status of Recommendations from 1988 Master Plan**

Summary of 1988 Recommendations	Current Status
Approve decision making framework	Implemented but found to be difficult to use consistently
Approve parks classification and standards system	Completed but time to review and update
Develop additional open space in Westview Heights and Riverwood	Completed
Add lights at Thompson and Cedar Park sports fields	Not implemented
Negotiate a comprehensive partnership agreement with School District No. 43	Completed, but a new agreement is required
Establish a nature reserve and use it to provide educational and interpretive services	Completed
Focus on decorative areas and downtown beautification	Completed
Create Parks and Recreation Foundation to help fund projects	Not implemented
Increase rates for DCCs to increase parks funding	Completed
Approach GVRD Parks regarding joint projects in estuary lands and river system trails	Completed
Establish and develop PoCo Trail system	Almost complete
Improve signage and information for parks	Completed
Establish a maintenance management system for parks	A work-order system in place, but MMS not implemented
Expand Hyde Creek Centre	Completed
Develop a community hall	Not implemented
Develop a performing arts theatre	Completed
Refurbish Kilmer House as a heritage site	Minor work done, but not refurbished
Expand Wilson Centre	Completed
Consider adding third ice sheet to Port Coquitlam Recreation Complex	Not implemented
Develop a skateboard bowl for youth	Completed
Develop policy for consistent support of community groups	Completed
A number of administrative and organizational changes	Most completed

A *Cultural Policy and Plan* was completed in 2001. Since its adoption, the City has pursued a community development approach to the delivery of cultural services, has formed a community-based advisory committee to help implement the Plan, and has undertaken the construction of Phase One of the Leigh Square Arts Village.

Representatives of the community's arts and heritage organizations were interviewed during the course of the current study and voiced strong support for the city's *Cultural Policy and Plan*. Given that the document was adopted only recently, and given the community's endorsement of its underlying philosophy and direction, the Master Plan is not intended to supplant the *Cultural Policy and Plan*, but rather to reinforce and augment it.

A number of issues that have not been addressed since the adoption of the *Cultural Policy and Plan* came to the fore during the course of the current study and are reiterated in this report. The two documents should therefore be seen as working together with other current planning studies to guide the development of parks, recreation, and cultural services in Port Coquitlam in the coming decade.

## 1.1 Methodology

The consultants gathered a great deal of data from the general public, stakeholders, surrounding communities and City files. The team has analyzed that information and identified issues that need to be dealt with in the next ten to fifteen years. After undertaking additional research on those issues, the consultants prepared the final report which includes a number of recommendations on how to address each issue. The inputs to the analysis are summarized in *Figure Two*.

**Figure Two  
Summary of Project Team Workplan**

Tasks	Learnings
Background information including planning, demographics and facility usage data	An understanding of the planning and policy framework within which leisure services are delivered
Facilitate Council Workshop	Agreed on a basis for setting priorities and justifying recommendations (see Section 5)
Analysis of demographics including current and projected composition of the City's population	An understanding of the current and projected market within which services will be delivered (see Section 2)
Identification of current trends generally and in Port Coquitlam specifically	An understanding of which types of activities are increasing or decreasing in popularity (see Section 3)
Hosted a public workshop to gain input	An understanding of issues raised by the public (see section 3 and workshop notes included in Appendix A)
Facilitated a total of five workshops with city staff groups	Helped to identify issues and add to consultants' understanding of issues (see Appendix B)
Conducted agency interviews	Helped to identify issues and add to consultants' understanding of issues (see section 4 and Appendix B)
Conducted stakeholder group interviews	Helped to identify issues and add to consultants' understanding of issues (see section 4 and Appendix B)
Public survey of 1500 randomly selected adults	A statistically valid profile of local activity patterns and demands (see section 4 and Appendix C)
Visited all parks and facilities	Gained a better understanding of the condition of infrastructure and of issues relating to it

## 2. BACKGROUND

### 2.1 Community Overview

Incorporated as a City in 1913, Port Coquitlam is now a thriving and growing community with an estimated population of 58,345. It remains one of the fastest growing municipalities in the Lower Mainland, as well as one of the youngest. The growth capacity is currently set at 80,000 by 2031, but increasing density patterns in the City's downtown may increase this number in the future.

Geographically, the City is largely defined by the Fraser, Pitt and Coquitlam rivers, and is 27.8 sq. km in size. Its land use patterns are diverse. While dominated by residential (36%) and recreational and protected areas (23.6%), other major land uses include commercial/industrial (10.9%), open and undeveloped (10.5%) and agricultural (9.5%).

Historically, the original inhabitants were the Coast Salish people, who were joined by the first European immigrants in the mid 1800's. The arrival of the Canadian Pacific Railway line in 1886 brought new residents, but it was the creation of CPR's freight yard and operations in 1911 that had a greater impact on the City's growth and subsequent development. The rail lines and yards have created a physical boundary between north and south Port Coquitlam that has affected transportation and service delivery. More recently, the Lougheed Highway, which runs along the rail lines, has contributed to that barrier.

Relatively affordable housing, employment opportunities, the natural setting, and a wide variety of amenities have contributed to Port Coquitlam's growth and sense of community. These characteristics have allowed the City to attract young families and retain older families and individuals.

### 2.2 Demographic Sources and Limitations

A number of sources were used to identify demographic information, trends and projections. These were:

- **Statistics Canada Census:** The only actual count of the population is done by Statistics Canada every five years. The last Census was undertaken in 2001 and the results are included in this document. The next Census was carried out in 2006 with May 16 being the actual Census Day. Complete Census results will not be available for several more months.
- The City should review the future population projections in this section with the actual 2006 Census when the data is available in early 2007. Statistics Canada only does population projections on a national and provincial/territorial basis. They make projections after adding a 3.1% under-coverage estimate (i.e. those missed in the Census), to the actual Census count.
- **BC Stats:** BC Stats use the Statistics Canada Census data and then does projections for population growth based on a variety of information sources, such as residential construction patterns, within its P.E.O.P.L.E. model. Their current projections are up to the end of 2005, although they also do longer-term estimates. BC Stats assumes a 4.37% under-coverage in their projections, rather than Statistics Canada's 3.1%. Their projections will be modified when the 2006 Census data is available..
- **GVRD Statistics:** The GVRD provides a considerable amount of comparative data for its 21 member municipalities based on Statistics Canada, BC Stats, and provincial and municipal information sources. The types of information include employment, business, housing activity, population, education, income, transportation, and land use.

- **City Documents and Planning Department:** The consultants reviewed the Official Community Plan, Annual Reports and other planning documents. They also met with a representative of the Planning Department to review likely growth patterns, significant neighbourhood characteristics, and major planning initiatives. Discussions were also conducted with School District No.43 to identify school enrolment patterns.

## 2.3 Growth Patterns

Figure Three provides an overview of the last four Census years and the growth patterns between them.

**Figure Three  
Growth Patterns by Census Year**

Census Year	Population	% Change 5 Years
1986	29,115	5.7% (1981)
1991	36,773	26.3%
1996	46,682	26.9%
2001	51,257	9.8%

The 2001 Census population was 51,257, but with the 3.1% under-coverage estimate used by Statistics Canada, the actual population would be closer to 52,845. Port Coquitlam's greatest growth period was the decade between 1986 and 1996 when the population grew by just over 60%. The growth slowed after 1996, but was still twice the Provincial average at 9.8% compared to BC's 4.9%. This was a similar ratio to 1991-1996 when the City's 26.9% growth was compared to BC's 13.5%.

## 2.4 Age Group Distribution in 2001 Census

The recent rapid growth that has occurred in the City has clearly been primarily families, as shown by the age group distributions *Figure Four*.

**Figure Four  
Age Group Distribution in 2001 Census by Percent**

Age Group	PoCo	GVRD	BC	Canada
0-14	21.9	17.4	18.1	19.1
15-24	13.7	13.4	13.2	13.3
25-44	34.3	32.6	30.1	30.3
45-64	22.7	24.4	25.0	24.3
65 +	7.4	12.2	13.6	13.0

Port Coquitlam is a young community with 78% of the population under the age of 50. Compared with the GVRD, BC and Canada, the City's child, youth and younger adult (under 45) population groups are a higher proportion of the population, while the older adult population cohorts are smaller. The median age of Port Coquitlam (35.1 years), is the lowest in the GVRD, and is lower than BC's 38.4 and Canada's 37.0. The proportion of adults aged 65 and older is significantly lower than the provincial and national averages.

The consultants were advised that School District No.43 is projecting declines in elementary school enrolments, but not to the same degree as those occurring in older municipalities. It is likely, however that one elementary school will be closed in the immediate future. No new schools are forecast for construction in the coming decade, and much of the new residential growth will have a low yield of school aged children.

## 2.5 Population Growth Projections

As stated previously, BC Stats provides population projections to municipalities and Regional Districts. For example, they first apply a 4.37 % under-coverage estimate to the 2001 Census figures, and then make subsequent year projections based on a number of growth indicators. For Port Coquitlam, their current projections are as follows:

- 2001 – 53,497 (Census was 51,257)
- 2002 – 54,915 up 2.7%
- 2003 – 55,795 up 1.6%
- 2004 – 56,413 up 1.1%
- 2005 – 57,563 up 2.0%

Given another 2% population increase from 2005-06, BC Stats would project a current population of 58,714.

The Planning Department has identified that they use a consistent 2% annual population increase projection based on the Census data. It is likely that the under-coverage in the Census will be closer to Statistics Canada's 3.1% estimate rather than BC Stats' 4.37%, due to the relatively stable nature of the City. With the 3.1% under-coverage, a revised estimate of the 2001 population would be 52,845, rather than the 51,257 Census figure.

**Figure Five** shows future population projections to 2016, based on a 2% annual increase, both using and not using the 3.1 under-coverage (UC) amount in the 2001 Census data.

**Figure Five  
Future Population Estimates**

Estimate Year	Pop. Est. (with UC)	Pop. Est. (without UC)
2006	58,345	56,590
2007	59,510	57,720
2008	60,700	58,875
2009	61,915	60,055
2010	63,155	61,255
2011	64,420	62,480
2012	67,020	65,005
2014	69,730	67,630
2016	72,545	70,360

When the 2006 Census data becomes available in the spring of 2007, it is likely that the enumerated population will be closer to the 56,590 figure, but that the actual population will be around 58,345.

If population growth does average out at 2% annually for the next ten years, the Official Community Plan estimates of 70,000 by 2021 and 79,000 by 2031 will be exceeded a decade earlier. Both the limited supply of developable land and the type of development, especially densification, will influence future population figures.

## 2.6 Areas of Future Growth

The vast majority of residential areas are single family. This is changing with the inclusion of mixed housing forms in infill projects and greater densification in the Downtown. The percentage of multi-family housing units grew by 16% compared to single family units between 1991 and 2001, and continues to grow, especially as the amount of developable land diminishes. The Riverwood area has some capacity left, and will see primarily single family housing, with some townhouse development. South Shaughnessy has more limited capacity left for single family, townhouse and row housing. A number of other neighbourhood areas, such as north of Gates Park, have infill capacity.

The highest level of development will occur in the Downtown. A number of new multi-unit developments have been built or are in various stages of construction, approval or consideration. This densification will contribute to the realization of many of the objectives of *Downtown Plan '98* as "the dynamic centre of a small, vibrant, livable city". There will likely be a higher older adult population in Downtown as residential facilities and amenities are added.

Port Coquitlam will continue to offer a variety of relatively affordable housing types, coupled with excellent amenities and opportunities. The development of the proposed Coast Meridian overpass will help connect the north and south areas of Port Coquitlam and provide greater accessibility to community amenities on both sides, as well as to the Downtown area.

## 2.7 Personal and Household Characteristics

There has been considerable immigration into Port Coquitlam, with 26.4% of its residents being foreign born, with 40.1% of that population immigrating after 1991. Historically, most early immigration had come from Europe and China. This has diversified significantly over the last two decades, as immigrants are now coming from a number of regions and continents. Newer immigrants include a growing number who identify themselves as a visible minority. The proportion of visible minority residents was 22.3% in 2001; this was an increase from 17.2% in 1996. *Figure Six* shows this trend.

**Figure Six  
Growth in Visible Minority Population**

Census Year	Population	Visible Min.	% of Pop.	BC %
1996	46,320	7,945	17.2%	17.9%
2001	50,805	11,335	22.3%	21.6%

The 5.1% increase in the City's visible minority population was higher than the provincial average. As identified in *Figure Seven*, there were also some shifts in the proportions of major visible minority groups over that same period.

**Figure Seven  
Visible Minority Groups**

Visible Minority	2001 Rank	2001 %	1996 Rank	1996 %
Chinese	1	42.4	1	48.5
South Asian	2	20.2	2	18.4
Filipino	3	9.3	3	7.9
Black	4	6.3	4	5.2
West Asian	5	5.3	7	3.6
Korean	6	4.6	8	3.1

In 1996, the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> largest visible minority groups were Japanese and Latin Americans. The numbers of individuals in these two groups remained virtually the same between 1996 and 2001, while the number of West Asians (mostly from Iran) and Koreans more than doubled. Immigration from China, South Asia, the Philippines, and people of Black ancestry remained high. Even though the proportion of Chinese was reduced during this period, the actual number of new residents at 955 was the highest. The Aboriginal Identity population also grew from 720 in 1996 to 1,030 in 2001.

**Family and Household Characteristics:** In 2001, there were 14,415 families in Port Coquitlam. The average family size was 3.3 persons (3.1 in BC) for married couples, 2.7 persons for common-law families (2.6 in BC), and 2.6 persons (2.5 for BC) for lone parent families. Of the lone parent families, 81.9% have a female parent. **Figure Eight** shows the family types and their proportions in the City.

**Figure Eight  
Types of Families**

Family Type	Number	Proportion	Family Size
Married-Couple	10,735	74.5%	3.3
Common-Law	1,475	10.2%	2.7
Single Parent	2,205	15.3%	2.6
Female S.P.	1,805	12.5%	2.6
Male S.P.	400	2.8%	2.4

The proportions of types of families are consistent with the provincial averages and are all within one percentage point. **Figure Nine** shows the characteristics for Port Coquitlam households, and gives the comparative percentages for the Province.

**Figure Nine  
Household Characteristics by Percent**

Area	Couples with Children	Couples without Children	One Person	Other Types	Owned	Rented
PoCo	40.7%	24.0%	18.2%	17.1%	74.5%	25.5%
BC %	27.6%	28.5%	27.3%	16.6%	67.0	33.0%

Household characteristics are substantially different than many of the provincial averages. These differences reflect the relatively young, family oriented and stable population characteristics of the City. There are more families with children, fewer people living on their own (perhaps also reflecting the low proportion of seniors), and a higher percentage of home ownership.

**Education Levels:** The levels of post-secondary education have risen consistently in Port Coquitlam. **Figure Ten** shows the levels of attainment of some form of post-secondary accreditation in Port Coquitlam based on age groupings.

**Figure Ten  
Educational Attainment by 2001**

<b>Attainment Level</b>	<b>Age 20-34</b>	<b>Age 35-44</b>	<b>Age 45-64</b>
Trades Certificate	12.4%	15.1%	16.2%
College Diploma	22.6%	23.4%	21.1%
University Degree	15.4%	18.8%	14.3%

The City also has the youngest population in the GVRD and will have seen a significant number of new post-secondary graduates since 2001, and a number of new students entering those systems. The higher trades certificate levels reflect occupation patterns to some degree (see **Figure Eleven**). Since the measure of educational attainment is cumulative, it is anticipated that the proportion of university graduates will increase in the future as the young population enters and completes post-secondary programs.

## **2.8 Income and Occupation Characteristics**

**Income Levels:** Income levels in Port Coquitlam are representative of the largely middle class, family nature of the community. The 2001 Census used the year 2000 as its income measure. The median household income for Port Coquitlam in 2000 was \$59,926; this is higher than the median income for the Province which was \$46,802. The median family income was higher at \$63,588, as compared to BC's \$54,840. Married couple households, however, earned more than twice as much as single parent households, taking in \$69,274 compared to \$32,496.

As a community, Port Coquitlam was virtually at the mid-point of the GVRD municipalities in terms of average household income. It is also at the mid-point for the number of families living under the Low Income Cut Off (LICO) at approximately 15%. A total of 11.2% of Port Coquitlam residents were receiving some form of financial assistance in 2005 in comparison with 13.3% of BC residents.

**Occupation Types:** **Figure Eleven** shows the most common occupational types in Port Coquitlam. The occupations are listed by rank within the occupations of the experienced work force of 28,190 which is split 53% male and 47% female.

**Figure Eleven  
Most Common Occupation Types**

<b>Occupation Type</b>	<b>Rank and Number</b>	<b>Percent of Work Force</b>
Sales and Service	1. 6,980	24.8%
Business, Finance, Administration	2. 6,000	21.3%
Trades, Transport, Equipment Operators	3. 5,100	18.1%
Management	4. 3,355	11.9%
Social Science, Education, Government	5. 1,705	6.1%
Natural and Applied Sciences	6. 1,655	5.9%
Health	7. 1,440	5.1%

The results are similar to many other GVRD communities except that the Trades areas are ranked slightly higher; this is not surprising given the CPR Yards. The City of Port Coquitlam is working on increasing the percentage of people who both live and work in the City. The expansion of light industry in the Dominion Triangle Lands will support this objective.

## **2.9 Implications from Demographics**

There are a number of implications that can be drawn from Port Coquitlam's demographics for programs, services, facility provision and open space and parks provision. These include:

- While there is a small decline in the number of elementary school aged children, there will be limited impacts in terms of registration in children's programs, swim lessons and youth sport. Unlike most other communities, it is likely that only one school will be closed in the next 5 years or so.
- The demand for all services and facilities will remain high and grow as Port Coquitlam's population continues to increase at a high rate.
- The population growth in the Downtown will place added pressure on amenities at the Port Coquitlam Recreation Complex and create increased demands for non-ice facilities for fitness and leisure programs. The demands for developed park spaces in the Downtown will also be affected.
- The newer seniors oriented multi-unit residences in the Downtown may place higher demands on Wilson Centre facilities, and the inclusion of design features for older adults in some park areas.
- Port Coquitlam is a family oriented community and will remain so. Facilities, parks and community special events should continue to support family activity.
- The growing diversity in Port Coquitlam may require a greater focus on inter-cultural marketing and communication with the various ethno-cultural groups.
- The Department should review the 2006 Census data when it becomes available in the spring of 2007, identify the changes and trends since 2001, and update the population projections if required.

## 3. TRENDS

This chapter provides an overview of a number of trends that are affecting leisure lifestyles, and parks and recreation services across Canada and in Port Coquitlam and deals with broader trends and their implications for recreation programs and services, facilities, and parks. These trends are grouped under five categories.

In addition, Section 3.6 will identify the implications these trends have for programs, facilities and parks and Section 3.7 discusses how the trends have been used by the consultants in developing their recommendations.

### 3.1 Demographic Trends

**Population Shifts:** The most significant shift in the Canadian population is that it is aging. Every five years, the median age of the Canadian population increases by approximately 2.1 years. Some provinces age faster than others, depending largely on the out or in-migration of young people and their families. Alberta is the youngest Canadian province because of strong job growth and relatively affordable housing. The three territories are younger still; the birth rates remain higher there and in Nunavut, for example, 45% of the population is under the age of 15. There is also significant variation between communities in the same province. As stated in the previous chapter, the percentage of people over 65 in Port Coquitlam is only 7.4% (2001). This is considerably lower than the percentages for BC (13.7) and Canada (13.0), and far lower than the 38% in a retirement community like Qualicum Beach.

David Foot, Canada's leading demographer, has written two books, *Boom, Bust & Echo* and *Boom, Bust & Echo 2000*. He identifies that it is too simplistic to view Canada as aging uniformly, and that there are significant differences between age cohorts and their respective impacts on society – especially the Baby Boom generation. Beginning with those born in 1930, Foot identifies the following cohorts:

- **Depression Babies 1930-1939:** These individuals will be between 67 and 76 in 2006. Many have more traditional values in comparison with succeeding generations, have a sense of duty and citizenship, and are often suspicious of change. Others of this generation are more open to new ideas, travel and continued learning. Whatever their perspectives, this group had large families and were the parents of the major bulge in the Baby Boomers born from the mid-50's to mid-60's.
- **World War II Pre-Boomers 1940-1946:** This relatively small cohort will be between 60 and 66 this year, so are either retired or about to retire. They were or still are the key leaders in many fields, including parks and recreation, assuming senior positions fairly early in their careers and staying there. They will be less likely to join senior's centres as they age and will continue to use mainstream facilities. They could be a great source of volunteers because of their organizational abilities, but will need to be personally asked.
- **Baby Boom 1947-1966:** The youngest Boomers turned 40 in 2006 and the oldest will be 59. This 19 year age cohort makes up over one-third of the Canadian population as significant increases in the birth rate, coupled with immigration after WW II, led to a swelling of the population over this period. The peak of the Baby Boom was 1961, so the "average" Boomer is only between 40 and 50. This means that the 65+ population won't really peak until 2026 at 20%, and then will grow more slowly to 23% by 2041.
- **Foot named those born between 1961 and 1966 as "Generation X".** This very large cohort had difficulty getting good jobs and opportunities because there were so many of them, and early Boomers were already entrenched in management positions. As a whole, Boomers are more affluent, tend to be more active than preceding generations, and think of themselves as younger than their parents at the same age. As they age, Boomers are shifting from activities such as tennis and aerobics to less strenuous ones such as walking, cycling, tai chi and yoga.

- **Baby Bust 1967-1979:** There was a sharp drop in the birth rate and the number of children born between 1967 and 1979, those who will be 27 to 39 in 2006. This drop led to elementary school closures in many communities across Canada in the early 1980's. This small cohort was fortunate in a number of ways. They had less competition getting into university, and as the first "techno-generation", rose relatively quickly as they entered the workforce – bypassing many of those in Generation X who remained sandwiched between them and the incumbent early Boomers. The Baby Busters tend to seek work-life balance and are more loyal to the team they work with than the organization itself.
- **Baby Boom Echo 1980-1995:** The fertility rate remained low entering the 1980's in terms of family size, but the number of births expanded as the Baby Boomers began to have children. This second swelling in the Canadian population, the Echo, was far smaller than the Boom but still led to increased demands for school and university places as the Echo generation matured. Their presence has kept middle and secondary school populations high and has made university acceptance more difficult because of the size of the cohort. The Echo cohort, aged 11-26, is a major consumer force, are wired technologically, are risk-takers recreationally, and often consider their friends as "family".
- **Millennium Busters 1996-2010:** Just as the Baby Boomers created the smaller Echo by having children, the smaller cohort of those born after the 1961 peak of the Boom and the Baby Bust generation, produced far fewer children. The Millennium Busters, aged 10 and under in 2006, have resulted in declining elementary school populations and school closures across British Columbia and Canada. In British Columbia there are 16,000 more grade 11 students than in grade 1 at the present time. This decline will also likely be reflected in drops in swim lesson demand and minor sport participation in the future. As a very young community, Port Coquitlam has generally not been affected by these patterns.

The demographic patterns identified by Foot are evident in Port Coquitlam, but care should be taken not to over-generalize. For example, potential future reductions in the number of children don't always result in youth sport declines when there are outstanding programs. The drop in tennis participation across Canada is a result of Boomers shifting to less strenuous activities such as walking, but communities that have excellent tennis facilities and youth programs have altered that trend. There is a clear interplay between demographics and other community characteristics.

***Growing Gap – Haves and Have-Nots:*** There has been a general shift in North America to a growing gap between the haves and the have-nots from a personal economic perspective. The gap is greater in the United States than Canada. In both countries, that gap is age related in that more than half the wealth of North Americans is now owned by people over 50. Young families with children are now twice as likely to live in poverty as defined by the Low Income Cut-off (LICO). Fee rates, however, still generally favour older adults more than young families. There is a need to re-examine accessibility and pricing policies, and to implement measures that support all individuals with low income, but especially young families.

***Increasing Diversity:*** Communities, especially large urban centres, have become increasingly ethnically diverse. Port Coquitlam experienced a 5.1% increase in the proportion of the population who are visible minorities between 1996 and 2001 and it can be anticipated that the proportion will grow in the 2006 Census. There are also increasing numbers of individuals from Eastern Europe, and other world regions and language groups. Parks and recreation services need to ensure that facilities and services are welcoming, address language barriers appropriately, and recognize the needs and interests of various cultures when the demand and need exists.

***Leadership Shifts and Gaps:*** The early Baby Boomers who have led parks and recreation organizations are soon going to retire. There are a number of capable people to replace them at the senior levels, but there appears to be a gap at the entry level with fewer younger people being attracted to the field or having had a chance to advance. There are also issues with attracting program, instructional and technical staff in areas as diverse as aquatics and arena plant maintenance. This is especially evident in smaller and mid-size communities. These entry-level leadership issues are also evident for non-profit society management. Concerted efforts will need to be

made by post-secondary institutions and the field to address leadership gaps. Individual Departments may need to develop and train their own staff in technical and program areas when there is a short supply.

## 3.2 Behavioural Trends

***Toward Informal and Individual Activities:*** There has been a clear shift from formal and organized activities to more individualized and informal. People are increasingly selecting activities that can be done individually or in small groups, at a time of the individual's choosing, and often near or at the individual's home. This is reflected in the top five favourite physical activities for adults and youth in Canada as identified in the Canadian Community Health Survey and presented below.

### Favourite Adult Activities

1. Walking
2. Gardening
3. Home Exercise
4. Swimming
5. Bicycling

### Favourite Youth Activities

1. Walking
2. Bicycling
3. Swimming
4. Running/Jogging
5. Basketball

With the exception of swimming, these activities can be done close to or at home. They can all be carried out at a personally convenient time and are generally unstructured. The only team sport found in either list is basketball; however, its inclusion is largely based on informal play rather than on formal organized team activity. In fact, registered sport participation levels fell to 34% in 1998 from 45% in 1992.

In the case of swimming, most aquatic activity is drop-in water play or lap swimming. Parks and recreation Departments should consider ensuring that lap swimming and drop-in activities can occur at times throughout the day. There is an increased interest in outdoor activities. New trail development consistently ranks at or near the top of public surveys in terms of preferred new facilities. Young families are also looking for inexpensive, informal activities that can be enjoyed as a family unit.

***Changing Preferences and Expectations:*** Another clear trend is the shift toward the experiential aspect of activities. People are seeking personal growth and meaning in the activities they choose. For example, the two fastest growth areas in tourism are cultural learning and ecotourism. Registration in classes has increased as people seek lifestyle skills. People not only have high expectations for achieving personal benefits, but also that there will be a high quality of service in terms of instruction, customer service, facility cleanliness and appearance.

As the Baby Boomers age, they continue to have an interest and commitment to being active, but will turn away from more strenuous activities such as tennis and jogging to more moderate activities such as walking and yoga. Boomers are also showing an increased interest in culture, both in terms of attending performances and cultural venues, and in actual participation in art activities.

***Time Segmentation:*** Geoff Godbey, a Professor Emeritus at Penn State University and the author of "The Sociology of Leisure", has noted the general feeling that many people feel rushed, and that their discretionary time is available in smaller chunks. This is reflected not only in the shift to more individual activities, but also to shorter periods of activity that involve "time deepening" where people multi-task during both work and leisure activities (e.g. reading a report while on a treadmill). While many individuals report that they value their leisure time more than work, they may still be challenged to integrate leisure into their lifestyles by finding or creating time.

***Volunteerism:*** Canada lost a million volunteers between 1997 and 2000, going from 7.5 to 6.5 million (Stats Canada). The greatest drop-off in volunteerism was found in the 35-49 age group; these individuals are perhaps

most affected by time segmentation and having to juggle work and family obligations with leisure and volunteerism. As Baby Boomers begin to retire, they may create an excellent pool of skilled volunteers. They will likely have to be actively recruited to become a volunteer in the community. Because of time pressures, individuals will more likely be willing to volunteer for shorter term projects and tasks, as opposed to long-term commitments. Examples of short-term projects are trail building and invasive species removal days in parks, and special event planning in recreation. This trend is termed “episodic volunteering”. A number of Port Coquitlam organizations identified volunteer recruitment as an issue.

**Wellness and Chronic Disease:** People are increasingly aware of the health benefits of activity and nutrition. This interest in personal wellness is reflected in the proportion of Canadian adults who are active enough to achieve health benefits. BC is the most active province in Canada with 58% of the population active enough to receive health benefits (2003/04 Canadian Community Health Survey). The proportion for Canada has risen from 24% in 1981 to the current 49%. While Canadian adults are generally more active, they are also becoming more overweight; approximately 15% of the adult population is now obese. A lack of activity, coupled with fast foods and trans-fats intake, are responsible; community wellness initiatives will need to include a healthy eating component along with physical activity.

Older adults are becoming increasingly active, but activity levels still go down as people age. There is also a 15% discrepancy between older men and women in terms of activity levels with men being more active. The male-female gap is very small for middle-age adults, so the current discrepancy may disappear as the Baby Boomers age. There is also the “fourth generation”. These are individuals who are impacted by chronic diseases such as Type 2 Diabetes as they age. Activity, however limited, will be an integral part of chronic disease management for these individuals.

**Children and Youth Inactivity:** Inactivity levels for children and youth are considered to be a greater problem. The Ontario Medical Association estimates that Canadian children are 40% less active than 30 years ago. Obesity rates tripled for children between 1981 and 1996, and children’s overweight levels grew from 15% for both genders to 29.2% for girls and 35.4% for boys.

Children now spend 3-5 hours daily in front of a television and less time playing outside. This challenge will require a coordinated effort by recreation, health, education and parents. There is also a 16% gap between male and female teens in activity levels. Inactivity and obesity levels in children and youth are resulting in the increasing early diagnosis of chronic diseases in the young, potentially resulting in a lower life expectancy than the current levels.

**Growing Leisure Activities:** Activities that have grown in popularity and will likely continue to grow include:

- Walking and Cycling – There will be continued demands for safe and inviting places for active transportation activities.
- Home Landscaping and Gardening – As the interest in gardening and landscaping grows, people will be looking for good information sources beyond television.
- Cultural Activities – The Boomers, in particular, will want to enjoy and participate in the visual, performing and cooking arts. There will also be a growing demand for art programs for school-aged children.
- Outdoor Activities and Environmental Learning – There may be a shift away from traditional camping towards closer to home, but challenging, outdoor pursuits on a day-basis. There is a growing interest in learning about local and regional flora and fauna.
- Cultural Learning and Ecotourism – When people do travel, they will want to go someplace to learn: art, language, the culture, cooking, and heritage. Ecotourism will also remain strong as people seek unique experiences.

- Youth Physical Activity and Healthy Living – Parents are beginning to get the messages about child and youth obesity and inactivity. There will be increasing demands for programs that get young people active and help them make healthy choices.
- Rehabilitation and Chronic Disease Management – As people age and chronic disease conditions increase, they will seek to remain active while managing injuries and conditions. Community recreation facilities, combined with rehabilitation programs and elements, will be key settings.

### 3.3 Organizational and Workplace Trends

**The Benefits Movement:** The 1992 and 1997 Benefits Catalogues prepared by the Canadian Parks and Recreation Association have had a subtle but profound affect. They have helped the field become more “outcomes” focused, and to broaden its mandate from the delivery of traditional services to the creation of individual and community benefits. In the 1990’s the Benefits Movement and approach largely focused on using the evidence of the benefits of parks and recreation as advocacy and communication tools – aimed at Municipal Councils, other institutions and citizens. The shift now is toward using the Benefits approach as a key planning tool. Departments are increasingly defining outcomes in their strategic planning processes, and then directing new strategies to achieve those outcomes.

**Partnering:** Parks and recreation has always functioned within a mixed delivery system model and has worked closely with other voluntary sport, culture and recreation organizations in the delivery of services. The most significant shift is the extension of these partnerships beyond the voluntary sector. Newer partners include the health system, social services, justice, education, the corporate sector, and community service agencies. This reflects both a broader interpretation of the mandate of parks and recreation agencies, and the increased willingness of other sectors to work together to address community issues. The relationship with health will be vital in promoting wellness. The traditional relationship with education, the sharing of facilities through joint-use agreements, is evolving into cooperative planning and programming aimed at addressing youth inactivity levels and community needs.

There has also been a growth in internal partnerships within municipalities. There are closer relationships with Police Departments around public safety and youth initiatives, and there are closer relationships with Planning and Engineering Departments in the development of greenway and active transportation systems.

**Alternative Delivery Systems:** Municipal parks and recreation structures and delivery systems have changed and more alternative methods of delivering services are evident. There is more contracting out of certain services, and more cooperative agreements with non-profit groups and other public institutions. There are also more public-private partnerships involving either the construction of new facilities, or the inclusion of private operations within publicly owned facilities. The successful public private partnerships have been based on strong and comprehensive agreements and ongoing communication.

**Expanding Service Demands:** Throughout British Columbia, local Parks, Recreation and Culture Departments are increasingly asked to be an integral part of addressing a myriad of social issues, responding to homelessness, drug use for youth and young adults, child care needs, and other issues traditionally responded to by provincially sponsored programs. In many communities, recreation personnel are working more closely on internal integrated service teams, and with social service personnel in responding to these needs. This often requires new and different skills, different program and service design, and the re-allocation of resources. Funding issues aside, leisure is becoming more widely recognized as a tool for social change. Its potential for improving the quality of life for local citizens is significant. There is a growing trend to advocate the use of leisure programs and services to reduce crime, to reduce risk factors for youth at risk, and to break down ethnic divisions and create better understanding between different cultures.

**Accountability:** Another clear shift is that political decision makers and volunteer boards are increasingly demanding that their Departments measure and demonstrate their impact on the community. This demand for accountability through performance measures doesn't necessarily result in outcomes focused organizations, because outputs are still far easier to measure. In the coming decade, the field will need to develop its capacity to ensure that sound performance measurement systems are in place, and have a balance between output and outcome measures. The field also has to become better at communicating the outcomes and benefits at the local, provincial and national level.

**Technology:** Parks and recreation has increasingly embraced greater use of technologies. This includes bar-coded entry systems for pass holders, computer and web-based program registration systems, user tracking systems, and enhanced communications with both users and colleagues. These high tech capacities will compliment, but never replace the need for human contact and personal attention.

In the parks area, the use of digitized aerial photography has changed mapping systems and has allowed for easier overlays of GIS mapping levels. Many of these maps, including trails, will be available to the public on interactive web-sites. In the near future, parks maintenance staff will carry a hand-held PDA that they can record work information on, and send directly to payroll and other computerized maintenance management systems. All of these will soon be voice activated.

**Broad Workplace Shifts:** A large proportion of new jobs in the Canadian economy are self-employed or part-time, and a number of full-time jobs have become more flexible in time patterns. This has contributed to an increase in weekday use of recreation facilities and open spaces, especially drop-in casual use. Job descriptions are becoming obsolete in many fields as individuals often find themselves working in teams and on tasks outside of their normal roles. Younger staff members, especially the Baby Busters, are less loyal to the organization than they are to the team and achieving goals; they expect to be part of the planning and decision-making processes of the organization.

### 3.4 Infrastructure Trends

**Aging Infrastructure:** Many of Canada's facilities are aging. The 2005 BCRPA Community Infrastructure Report - Phase 1 identified that almost 75% of ice arenas in BC are 25 years or older, along with 82% of curling rinks and 91% of outdoor pools. Just over half of BC's indoor pools were 25 years of age or more in 2004. Many early facilities were built as Centennial projects in 1967, while others were built in a second wave of facility construction in the 1980's. Many older facilities are deteriorating more rapidly than necessary because of limited preventative maintenance programs. These facilities now have envelope, code, mechanical, and slab problems. The multi-purpose recreation centres built in the 1980's are in better shape, but need work, particularly in the pool component.

**Infrastructure Program:** Many provinces had their own community facility infrastructure funds in the 1980's and 1990's that provided either a half-or-third of a project's capital cost. As a result, a large number of new facilities were built and others renovated. Most of these funds were discontinued in the mid to late 90's, with the funding generally being redirected to health.

The Canada Infrastructure Program was not as accessible for community facilities, and it is unknown whether its successor programs will be more supportive through the New Deal for Communities. This will be worked out in the individual MOU developed between the government of Canada and each province-territory. BC and Canada recently signed the MOU for the Municipal Rural Infrastructure Fund. The new gas tax rebate will positively impact on recreation through active transportation projects and perhaps indirectly by freeing up other municipal funds. It is highly likely that a number of new provincial infrastructure funds will be re-established in the coming 5 years across Canada to address the infrastructure deficit that has been built up.

**Facility Shifts:** A large number of community recreation facilities were built across Canada at the time of the 1967 Centennial. Many of those facilities were stand-alone arenas and curling rinks that catered to children and youth. The second wave of recreation facility construction in the 1980's saw a shift to multi-purpose facilities that combined a number of uses. There was also a shift to constructing free-form leisure pools within these complexes beginning in the mid to late 80's. A growing trend will be the inclusion of partners from other fields in combined facilities. This may include public health units, libraries and social services.

**Expanded Facility Roles:** Community leisure facilities are taking on a greater role in attracting tourism and in economic development. In particular, games and tournaments, cultural events, and heritage and agricultural activities are regarded as a means for economic growth and development. In fact, larger events have the benefit of providing the impetus and funding for facility construction and renovation.

### **3.5 Environmental Trends**

**Growing Sense of Stewardship:** The environment has remained on the agenda of individual British Columbians and other Canadians. This is evidenced by the public support given to the preservation and protection of natural areas, and the current pressures on the Province to upgrade provincial parks that are perceived to have deteriorated. On a personal level, 88% of Canadians recycle or compost. These and other environmentally friendly behaviours, however, do not appear to extend to reducing fossil fuel consumption in vehicles use. The average car produces 4 tonnes of Green House Gases annually, and public active transportation and public transit systems will need to be improved to reverse this pattern. Environics found that 85% of Canadians think the environment will get worse, especially in terms of air and water quality.

**Environmental Activism and Activation:** Parks and recreation agencies will be challenged on their stewardship practices, and will need to have sound urban forest management and Integrated Pest Management (IPM) policies and practices in place. There is a growing citizen interest in learning about the environment. Municipal Parks and Recreation Departments should look at increasing environmental education opportunities.

**Interest in the Environment:** There is heightened interest in environmental activities and learning, including an interest in learning about local flora and fauna. Growing activities include birding; over 70 million North Americans collectively now spend approximately \$5.5 billion annually. While interest in camping remains high, there is a growing trend towards shorter-term, but more intensive environmental experiences such as wilderness hiking. People are also investing more in their individual environments as gardening and home landscaping grow in popularity.

**Climate Change:** While there is not common agreement on the causes, there is agreement that global warming is occurring. In the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, the average global temperature rose 1 degree Fahrenheit; the expected increase in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century is 5-8 degrees F. A rise of this magnitude will impact snow levels and glacial melting, sea levels and eco systems. The only safe prediction appears to be that weather will become more unpredictable. The number of extreme weather events in this decade in Canada has doubled over those 30 years ago.

## 3.6 Implications of Trends for Programs, Facilities and Parks

### *Program Implications*

- Drop-in Use: There will be greater demands on drop-in activities or individual or small group use. This will be seen in fitness, lap swimming, and youth drop-in, but not necessarily in public skating or tennis.
- Day-time Use: As job schedules become more flexible and people retire, there will be increased demands for day-time use – especially informal drop-in use.
- Compressed Timeframes: Where feasible, more programs should be offered in compressed timeframes – a one or two day workshop instead of on a weekly basis for a longer timeframe.
- Social Aspect of Programs: Conversely to the previous point, some people enjoy the constancy and social aspects of ongoing programs. Especially for older adults, social elements should be included as part of the post-activity period.
- Wellness, Health and Rehabilitation Partnerships: Programs aimed at rehabilitation and wellness can be offered through partnerships with the health sector. Programs offered in community rather than clinical settings are more likely to lead to ongoing healthy lifestyle behaviour.
- Access and Cultural Diversity: All populations in a community need to be targeted and barriers removed. A particular concern is the capacity of many young families to afford services.
- Youth Inactivity: Youth inactivity and obesity are considered by many to be at the epidemic level. Schools play a key role but often have diminished capacity. Partnership approaches by schools, Parks and Recreation Departments, and parents will be required to address the issue.
- Leadership Recruitment and Development: As identified previously, shortages in front-line, technical and program leaders (lifeguards, instructors, etc.) may require Departments to identify, recruit and train their own staff in specific areas.

### *Facility Implications*

- Aging Infrastructure: A careful analysis of the major systems of aging facilities will need to be done and a repair/retrofit plan developed. As systems such as roofs age, deterioration accelerates with time, so repairs that are put off generally become more serious and costly.
- Life Cycle Management: Facilities of any age require a life cycle management plan to review the condition, and repair and replace systems within reasonable timeframes.
- Energy and Water Management: Fossil fuel costs will continue to increase and systems to reduce consumption need to be considered based on payback. These include roof solar panels, heat recovery systems and motion sensitive lighting. Buildings should be planned with appropriate LEED principles and supplementary energy sources such as solar and geothermal. Water use needs to be reduced in shower, toilet, pool and grounds/landscaping applications.
- Drop-in Elements: Fitness, aquatic and other elements should be designed to support drop-in use. This includes adequate size, proper space configurations and climates, and the visibility of spaces to the public.
- Rehabilitation and Chronic Disease Elements: In pools, the use of rapids channels and lanes for water walking, as well as water temperature and swirl-pools can contribute to rehabilitation programs. Fitness apparatus can be selected for adaptability to individual flexibility and disabilities.
- Active Transportation Connections: Ideally, walkway and bikeway connections should be made to indoor facilities. At a minimum, adequate bicycle parking and storage should be provided.

### **Park Implications**

- **Active Transportation Systems:** The development of greenways, bikeways and pathway systems, both within and connecting park areas, is a key priority for open spaces systems. These systems contribute to personal and environmental health.
- **Natural Area Management:** The stewardship of natural environments requires sound and sensitive management practices; many communities have developed natural areas and urban forest management plans.
- **Environmental Interpretation and Education:** Nature interpretation is no longer carried out in provincial parks, in spite of heightened public interest. Regional and local authorities may consider interpretive programs, signage, and environmental education programs and information.
- **Horticultural and other Parks Programs:** Recreation staff seldom include programs of this nature, and parks staff who have the expertise generally don't see this as part of their mandate. Working together, they can address a growing interest in gardening, plant selection, pruning and home landscaping basics.
- **Water Management:** The conservation and wise use of water needs to be infused into park operations, including automated irrigation systems and drought tolerant, native plant selection.
- **Sport Field Demands:** While there may be the need for additional sport fields in many areas, the actual demographic and user group trends need to be carefully examined. In many cases, improving the quality of existing outdoor fields or the construction of artificial turf fields may better meet the needs in an era of declining youth population.
- **Outdoor Gathering Places:** Many ethno-cultural groups place a premium on large gatherings, as do many organizations and communities for special events. Large group areas with adequate shelter and washrooms should be considered within parks systems.
- **Multi-use Youth Parks:** The most successful youth parks have enough elements that they attract a range of youth groups and interests. These elements may include a skateboard facility, sport courts and social gathering spaces.
- **Parks and Accessibility:** Most Canadians view parks as part of the "commons". There is an expectation that they will continue to have free access to parks and trails for individual use. The significant public reaction to parking charges in Provincial Parks is an indicator of these expectations. At the same time, people are more willing to pay for group uses of parks such as sport-field rental or private group events, as well as for specialized services such as camping. Care needs to be taken in the introduction of new charges for individual use and access to Regional and Community Parks.

### **3.7 Using Trends in Planning**

Trends are broad patterns of change in community demographics, attitudes and behaviours. They are not firm determinants of behaviour and individual preferences and patterns will continue to be important considerations in the planning and provision of leisure services.

The trends areas identified in this section are generally the most applicable to parks and recreation. Consideration should be given to including trends analysis in the Department's annual strategic planning process. The new data contained within the 2006 Census also needs to be reviewed when it becomes available in the spring of 2007 from Statistics Canada. Trends and demographic data are valuable supplements to more direct communication with user groups, community organizations and individuals when planning and providing programs, facilities and open spaces.

## 4. SYNTHESIS OF PUBLIC INPUT

### 4.1 Public Survey

In May of 2006 the consultants mailed 1,500 survey packages to randomly selected adults within the City. A small number (23) were returned by the post office as “undeliverable” indicating the targeted adult was no longer at that address. Of the 1,477 questionnaires that were received by prospective respondents, 707 completed returns were received by the cut-off day three weeks after the initial mailing.

The net sample size of 707 completed returns within a total adult City population of 43,000 is more than sufficient to reliably represent that population with a confidence level that exceeds industry standards. We are 95% confident that the survey results are within +/- 3.8% of what the population would answer if all residents were surveyed. Statistically speaking, that means that if the survey were repeated 20 times, all but one of them would be within 3.8% of the results of the first one.

The respondents were asked a series of demographic questions. The results of these questions show that the sample represents the demographic profile of the community quite closely, in that the gender, age, family composition and area of residency of the sample is similar to the profile of the general population. Answers to other parts of the questionnaire are summarized under the following headings.

**Perceived Benefits of Leisure Services:** Respondents perceive a great deal of value associated with public leisure services. When asked of the extent of their perceived benefit to their household only 4% indicated no benefit and over 60% indicated quite high levels of benefit. Younger respondents and those with dependent children in the household were more likely to indicate very high levels of benefit to their household.

When asked about the extent of the perceived benefit to the community even higher levels of value were indicated. Only 1.5% indicated no benefit and more than 69% indicated very high levels of benefit to the community. Females were more likely to indicate very high levels of community benefit, as were younger respondents.

This notion that public leisure services benefit the community even if they don't benefit one's own household is quite important. It supports the concept of “public good” which is often defined as “indirect benefit to all citizens regardless of direct benefit to each”. It also translates into a basis for setting priorities that is outlined in the next chapter.

Respondents were also asked to rank public services in terms of their importance to the household. The relative support for parks, recreation and cultural services was high (about 87% indicating important or very important) but not as high as other public services. The results are summarized in **Figure Twelve**.

**Figure Twelve**  
**Importance to Household of Public Service Categories**

Category of Public Service	Very Important	Important	Not Important	No Opinion
Streets and roads	70%	28%	1%	0%
Water and sewer	70	26	3	1
Recreation facilities	29	57	10	4
Public safety	85	14	1	1
Trails and parks	33	55	10	3

Figure Twelve shows that the vast majority of residents has public safety on their minds and believes it a very important public issue and service. It also shows that there is a small but clear minority that does not support public spending on parks, recreation or cultural services.

**Barriers to Use:** A minority of respondents (36%) indicated that nothing limited their household's use of recreation or cultural programs or services. The most important limitations were Lack of Time (30%), Program Times and Days (27%) and Cost (23%). There isn't much that the City can do about a citizen's lack of time, but this response does point to how leisure services might be packaged (e.g. more flexibly, and/or in smaller units).

The timing and cost limits are of concern. Both responses are higher than the consultants usually find to this question, indicating that they are significant issues. The City needs to find ways of reducing these important limitations. Younger respondents and those with dependent children in the household were more likely to indicate that cost was a barrier than others. This helps to focus the types of responses the City might entertain to reduce this barrier.

A much higher proportion (55%) indicated that nothing limited their use of parks and trails. This reflects the fact that parks are more broadly accessible by residents without concerns for scheduling of the parks service or a cost to visit a park or trail. Males were more likely than females to indicate no barriers to parks use, as were households without dependent children. The most important barriers to parks and trails use were Concerns for Personal Safety (30%) and Location Not Known (15%). Younger respondents and those living south of the highway were more likely to indicate that they didn't know the location of parks, while females were more likely to indicate that they were concerned about their personal safety.

Respondents were asked how the household found out about parks, recreation and cultural services and opportunities. The sources of information are summarized in **Figure Thirteen**.

**Figure Thirteen**  
**Sources of Information About Leisure Services**

Source of Information	Proportion of Sample
Local newspaper	75.6%
Seasonal Leisure Guide	68.2
Word of mouth	44.2
Recreation program flyers	39.6
Through activities at recreation centres	21.2
Notices through schools	15.0
City website	14.1
Online registration	5.7

Females were more likely than males to get information from the Seasonal Leisure Guide, as were residents north of the Lougheed Highway and households with dependent children.

**Satisfaction Levels with Existing Services:** All respondents were asked whether they believe current opportunities in Port Coquitlam are lacking, adequate or more than adequate. **Figure Fourteen** summarizes the answers to that question.

**Figure Fourteen  
Adequacy of Opportunities**

<b>Category of Leisure Service</b>	<b>Lacking</b>	<b>Adequate</b>	<b>More Than Adequate</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>
Fitness/Health	25%	51%	10%	14%
Performing Arts	34	32	5	29
Recreational Sports	17	57	9	18
Competitive Sports	16	45	8	31
Outdoor/Nature	15	54	19	12
Special Events	19	52	8	22
Visual Arts/Crafts	27	33	4	37

The results show that the areas most lacking (relative to other areas) are the Performing Arts and the Visual Arts. However, even in these areas more respondents feel they are adequate or more than adequate than feel they are lacking. The area in which opportunities are most abundant (relative to other areas) is recreational sports.

The survey then approached the issue of satisfaction from a different point of view. It asked all respondents to indicate their satisfaction with a series of indoor and outdoor amenities. Those answers are summarized in *Figure Fifteen*.

**Figure Fifteen  
Satisfaction Levels by Amenity**

<b>Amenity</b>	<b>Very Satisfied</b>	<b>Somewhat Satisfied</b>	<b>Somewhat Dissatisfied</b>	<b>Very Dissatisfied</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>
Parks/Greenspace	32%	53%	10%	3%	3%
Terry Fox Library	30	41	12	3	14
Bicycle/Pedestrian Routes	29	45	12	5	9
Indoor Pool	18	41	17	6	18
Sports Fields	17	43	14	5	21
Playgrounds	17	42	18	3	20
Ice Facilities	13	34	13	3	38
Recreation Centres	12	48	18	4	18
Seniors Centre	12	23	9	2	54
Health/Fitness Facilities	10	40	20	7	23
Tennis Courts	10	30	16	5	39
Outdoor Pools	8	29	24	8	31
Sports Courts	7	24	17	4	48
Lacrosse Boxes	7	21	13	4	55
Spray Pools/Water Parks	6	21	22	14	36
Youth Centres	5	20	13	7	55

As indicated, the highest levels of satisfaction are related to unstructured outdoor spaces such as parks/greenspaces and bicycle/pedestrian routes, followed by high satisfaction ratings for the library. There is majority satisfaction (i.e. either very or somewhat satisfied) for all amenities down the list to and including recreation centres. For amenities below this level, there are also very high levels of No Opinion, indicating a lack of knowledge about the adequacy of those amenities.

Finally, for those respondents who had taken part in a City sponsored leisure program or service, satisfaction levels were tested relating to that experience. Those responses are summarized in *Figure Sixteen*.

**Figure Sixteen**  
**Satisfaction Levels Associated with Using Leisure Services**

Aspect of Service	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know
Customer Service	23%	56%	9%	1%	12%
Registration Process	17	46	21	3	14
Program Quality	12	53	20	2	13
Program Fees	10	43	33	3	12

Again, the cost of accessing programs is an issue, as it is the lowest ranked item of satisfaction. Also, about one in five patrons had some concerns about the quality of the programming or the registration process. Satisfaction with customer service, however, appears to be quite high.

**Support for Infrastructure Expansion:** Local citizens support new or improved indoor and outdoor leisure service infrastructure, and they support parks and trails improvements more than indoor facilities. This is consistent with the fewer barriers they associate with the use of parks over facilities.

A total of 67.5% of respondents supported some form of new or improved parks or outdoor recreation facilities. Younger respondents and those with dependent children in the household were more likely to indicate such support than older citizens or households without dependent children. When those who supported improvements were asked which type of amenity, they listed a wide array of categories of improvements which are summarized in *Figure Seventeen*.

**Figure Seventeen**  
**Summary of Support for New or Improved Parks or Outdoor Facilities**

Type of Improvement Needed	Proportion of Those Indicating Improvements Needed
Spray Pool/Water Park	39.4%
Gardens/Horticultural Areas	28.8
Dog Off-Leash Areas	27.7
Outdoor Swimming Pools	27.1
Sports Fields	26.8
Neighbourhood Parks/Playgrounds	23.9
Trails	20.9
Sport Courts	17.3
Tennis Courts	15.0
Lacrosse Boxes	6.1
Skateboard Parks	4.9

Younger respondents were much more likely to indicate a need for new or improved sports fields and spray pools than older respondents, who were more likely to suggest support for gardens and horticultural areas. For all other amenities above, support was generally consistent across all demographic subgroups.

A total of 63.9% of respondents supported some form of new or improved recreation or cultural facilities. Younger respondents and those with dependent children in the household were more likely to indicate such support than older citizens or households without dependent children. Also, this is one of the rare situations where area of residency appears to influence opinions. Those living on the south side of Lougheed Highway were more likely to indicate a need for new facilities than those living north of the highway.

When those who supported improvements were asked which type of amenity, they listed a wide array of improvements which are summarized in **Figure Eighteen**.

**Figure Eighteen**  
**Summary of Support for New or Improved Parks or Outdoor Facilities**

Type of Improvement Needed	Proportion of Those Indicating Improvements Needed
Health/Fitness/Weight Training Area	40.7%
Indoor Pool	40.5
Ice surface	34.8
Arts/Cultural Facility	27.0
Seniors Centre	22.2
Youth Centre	19.0
Gymnasium	16.9
Preschool/Childrens' Program Area	11.9

Younger respondents were much more likely to suggest a need for new or improved indoor pool or ice surface than older respondents, who were more likely to indicate support for a seniors centre. Those on the south side of the highway were more likely to indicate a need for an indoor swimming pool than residents north of the highway. Households with dependent children were more likely to indicate a need for an indoor pool and ice surface than those without, and less likely to indicate a need for a seniors centre.

Those indicating a need for a new ice surface were then asked to specify the activities they would participate in if that type of facility were built. The results to that question are summarized in **Figure Nineteen**.

**Figure Nineteen  
Activities Desired in a New Ice Surface**

<b>Activities Responding Household Would Participate In</b>	<b>Proportion of Those Indicating Each Activity</b>
Public Skating	74.2%
Skating Lessons	39.9
Minor Hockey	29.2
Adult Hockey	27.0
Lacrosse	15.0
Ball Hockey	12.9
Figure Skating	11.2
Ringette	6.0

It is important to note that the above percentages can be misleading. They do not indicate that 74.2% of respondents would use a new arena for public skating; but that 74.2% of those that were asked the question would use it for that purpose. In fact, the 74.2% of those who would use a new arena for public skating equates to only 24% of all respondents. Similarly, those indicating use for minor hockey represent less than 10% of the sample households.

Those indicating that they supported new or improved facilities were then asked if they would support tax increases to help pay for them. Over 51% of that sub-sample responded positively to this and were then asked how much tax increase they would support. Most of the support was at the lowest levels of tax increase (in the \$30 per year range). This does not suggest significant support for tax increases for new or improved facilities.

**Financing Leisure Services:** Respondents were asked about their support for various options for improving parks, recreation or cultural services. Responses are summarized in *Figure Twenty*.

**Figure Twenty  
Support for Options to Improve Leisure Services**

<b>Options to Improve Services</b>	<b>Proportion of Those Indicating Support</b>
Seek corporate/private sponsorships	72%
Increase admission and membership fees	42
Increase facility rental charges	32
Raise property taxes	25
Reduce hours of operation	6

There is clearly more support for increasing user fees and rental charges than raising taxes. However, this contradicts previously identified high fees being a barrier to access. There is very little support for reducing service levels in facilities. Males are more likely than females to support user fee increases as are households without children.

**General Comments:** At the end of the questionnaire, all respondents were asked if there were any other comments they would like to make regarding parks, recreation and cultural services. Over forty percent took the

time to write in one or more comments. The comments were too wide ranging to be easily categorized, however, some of the most often referred to “themes” were as follows:

- Satisfaction with and support for what exists in terms of open space, facilities and services
- Dogs in parks - need for controls and off-leash areas
- Cost of accessing services – references to the high fees and how much this is a barrier to access
- Additional ice time, primarily for minor hockey
- Additional water based recreation – most comments related to more water parks
- Improved sports fields – especially soccer
- Concerns about safety – many references to drug dealing in parks and/or “unsavory” characters in parks
- Small town feeling – many positive references to the fact that there continues to be a “small town” feel to the community

## **4.2 Stakeholder Input**

The consultants engaged in discussions with sixty organized community groups. They had a wide array of constructive comments about what needs to be done to improve services. These comments are summarized in Appendix B. They are too varied to easily categorize or summarize, however, they were considered by the consultants in identifying and in further researching the issues.

## **4.3 Input from Public Forum**

The first public event was held on April 11<sup>th</sup>. Approximately 20 citizens attended. They provided a great deal of constructive input which is recorded in detail in Appendix A. Like the stakeholder input, the comments are quite varied and not easily categorized or summarized herein. However, they were used in identifying and in further researching the issues.

It should be noted that there is a great deal of consistency between how the public responded in the general survey and how they responded at the public event.

## **4.4 Public Open House**

A second public event was held on January 24<sup>th</sup>, and provided local residents with an opportunity to review and comment on the draft version of the report. The Open House was held at City Hall and included approximately 75 participants.

Comments related to recreation and cultural facilities; parks, open space and trails; and the delivery of services were recorded, and are included in Appendix D of the report.

Detailed information regarding the survey is included in Appendix C.

## 5. A BASIS FOR PLANNING

On April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2006 in a workshop involving City Council and senior City staff, a framework was established and confirmed for decision-making that will apply for this Master Plan and to other decisions the Parks and Recreation Department might make during the timeframe of the plan. The framework consists of a Mission Statement, a commitment to a Benefits Based Approach for the delivery of services, a series of Benefits that would act as objectives and a process for using them on an ongoing basis to support future decision making.

### 5.1 Mission Statement

**The City of Port Coquitlam is dedicated to meeting community needs for the benefit of all citizens through the provision of parks, recreation, athletics, arts, culture and fitness**

### 5.2 The Benefits Based Approach

The benefits based approach recognizes that public goods are focused on indirect benefit to all citizens rather than the direct benefit to those who make use of services. In other words, a City of Port Coquitlam public leisure service, in addition to providing direct benefit to users, must clearly demonstrate that there is some indirect benefit to the entire community, even if some community members haven't made use of or accessed the service.

This indirect benefit to all citizens, is sometimes called a "public good" and justifies public sector involvement in the delivery of the service, if such involvement is needed in order to ensure the indirect benefit or public good. This approach essentially sets up a cost/benefit framework in which decisions are focused on achieving the greatest amount of public good or indirect benefit at the least possible cost to local taxpayer.

### 5.3 The Benefits

The workshop participants agreed on two categories of benefits or goals.

#### 5.3.1 To use leisure services to foster a sense of community identity, spirit, pride and culture.

City sponsored parks, recreation and cultural services should be used as a vehicle to connect local citizens more positively to their community and enhance their sense of comfort with it. Where such initiatives require tax support, it will be considered in terms of the amount of public good created in relation to the cost to the taxpayers. The success of such initiatives will clearly benefit all citizens.

The City helps connect people to their community in a positive way. Community is a concept that exists on a variety of levels. One's community can be their neighbourhood or their city of residence. Or, it can be a community of interest that does not have geographic boundaries. In the case of Port Coquitlam, it also refers to the Tri-Cities sub region.

### **5.3.2 To use leisure services to foster growth of individuals to reach their full potential.**

City sponsored parks, recreation and cultural services help individuals to grow physically, emotionally, morally and creatively, and help them to be as good as they can be. Where tax support is needed to ensure such success, it will be considered within the cost/benefit framework referred to above. Healthier, more responsible citizens will be better contributors to community life, better leaders in the community, will require less social service, health service and justice service supports. As a result, there is clear benefit to the entire community.

## **5.4 Service Objectives**

The following service objectives are consistent with the two goals (benefits) described above. They may be considered as specific public leisure service categories for achieving the goals. All City sponsored parks, recreational or cultural initiatives directed toward achieving the two goals could be categorized under one or more of the objectives, or support other initiatives that do. Achieving any of these objectives results in both direct and indirect benefits. They contribute to the public good, economically, environmentally, personally and socially.

### **5.4.1 Sense of Community**

- **To Encourage Special Events and Celebrations**  
Special events (e.g. carnivals, fairs, tournaments) can contribute to a feeling of community identity and spirit. Therefore, the City should be involved in organizing special events and participating in events organized by others to the extent necessary to foster a sense of community identity, spirit, pride and culture.
- **To Support Local Groups**  
Local clubs, groups and agencies are and will continue to organize and sponsor leisure opportunities. This “people doing things for themselves” aspect of community life is socially worthwhile and desirable. The City should support such groups in their efforts to the extent necessary to achieve this good. Support may occur in a number of ways, including subsidized access to facilities, assistance in problem solving, or help with leadership training.
- **To Facilitate Spectator Experiences at Sporting Events**  
Community identity, spirit and culture can be fostered through the environment created by spectators at athletic events. In such events, sport can be closely linked with community identity and pride. Being a spectator can be informal as well as formal. It can be spectators at a lacrosse tournament or casual viewing of swim lessons. The City should play a role in ensuring such opportunities exist.
- **To Facilitate Spectator Experiences at Arts Events**  
Using the same logic as above, artistic endeavours (both performing and visual) represent one of the most significant aspects of developing a culture in any community. Through exposure to the arts, local residents should develop a better understanding and appreciation of their community and its cultural aspects.

- **To Facilitate Opportunities for Social Interaction**

Because social functions are a valuable vehicle to use in developing community cohesion and identity, the City should strive to ensure that such opportunities exist. Some, it might sponsor itself; others, it supports through a coordinating or referral role. Social functions can be both organized (e.g. a community dance or festival) or casual (e.g. a public lounge in the foyer of a Recreation Centre).

- **To Protect Natural and Historic Resources**

The protection of natural and aesthetic features, vistas, natural phenomena and features of historic significance, and the provision of public access to such features will contribute to a greater understanding of and pride in the community and, therefore, contribute to community growth. Natural parks or reserves are obvious vehicles for delivering this indirect benefit to all citizens whether or not they visit or use them.

- **To Beautify the Community**

The extent to which a community is seen by its residents as being visually pleasing is directly related to the potential for creating community identity, spirit and culture. Therefore, making a community more beautiful is a worthwhile social objective worthy of tax support. Landscaped gardens, entrances to the community, aesthetic features at important intersections and public art are all services that the City can justify delivering because they increase the quality of life for all citizens.

- **To Support Family Oriented Leisure Opportunities**

The family unit is an integral building block of community. The City should provide opportunities and support for families to pursue leisure as a family unit in a way that fosters family development. If families can be strengthened through recreation, the community becomes stronger.

- **To Integrate Generations and Sub Groups Within Our Community**

Community growth can be fostered through increased contact between people of varying age groups within the community. The more contact and interchange between seniors and younger adults and children, the greater the potential for community growth. Therefore, in the provision of leisure services, attempts should be made to provide such contact and interchange between seniors and younger residents with a view toward transmitting cultural heritage across the generations.

Community growth can further be fostered through the mixing of various ethnic groups so that each better understands and appreciates the difference and strengths of the other. Multicultural recreation and cultural services can be used as a vehicle in making the community more cohesive.

Community growth can also be fostered by integrating individuals with various special needs into mainstream programming. Regardless of the need, recreation and culture can be used as a leveling and integrative force.

## 5.4.2 Individual Citizen Growth

- **To Foster and Promote Fitness and Overall Well Being**

Fitness, in this context, is used broadly as a synonym for wellness, and refers to mental and emotional, as well as physical fitness. The City should provide fitness and wellness services for people at all levels of ability, from those who require specialized services to those who are very fit and able. A variety of proposed initiatives are already in place to assist in the promotion of health and wellness.

- **To Foster and Promote Pre-School Leisure Opportunities**

An opportunity should exist for every pre-school aged child to participate with other children in a variety of leisure experiences, in order to:

- Expose the child to social settings
- Foster gross motor development
- Provide a generally happy and satisfying atmosphere where growth can occur through play
- Teach basic safety skills and attitudes
- Celebrate their natural creative tendencies
- Understand and celebrate the differences between people at an early age

The City should be one of the players, providing leadership to ensure this happens.

- **To Foster and Promote Basic Leisure Skill Development in Leisure Pursuits for School Aged Children**

Working in partnership with the School District and other providers of service, the City of Port Coquitlam should provide opportunities for basic proficiency in a variety of leisure pursuits in such areas as sport, performing and visual arts, outdoor nature oriented skills, and hobbies, in order to:

- Provide exposure to skills which may form the basis for enjoying lifetime leisure activities
- Contribute to gross motor and fine motor physical development
- Provide social settings in which social, moral and emotional growth can be fostered
- Provide the basis for leisure education (i.e. the teachings of the benefits of and wise use of leisure time)
- Explore creative potential

Other agencies (e.g. the school system) may provide skill instruction in some areas, with the City filling the gaps.

- **To Foster and Promote Advanced Leisure Skill Development in Leisure Pursuits for School Aged Children**

Some opportunities should be provided for those children who wish to further develop their interest and skills in a wide variety of leisure pursuits beyond the basic level. The City will be one of the providers of such opportunities. While the City may have some responsibility to provide growth at all levels of ability it may decide that:

- As an athlete or artist progresses through various levels toward a professional level, the City's level of responsibility reduces
- A basic level of instruction is generally considered a higher priority public good than more advanced levels of instruction
- The City does not have the resources to provide advanced levels of skill development for all types of leisure services and might focus on only a few arts and sports areas

- **To Foster and Promote Social and Young Opportunities for Teens**

Teens are either school aged children or adults. So, in terms of skill development, they are captured through the above two service objectives and the subsequent two. However, the maturing from youth to adult that occurs during teenage years is often a critical time in the life of an individual.

It is also a time that individual difficulties may result in severe social problems. Hence, the City will provide opportunities for teens to:

- Learn about themselves and how they will react to various social settings and pressures
- Develop positive social/emotional/moral skills, principles and convictions
- Develop positive leisure lifestyle patterns that will remain with them through adulthood

- **To Foster and Promote Basic Leisure Skills in Leisure Pursuits for Adults**

The City should be a player in the provision of a range of opportunities for adults who wish to be exposed to such endeavours and learn basic skills in each.

- **To Foster and Promote Advanced Leisure Skills in Leisure Pursuits for Adults**

The City will also be involved in providing opportunities for those adults who wish to further develop beyond a basic proficiency level their interests or abilities in a variety of leisure pursuits.

- **To Foster and Promote Leisure Opportunities for Seniors**

People do not stop growing as citizens at a specific age. Opportunities should be provided by the City for senior citizens to participate in the leisure activities of their choice in order to:

- Maintain overall fitness levels
- Maintain social contacts and continue to be involved in social environments
- Provide a continuing sense of worth and meaning of life through continuing personal growth

- **To Interpret the Environment**

Opportunities should be provided for every local resident to learn about, understand, relate to and experience all aspects of his/her environment. Learning about human impacts on the environment

is also important. While the school system will teach much of this curriculum, it is also important for the parks system to educate all citizens about the environment.

- **To Foster Reflection and Escape from Urban Form**  
Often growth can occur through escape, reflection, contact with nature and relaxation in a natural environment. Because of this, opportunities should be provided for residents to experience nature within the City.
- **To Educate Individuals About Leisure Opportunities and about the Wise Use of Leisure Time**  
All residents should understand how available opportunities can contribute to public good and how participating in them can be valuable. They should also be aware of how best to use their leisure time.
- **To Foster Adequate Communication about Leisure Opportunities**  
A communication/information system should be established and maintained whereby all residents are made aware of the leisure opportunities that are available to them and how to gain access to leisure opportunities in the community.

In order to achieve the above, the City of Port Coquitlam will provide leadership and coordination where necessary. It will support others to provide services where they are well positioned to meet the public service objectives. It may also provide services directly where no other agency is able or willing to provide the service and the need is great. The City will also monitor the infrastructure necessary for success in achieving the above objectives.

## **5.5 Mandate/Decision Making Framework**

The previous four sections justify public sector involvement in the delivery of parks, recreation and cultural services on the basis that they are a social utility in the same way that fire, police and water services are a physical utility. Each of these indirectly benefits everyone in the community regardless of how much they use them directly. Each contributes to the greater good of the entire community.

It should be noted, however, that many of the service objectives can be achieved with little or no intervention or support from the City. If a park, recreation or cultural service is provided without public subsidy (i.e. the subscribers to the service pay the entire cost of the service, or if another agency subsidizes it) and is provided in such a way that there is still significant benefit to the community as a whole, then the service objectives have been achieved without the need for tax subsidy. The mandate of the Department is, therefore, to focus its resources on where they are most needed to realize the service objectives at the least possible cost to the taxpayers.

In implementing this approach to parks, recreation and cultural services, a proactive approach to leisure service delivery is assumed.

### **Recommendation #1**

The Department should adopt the following decision making framework:

- Operate within the philosophical foundation for the delivery of publicly sponsored public leisure services which is embodied in the Mission Statement and the two Goals (i.e. benefits headings). The Department's previous list of eleven Goals should be retained and incorporated with its list of Key Services.
- Adopt the twenty-one service objectives, which give meaning to and are consistent with the Mission and Goals, and provide direction for service delivery and accountability.
- Generally, accept responsibility for achieving the goals and objectives in the most cost-effective manner possible and within the bounds of limited available public resources.
- Monitor the provision of all parks, recreation and cultural services and activities available to residents of the City and determine which of the twenty-one objectives are being appropriately met with little or no public involvement or intervention.
- Where objectives are not being met by other service providers in the area, work with and support other public agencies and community groups where appropriate to ensure services are provided in a manner which will best meet the above-noted objectives.
- Where certain services cannot be operated by any other providers of service in a manner that will meet the objectives, even with public support as above, consider sponsoring those services directly.
- Be concerned at all times with obtaining the greatest amount of benefit at the least possible net cost to the taxpayer, and constantly engage in cost/benefit analysis.

## **5.6 Using the Benefits Based Approach**

One of the ways this approach can be used is to augment annual budgeting and business planning. The first step in an annual program of using the benefits based approach would be to catalogue the resources that are currently being used and show what kinds of benefits are being realized as a result. *Figure Twenty-One* is provided for that purpose.

**Figure Twenty-One**  
**Consultants' Assessment of Service Benefits –**  
**Illustrative Example**

		<b>Cost Centres and/or Service Centres in City's Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Budget</b>						
<b>Service Objective</b>		<b>Hyde Creek</b>	<b>PoCo Recreation Complex</b>	<b>Parks and Trails</b>	<b>Sports Fields</b>	<b>Cultural Services</b>	<b>Special Events</b>	<b>Community Development</b>
✓ – Major Focus								
✓ – Minor Focus								

Foster a Sense of Community								
1.	Special Events	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
2.	Support to Community Groups	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
3.	Spectator Sports	✓	✓		✓		✓	
4.	Spectator Arts	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
5.	Social Interaction	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
6.	Protecting Natural and Historic Resources			✓		✓		
7.	Beautify the Community			✓		✓		✓
8.	Family Leisure Services	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
9.	Mix and Integrate Sub Groups	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Foster Growth of the Individual								
10.	Fitness and Well Being	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
11.	Pre-school Opportunities	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
12.	Basic Skills for Children	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
13.	Advanced Skills for Children	✓	✓		✓	✓		
14.	Social Opportunities for Teens	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
15.	Basic Skills for Adults	✓	✓		✓	✓		
16.	Advanced Skills for Adults	✓	✓		✓	✓		
17.	Recreation for Seniors	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
18.	Interpret the Environment			✓		✓	✓	✓
19.	Reflection and Escape			✓		✓		
20.	Educate About Leisure	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
21.	Communication System	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓

In addition to the information in *Figure Twenty-One*, it would also be appropriate to discuss which of the objectives are being we served by other agencies or providers of service in the community. Just because the City isn't spending money to achieve a specific objective, doesn't mean it isn't being achieved. In fact, *Figure Twenty-One* could be recreated with columns for each of the other sectors in the community (e.g. the School District, GVRD Parks, service clubs, health services, private fitness centers etc.) showing the benefits that each is delivering to augment the City's efforts.

The staff could use a system similar to **Figure Twenty Two** to indicate major and minor focus. Or, they could use a numbering system to indicate where the City is currently realizing returns on its tax investment in a major, moderate or minor way.

Once each year staff would prepare a chart similar to the one above and provide it to the Parks and Recreation Committee of Council for its annual planning exercise. It would include a summary of costs and benefits as each column has a cost attached and each cell has a subjective indication of benefit. The Committee would review and discuss the results of the chart before proceeding to subsequent steps in the process. It might review each column and wonder why a specific service area is not focused on some objectives, but is focused on others. Or, it might review each line in the figure and wonder why there is so little effort or so much effort focused on a specific objective.

The second step would be to review and adjust the list of service objectives (i.e. benefits) for the following year. The Committee could add, modify or delete from the list of twenty-one objectives.

The Committee would then prioritize the benefits to determine where more can be done to achieve each. *Figure Twenty-Two* below is provided as a template for that process.

Each workshop participant would be given a specific number of priority votes. The column on the right represents the collective total of all these votes. The other column shows the top ranked priorities where the one with the highest number of votes is the highest priority.

**Figure Twenty-Two  
Service Objectives Which Most Need to be Improved**

<b>Foster Sense Of Community</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Priority Score</b>
1. Special Events and Celebrations		
2. Support of Local Groups		
3. Spectator Sports		
4. Spectator Arts		
5. Social Interaction		
6. Protecting Natural and Historic Resources		
7. Beautifying the City		
8. Family Leisure Services		
9. Integrate Sub-Groups		

  

<b>Foster Growth Of The Individual</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Priority Score</b>
10. Fitness and Well Being		
11. Pre-School Opportunities		
12. Basic Skills for Children		
13. Advanced Skills for Children		
14. Social Opportunities for Teens		
15. Basic Skills for Adults		
16. Advanced Skills for Adults		
17. Recreation for Seniors		
18. Interpret the Environment		
19. Reflection or Escape from Urban Form		
20. Educate about Leisure		
21. Ensure a Good Communication System		

The final step would be to render the City's activities more effective at meeting the twenty-one objectives, and more specifically, the highest priority service objectives. To do this, the Committee would review the inventory chart in *Figure Twenty-One* from each of the two axes independently.

To start, the separate rows of the chart, each representing a service objective, should be analyzed with a view toward more effective strategies for achieving each objective.

For example, the Committee might brainstorm new ideas for achieving a specific objective. Then it might estimate costs and benefits of each item on the list, prioritize them and implement only those that are the most cost effective.

At the end of the year an evaluation process would reveal success or lack thereof in achieving a specific objective. The costs of the strategies could then be weighed against the benefits, and adjusted during the following year to delete those that are least effective and where appropriate, new strategies would be implemented.

It would also be necessary to analyze each of the existing service centres that are assigned columns on the chart. The Committee might, for example, "discover" through the inventory process that a particular program or service was involved in a major way in achieving two objectives, in a moderate way in achieving three others, and in a minor way in achieving two more. With some thought it would be possible to develop low or no cost strategies for:

- Moving some of the modest or moderate symbols up to the major category
- Reducing costs of achieving the objectives
- Achieving new objectives with the same program

In the final step, all suggestions for developing or adjusting existing services would be developed into budget proposals showing their cost/benefit in terms of achieving objectives. The final budget review and approval process would also be based on this more structured cost/benefit approach.

## **5.7 Other Uses of the Decision Making Framework**

The framework could also be used in other ways. For example, in business planning, when priorities must be set between two capital projects, the set of service objectives can be used as a basis for a cost benefit analysis to determine which of the two projects will result in more public good in relation to the costs of the project. A table would be created with the list of twenty-one service objectives down the left hand side as in *Figure Twenty-One*. But there might be only two columns: one for each facility option. At the top of each column would be the facility project with the costs associated with it. Within the columns would be subjective assessments of the degree to which the project would deliver on each of the service objectives. If the objectives have been prioritized, that might help the analysis. Regardless, the result will show clearly which of the two projects will generate the greater magnitude of benefits and those can be cross-referenced to the costs.

Another use of the decision making framework could be a more general assessment of how well the Department is doing within each of the areas. For example, the consultants have prepared *Figure Twenty-Three*, which shows their assessment of the relative success of meeting the service objectives at the present time.

**Figure Twenty-Three  
Consultants' Assessment of Department's Services**

	Service Objective	Degree to Which Objective is Currently Being Met			Comments
		Sufficient Services to Meet Needs	More Could be Done	Very little is being done to meet needs	

<b>Foster a Sense of Community</b>					
1.	Special Events	X			While there is always room for improvement, the City has a wonderful array of special events at the present time. However, additional resources could be allocated to augment park staff for events.
2.	Support to Community Groups		X		The City provides great support to most groups, but there are some, particularly in the areas of arts and heritage, that need more.
3.	Spectator Sports		X		There are many opportunities for spectator events, but in the field and aquatic sports, there currently is room for improvement.
4.	Spectator Arts		X		The City has made progress in this area, but Phase II of Leigh Square is needed before needs are fully met.
5.	Social Interaction	X			There are many opportunities in parks and numerous social events.
6.	Protecting Natural and Historic Resources		X		The City protects significant resources, but should confirm protection of space around Traboulay PoCo Trail and its completion.
7.	Beautify the Community	X			Hanging baskets and garden areas are very popular.
8.	Family Leisure Services	X			There are many opportunities in parks and some in indoor spaces.
9.	Mix and Integrate Sub Groups			X	While some of this happens, more focus is definitely needed to ensure it happens more consistently.
<b>Foster Growth of the Individual</b>					
10.	Fitness and Well Being		X		Fitness opportunities are needed at Port Coquitlam Recreation Complex
11.	Pre-school Opport.	X			Significant opportunities in the City.
12.	Basic Skills for Children	X			Opportunities in sports have existed for many years, and opportunities in the arts are evolving well.

**Figure Twenty-Three (continued)  
Consultants' Assessment of Department's Services**

	Service Objective	Degree to Which Objective is Currently Being Met			Comments
		Sufficient Services to Meet Needs	More Could be Done	Very little is being done to meet needs	
13.	Advanced Skills for Children	X			Opportunities in sports have existed for many years, and opportunities in the arts are evolving well.
14.	Social Opportunities for Teens		X		Youth Centres provide an excellent service as does the new skatepark, but more can be done to ensure all youth are involved.
15.	Basic Skills for Adults	X			Opportunities and services are consistent with need.
16.	Advanced Skills for Adults	X			Opportunities and services are consistent with need.
17.	Recreation for Seniors	X			The Port Coquitlam Recreation Complex provides a superlative service for seniors and they are involved in mainstream services as well.
18.	Interpret the Environment	X			The City has capitalized on opportunities available on Traboulay PoCo Trail.
19.	Reflection and Escape	X			Many aspects of the parks system provide such respite from urban form.
20.	Educate About Leisure			X	There are numerous opportunities to do more in this area.
21.	Communication System	X			There is no evidence of any concerns regarding a lack of information about leisure opportunities.

According to the information in *Figure Twenty-Three*, the City does at least an adequate job on thirteen of the twenty-one service objectives. Some additional effort is needed for six more. The Department should look for opportunities to educate citizens about the wise use of leisure time and consciously look for ways to mix subsets of the local population in order that they are inclusive and celebrate diversity.

## **5.8 City Strategic Objectives**

The City also has a Corporate Strategic Plan which includes eight Strategic Objectives representing the overall priorities for the City's efforts and resources for the next ten years. Any decisions within the Parks and Recreation service delivery system must also consider how the decision supports these strategic priorities. They are listed below:

- Improve mobility and access
- Maintain and improve public infrastructure assets
- Build a complete community
- Enhance community safety
- Enhance customer service
- Build strategic alliances
- Maintain financial stability
- Build a strong organization

The objectives were approved by City Council in the spring of 2006, and are referred to in the consultant's discussion of each of the recommendations included in the report.

## 6. ISSUES

The consultants identified a number of issues that require analysis and direction. These have been categorized under the following headings: Recreation and Cultural Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space and Service Delivery.

### 6.1. Recreation and Cultural Infrastructure

The City's recreation and cultural infrastructure remained reasonably stable during the 1990's. There was some upgrading and enhancements to the Port Coquitlam Recreation Complex and Hyde Creek Recreation Centre to increase capacity for service, but there was very little in the way of new infrastructure provided.

With the approval of the *Cultural Policy and Plan* in 2001, a round of investment was triggered in cultural amenities. Leigh Square was upgraded and the first phase of the Leigh Square Community Arts Village is currently under construction. Although the Leigh Square project will be important in advancing cultural services in the community, considerable opportunities remain to incorporate cultural processes and elements in other aspects of the city's infrastructure, including community and public art in indoor and outdoor recreational facilities and parks.

During the current study, demand was expressed for a number of service improvements that would require investment in recreation or cultural infrastructure. Primary among them was more indoor ice, more indoor and outdoor pools and additional investments in cultural amenities. These are analyzed below.

#### 6.1.1 Additional Ice

The City currently operates two indoor regulation sized sheets of ice at the Port Coquitlam Recreation Complex. The City has operated the two sheets for many years and the total amount of ice time available has not changed for more than two decades. During that time, the City has grown substantially.

The following characteristics of ice use are important to understanding the total need for ice in Port Coquitlam.

- Port Coquitlam Minor Hockey is the largest ice user in the City. It currently has approximately 600 registered players ranging in age from 5 to 21 years. This number is less than the registration ten years ago even though the total number of residents in that age group is currently much larger than it was at that time. This decline is not unique to Port Coquitlam. Minor Hockey registration in BC has declined about 8% over the past five years.
- The total number of school aged residents in Port Coquitlam is projected to fall over the next ten years, further reducing the pool of potential minor hockey players.
- When other minor sports and adult hockey registrations are added, the total number of organized ice sport users in Port Coquitlam approaches approximately 1,000. These users are assigned the vast majority of the capacity available in the two ice surfaces.
- The remaining use is comprised primarily of school groups (usually during school hours) and the general public (primarily during public skating sessions and a number of other skating programs).
- Overall, total ice use in Port Coquitlam has remained relatively stable for many years. The consultants were advised that the total amount of late night ice use and early morning ice use has

decreased somewhat from high levels over a decade ago, but all prime time is completely full and has been fully used for more than ten years.

- Some ice user groups cannot get all of the ice they need within the two existing ice sheets and must go outside of the City to make up the shortfall. In recent years Port Coquitlam Minor Hockey has rented roughly 28 hours per week outside of the City. This makes up about one quarter of its total requirements.
- It is also important to note that the local Junior Hockey team has recently left the community, thereby freeing up six hours of ice time per week for other uses. This reduces the need for additional local capacity.

The Parks and Recreation Department has researched the need for more ice and has developed a plan for additional ice capacity to be added to the Port Coquitlam Recreation Complex. It calls for either a full sized ice pad or a sheet of leisure ice. The Department's recommendation to Council is to develop a sheet of leisure ice. The recommendation is based on the assumption that if all leisure uses were transferred from the two existing sheets, it would free up sufficient capacity to "bring home" ice time that minor hockey currently utilizes at arenas in Pitt Meadows and Coquitlam.

Minor hockey is on record as saying that if it could get access to about 18 hours of ice on a new ice sheet as well as an additional 15 hours of "freed up" capacity on the two regulation sized ice sheets, it could operate its program completely within the City and no longer have to rent ice in surrounding communities.

If a new ice sheet were provided at the Port Coquitlam Recreation Complex, and if 18 to 20 hours were allocated to Minor Hockey for its use, there would still be a great deal of capacity to be used by non sport participants.

In the City's list of unfunded capital projects, there is a \$7.6 million project to add a new ice sheet to the Port Coquitlam Recreation Complex. (This figure requires verification as costs have been increasing dramatically in recent years.)

The consultants have toured the Port Coquitlam Recreation Complex site, and concluded that it has relatively little capacity for adding much more indoor space. The consultants believe that an ice sheet would likely take up some of the existing parking area and create potential conflicts in overall site operation.

It is also worth noting that in the public survey:

- A lack of facilities was a barrier to household participation patterns in only ten percent of households
- Only 35% of the respondents who supported new or improved indoor recreation facilities, felt that a new ice surface was a priority
- If a new ice surface were provided, the highest potential use by far was for public skating (74% of respondents) followed by skating lessons (40%)
- One of the frequent comments was the complaint from minor hockey households regarding travel outside the community to participate in the sport

The survey results tend to verify that a new ice surface is not a particularly high priority but that if one is built, a leisure sheet of ice may be preferable to a regulation sized ice sheet. It is the consultants' opinion that a new ice surface is not needed in the immediate future. As a result, it is suggested that this topic be reviewed in five years to determine (1) the impact of demographic changes in Port Coquitlam, and (2) the need for additional ice and the most appropriate type of facility for the community.

### **Recommendation #2**

- Develop a new ice surface on the site of the Port Coquitlam Recreation Complex toward the end of this plan if it can be verified that there is sufficient room on the site to accommodate the required expansion to the building footprint.
- Address the type of ice surface required (leisure ice versus a regulation sheet of ice) at the time the proposed facility is being planned.

### **Rationale**

If a new ice surface were developed on the site it would provide additional capacity to locally serve minor hockey users that currently have to travel outside the community to substandard facilities. It would also provide leisure skating and instructional capacity to hopefully encourage additional residents to skate. Providing facilities within walking and cycling distances not only reduces pollutants resulting from the use of cars but from a local health perspective it encourages non-motorized movement which will ultimately assist in addressing concerns related to health.

### **Relationship to City's Objectives**

A new ice module at the Port Coquitlam Recreation Complex would help the City to address two of its eight Strategic Objectives, namely #3 (Build a Complete Community) and #5 (Enhance Customer Service).

The new facility would also help to meet ten of the Service Objectives summarized in *Figure Twenty-One*, including special events and celebrations, social interaction, family leisure services, integrating community sub-groups, fitness and wellbeing, pre-school opportunities, basic skills for school aged citizens and adults, social opportunities for teens, and recreation opportunities for seniors.

## **6.1.2 Additional Aquatic Facilities**

### **Indoor Pools**

Port Coquitlam currently has one indoor pool located at its Hyde Creek Recreation Centre. The pool, which was expanded and upgraded in 1995, now has a rectangular tank and a leisure tank and has total annual capacity for approximately 300,000 swims per year<sup>1</sup> in all seven categories of aquatic service including:

- Recreational swimming (for fun)
- Swim instruction (to learn skills)
- Sport training
- Fitness (both lane swimming and water based aerobics classes)
- Special events and competitions

---

<sup>1</sup> Typically capacity is directly related to water surface area, but it also varies also with depth. A pool with approximately 5000 square feet of water surface would be able to accommodate about 300,000 swims in a 5000 hour operating year if it were full most hours. "Full" would vary with the type of use, but the rate of 60,000 swims per 1000 square feet of water surface area (75% of it less than 5 feet deep) would apply to a pool expected to provide a mix of all seven categories of aquatics service.

- Rehabilitation and therapy
- Leadership training

Current use of the facility is difficult to measure accurately, but is estimated to be approximately 200,000 swims per year. The total number of swims has increased in recent years and now represents a situation where prime time hours are operating at or near capacity while non-prime time hours have a significant amount of excess capacity.

The 200,000 swims represents about 3.5 swims per capita which is at the low end of the range for most urban centres (most communities in the GVRD would have swim rates between 3.5 and 6 swims per capita). That likely means that some Port Coquitlam residents are swimming in indoor pools in surrounding communities, such as Coquitlam's City Centre Aquatic Centre.

The notion that there may be a need for additional indoor pool capacity comes primarily from the public survey, where it tied for first as the most needed new or improved recreation facility. Also, the local summer swim club indicated a need for additional training time (although its primary need is for a better, larger outdoor pool). The need for a new indoor pool was felt more in the south half of the City than in the north half where the existing pool is located.

The need for a new indoor pool may be impacted in the future by increasing residential population to the north and east in Coquitlam and the opening of a new bridge connecting north Coquitlam to north Port Coquitlam. However, there may also be an impact on Hyde Creek as the Poirier Pool replacement is opened in 2007. This facility could pull users from Coquitlam's City Centre Aquatic Centre and that freed up capacity could draw users from Port Coquitlam.

If additional indoor pool capacity were to be developed in Port Coquitlam, the characteristics of the new capacity would likely be as follows:

- A new pool would be developed on the south side of the City rather than trying to add capacity at Hyde Creek, in order to provide equity of access to indoor aquatic services.
- The best location for this type of facility would be at the Port Coquitlam Recreation Complex. However, there is not sufficient room on that site to locate both a new skating surface and a new indoor pool.
- The new pool would likely have two tanks to provide the widest possible range of swimming. One tank would be rectangular in nature and would be used for fitness class and lane swimming, swim club sport training, competitions and special events, leadership training and swim skill instruction. The other would be used for recreational swimming and therapeutic/rehabilitation uses.
- Such a new facility would cost (in 2006 dollars) a minimum of \$12 - \$14 million and a possibly up to \$18 million for a short course rectangular pool and more than \$20 million if the rectangular pool were 50 meters in length.
- A new indoor pool would not be used to full capacity in the short term, however, the community would "grow" into it. In fact, a new pool would have sufficient capacity that it would not likely be completely full even at the City's maximum size of 80,000 allowable under the current Official Community Plan. That means that it will never operate at its most cost effective level, which for an indoor pool, is quite important. The consultants estimate that if a new pool the size of the Hyde Creek facility were developed in the short term in the south side of the City, it would likely attract 100,000 to 150,000 uses and would operate at a deficit of approximately \$700,000 to \$800,000 annually.

### **Recommendation #3**

- **#3a** - Delay the development of any indoor pool capacity for at least ten years. (It should be noted that usage should be monitored so that this situation can be reviewed if behaviour patterns change or if residents from Coquitlam start using the existing pool in greater numbers.)

### **Rationale**

In the next five to ten years, not building a new indoor pool will force existing demand into the unused off-peak hours at Hyde Creek, thereby making it more cost effective (i.e. lower net public subsidy per swim) than it is currently, while building a new pool would substantially increase the net public subsidy per average swim in the community.

It is prudent to wait to observe the impact of the new pool in Coquitlam and the new bridge connecting Coquitlam to Port Coquitlam before any decision about new indoor pool capacity is made. The use of Hyde Creek by Coquitlam residents should be monitored in the next few years and significant changes reported to Council.

### **Relationship to City and Departmental Objectives**

Not building a new indoor pool will not achieve any of the Service Objectives as there will be no increase in service levels for indoor swimming. However, not building a new indoor pool for at least the next five to ten years will help to achieve the City's seventh Strategic Objective which is to Maintain Financial Stability.

### **Outdoor Pools**

The City currently operates two outdoor swimming pools: Centennial Pool built in 1958 on the north side of the City, and Robert Hope Pool built in 1967 on the south side. Both are used for about 12 weeks each summer. Centennial Pool has a single six lane twenty-five meter tank. It is used mostly for recreational swimming and for summer swim club training and swim meets. Robert Hope is a six lane 25 yard pool used for recreational swimming with a small amount of swim club practice time.

There are also two other outdoor aquatic amenities in Port Coquitlam: Routley Wading Pool in the south half of the City and Sun Valley wading and spray pool in the north.

As *Figure-Twenty Four* shows, most of these facilities are not well used.

**Figure Twenty-Four  
Swims by Pool in 2005**

<b>Pool</b>	<b>2005 Swims</b>
Centennial Pool	4806
Robert Hope Pool	4962
Routley Pool	4910
Sun Valley Pool	12,290
Total Swims	26,968

Anecdotal evidence suggests that the use of Centennial and Robert Hope pools has declined over the past decade, but the Sun Valley pool has experienced high levels of use associated with its splash park.

Outdoor pools are expensive to operate as the water needs to be treated and filtered and a high level of staff is required.

The summer swim club currently has about 115 members. They train indoors for a part of the year but primarily train at Centennial during the summer months. The club is on record as desiring a 50m outdoor pool so that it could have more training time and a much better competition pool.

**Recommendation #3 (cont'd)**

- **#3b** - Continue to operate Centennial Pool for the next ten years before any decision is made about its redevelopment or closure. (As there are problems with the deterioration of the change room building, it needs to be assessed as soon as possible and measures taken to keep it functional for at least ten years.)
- **#3c** - Replace Routley Pool and Robert Hope Pool with a single splash park on a high profile location in the south central part of the City. One option for such a site would be Castle Park.
- **#3d** - Develop a new splash park/washroom at Lions Park. It may be that this amenity could be financed at least in part through an amenity funding agreement with the developer of an adjacent site.
- **#3e** - Consider retrofits at Sun Valley over time to enhance the existing splash park and phase out the wading pool.

**Rationale**

With the resultant four pools (Sun Valley in the extreme north, Centennial in the north but easily accessible to the south, a new splash park in Lions Park in the south but easily accessible in the north, and a new splash park in the south central area - potentially at Castle park) the City would have good coverage in terms of outdoor pools. The new splash parks would be much better used than the existing rectangular pools and wading pools, and could operate much more cost effectively.

### ***Relationship to City and Department Objectives***

New spray pools would contribute significantly to the City's Strategic Objectives #3 which is to Build Complete Communities and Objective #5 which is to Improve Customer Service. Replacing wading and outdoor pools with splash parks will result in savings which will also contribute to Objective #7 which is to Maintain Financial Stability.

Due to the popularity of splash parks, (39.4% of survey respondents cited spray pools / water parks in the preference study) they will help to achieve several of the Department's service objectives including Social Interaction, Family Leisure Services, Fitness and Well Being, and Pre-School Opportunities.

### **6.1.3 Improvements to Library Space**

The Terry Fox Library is the only public library in Port Coquitlam. It is part of the Fraser Valley Regional Library system of 24 libraries and falls under the direction of the FVRL Board. The Parks and Recreation Department serves as the City's liaison, and provides a number of services to the Library. In 2005, the Library had approximately 190,000 visits and over 405,000 items borrowed; nearly half (27,431) of Port Coquitlam residents are card holders. The size of the library is approximately 15,000 sq. ft.

Built in 1983, and affected by increasingly heavy use, the quality and functionality of the Library's interior spaces are substandard and limiting to patrons. The carpeting, wall surfaces, work areas and furnishings need to be updated. The functional layout is not efficient and the facility lacks family seating areas. To address these and other issues, the City has embarked on a two phase retrofit project. Phase One will relocate the existing offices, staff room and information services workroom to the area now occupied by the meeting/program rooms. The office and work areas will be converted to usable public space.

Phase Two is intended to re-locate and re-design the circulation services work area, re-arrange shelving, and improve the information services point and public computer lab. Consideration should also be given to improving the display units for the Terry Fox memorabilia to museum quality. The Phase Two project is clearly needed to improve the functionality of the existing space, improve traffic flow and sightlines, and create better public and work spaces.

The central issue is whether the two phases will provide adequate library space for the future. The only provincial standard for public libraries was identified in 1978 by the Library Services Branch at 0.5 sq. ft. per capita. With an estimated 2006 population of 58,345, Port Coquitlam would be short of that standard as its space equals only about .27 sq. ft. per capita. A number of library systems often espouse a higher standard identified by Dahlgren in 1998; this calls for a "minimum" of 0.6 sq. ft. per capita up to an "ideal" per capita ratio of 1.0 sq. ft. At the "minimum" standard, a 15,000 sq. ft. library, such as the Terry Fox, would be expected to serve a population of 25,000. Using standards as the primary rationale would mean that Port Coquitlam should be considering a second branch library in the near future to meet current population demands.

The use of set standards for facility types is decreasing, and being replaced by community-based needs analysis. As the Port Coquitlam population grows, however, a second branch library of 15,000 to 20,000 sq. ft. will be required at some point.

In the consultants' opinion, the retrofits to Terry Fox are the priority and should provide adequate additional functional space for at least the next five to ten years. The meeting/program rooms that are lost in the renovation could be replaced with the use of community facilities, including those proposed for addition to the adjacent Port Coquitlam Recreation Complex and some new spaces at the Gates Park Fieldhouse.

At the point in time when additional library space is required, it will be very difficult to expand the Terry Fox facility. The current site leaves little space to add on at grade level, and while the original building was apparently

designed to add a second floor at some point, it would be technically difficult and expensive to do so. This means that additional library space may need to be created at a different location in the future, ideally in the north half of the City.

#### ***Recommendation #4***

- Proceed with Phase Two renovations and improvements to the Terry Fox Library as a first priority. Re-evaluate the need for significant expansion of library space in 2011 or later.

#### ***Rationale***

The next few years will be used to evaluate the impacts of the space made available in the two phases of renovation, and rapid changes in how information is used and distributed. If additional library space is required, the Branch should ideally be located in the north area of Port Coquitlam to provide better geographical coverage. In any case, a new branch library will not be opened within the ten year horizon of this current Plan.

The Phase One and Two renovations to the Terry Fox Library are badly needed to improve the quality and functionality of public and work spaces. The Library has an outreach perspective and programs can be held at a variety of other community locations, including the new multi-purpose spaces proposed for the Port Coquitlam Recreation Complex. The improvement of maintenance services and an annual Capital Improvement Fund will ensure the ongoing quality of the Library spaces. Once the impact of these renovated spaces has been determined over the next ten years, an evaluation of future library spaces could be undertaken.

#### ***Relation to City and Department Objectives***

The Phase Two project addresses three of the City's eight Strategic Objectives: #2 (Maintain and Improve Infrastructure Assets), #3 (Build a Complete Community), and #5 (Enhance Customer Service).

The Library project also directly supports two of the Department's Service Objectives, including educating individuals about available leisure opportunities and about the use of leisure time, and fostering adequate communication about leisure opportunities. However, a library is justified by its ability to realize public goods other than those identified for recreation services. Its priority, therefore, may be significantly higher than is indicated herein.

#### **6.1.4 Additional Fitness, Multipurpose and Wilson Centre Space**

In the north half of the City, there is an excellent fitness centre associated with the Hyde Creek Recreation Centre. It is used to a high proportion of its capacity even though it has not been added to in recent years. In peak times, there is little or no excess capacity in that facility. There is also anecdotal evidence (from Hyde Creek staff) that the users of the space are more likely to be residents of the north half of the City than the south half.

The programming spaces in the Port Coquitlam Recreation Complex are used to full capacity. There are times when demand outstrips the ability of the centre to accommodate activities and programs. This is particularly true for the Wilson Senior Centre. Use of dry floor spaces at the facility has been increasing over the past decade. More space is needed to keep up with the demand for from patrons. At present, there is a very small youth drop in centre. Additional space is needed to provide a more complete service for youth and seniors. Also, the Mabbett Room is limited in terms of access as there is no elevator to this second floor amenity.

All of the above points to a significant need for additional dry floor space at the facility. To respond to this need the Department developed a plan in 2005 for a second storey addition. It would have an elevator to ensure equity of access to existing areas, as well as new fitness and multipurpose spaces. Additions would complement and possibly reconfigure the Mabbett Room, and would add more space for youth services, additional multipurpose program space and a fitness centre comparable to the fitness room at Hyde Creek, as well as serve growing seniors programs.

The proposal for a dry floor expansion is currently unfunded in the City's 2007 Business Plan, and has a capital cost estimate of about \$4.1 million. The consultants have reviewed this estimate and revised it to \$5 million in 2007 dollars.

In the public survey, additional fitness spaces were the most desired new additions to recreation facilities. During interviews, and in subsequent discussions, the Wilson Centre Senior Advisory Committee expressed a strong desire for more multipurpose space to augment programs for their clientele. As planning takes place related to the improvement and expansion of the centre, further consultation with all patrons, and the seniors in particular, will be very important.

#### **Recommendation #5**

- Develop new spaces at the Port Coquitlam Recreation Complex for the Wilson Centre as well as fitness, youth and multi purpose rooms.

#### **Rationale**

The currently unfunded project is an excellent response to the needs identified in this study. The operating implications are minimal as the resulting spaces are relatively effective in terms of cost recovery.

The project would provide much needed new space and service potential at a reasonable capital cost without creating a high operating liability. The new spaces would be supported by the public and would round out the services available at the complex. They would also increase equity in provision on the two sides of the Lougheed Highway.

#### **Relation to City and Departmental Objectives**

New fitness, youth services and multipurpose spaces at the Port Coquitlam Recreation Complex would contribute to 5 of the City's Strategic Objectives including #1 (Mobility and Access), #2 (Maintain and Improve Infrastructure), #3 (Build a Complete Community), #5 (Enhance Customer Service) and #4 (Maintain Financial Stability).

It would also contribute to ten of the Departmental Service Objectives including support for local groups, social interaction, integrating sub-groups, fitness and well being, pre-school leisure opportunities, skill development for school aged children, skill development for adults, and recreation opportunities for seniors.

### **6.1.5 Upgrades to Terry Fox Theatre**

The Terry Fox Theatre was built at Terry Fox Secondary School in the mid-1990s with funding from both the City and School District No. 43, as well as from other sources. The theatre is owned by the School District and operated on its behalf by a recently reorganized not-for-profit society, the Terry Fox Theatre Advisory Group (TAG). The theatre is one of three theatres built in the 1990s in Port Coquitlam, Coquitlam, and Port Moody in place of the single, large facility originally proposed to serve all three communities. The Terry Fox Theatre is the only one of the three owned by the School District.

During the development of the 2001 Cultural Policy and Plan, community user groups identified a number of deficiencies in the theatre. These were reiterated during discussions with community groups in 2006. User groups have stated that the theatre would benefit from an acoustical upgrade; the creation of a larger lobby, concession, box office, and loading area; and the construction of a better physical separation from the school. Because these concerns have not been addressed, they reduce the quality of audience experiences while hampering the theatre in reaching its full potential.

While the theatre possesses a number of highly positive attributes, some performing arts groups tend to avoid using it, citing poor acoustics (for soft orchestral music, choral music, and vocals), operational inefficiencies (due to a poor loading area and lack of a physical separation from the school), and reduced revenue generation opportunities (due to the small size of the lobby and the lack of a concession). Addressing these deficiencies would enhance experiences for both audience and performers and broaden the type of programming available in the community.

The capital cost to address these issues is likely in the range of \$1 to \$1.5 million based on 2006 estimates. With such significant costs, it may require phasing, with acoustics a first priority (10% of project cost), lobby additions and school separation a second priority in conjunction with a concession (60% to 70% of the cost), and a loading dock as a third priority (20% to 30% of the cost). These upgrades would not increase operating costs. Indeed, a larger lobby and a purpose-built concession have the capacity to increase revenues.

Because the City participated in funding the construction of the facility, there is an agreement in place with the School District that enables the City to assign rental slots to community organizations. City staff members have indicated that insofar as there is a resurgence of interest in the performing arts at Terry Fox, the school is interested in acquiring more time in the theatre for school use. This may be at the expense of community use. Although the loss of public rental opportunities might have a negative effect on the cultural life of the community, such a development would likely minimize the City's potential for involvement in facilitating physical upgrades to the theatre. Should a new joint use agreement be concluded between the City and the School District, the potential for the City to participate in upgrades to the theatre would remain.

The City's current agreement with the School District requires the latter to undertake capital improvements to the facility. A renegotiated agreement could result in a new framework to address such improvements. The City might, for example, agree to assist monetarily in return for greater public access to the facility, or to act in a facilitative role to secure "outside" funding to upgrade the building (e.g. from senior levels of government, local service clubs, and other sources). Alternatively, the relevant clause might remain unaltered, with the School District perhaps turning to TAG to address physical upgrades to the theatre. TAG, however, is hard pressed just to operate the facility, let alone to raise capital for its improvement.

**Recommendation #6**

- Renegotiate its agreement with School District No. 43 to ensure continued community access to the Terry Fox Theatre.
- Work in a facilitative role with the School District and the theatre operator to secure funding for upgrades to the facility.

**Rationale**

Upgrades to the Terry Fox Theatre are needed to enhance both audience and performers' experiences, to broaden the type of programming presented in the theatre, to correct operational inefficiencies, and to increase revenue generation opportunities. Given the City's initial involvement in funding its construction and its ongoing role in facilitating access by community groups, it is appropriate for the City to assist in improving the facility.

**Relationship to City and Department Objectives**

Facilitating upgrades to the Terry Fox Theatre addresses four of the City's Strategic Objectives: #2 (Maintaining and Improving Infrastructure Assets), #3 (Building a Complete Community), #5 (Enhancing Customer Service), and #6 (Building Strategic Alliances).

Two of the Department's own service objectives would also be addressed including providing support to local groups, and facilitating spectator experiences at arts events.

**6.1.6 Phase Two of Leigh Square Community Arts Village**

Port Coquitlam's arts and heritage organizations are highly supportive of the City's 2001 *Cultural Policy and Plan* and are particularly pleased that Phase One of the Leigh Square Arts Village is proceeding. Several groups will be active partners in the use of Phase One. There is considerable support for moving forward with Phase Two within the shell of, or on the site of the current Elks Hall, as activities such as major exhibitions of visual arts and the presentation of moderately sized informal performances will not be possible in Phase One.

The development of facilities for the arts was a key recommendation of the Cultural Policy and Plan adopted by the City in 2001. Since that time, the City has undertaken a more detailed analysis of its arts facility needs, developed an architectural space program, developed construction drawings and specifications, secured funding, and tendered the construction of Phase One of the Leigh Square Arts Village. Construction of the facility was well underway at the time of the public consultations held in conjunction with the preparation of the current plan.

Extensive public consultation in its planning process indicated that Phase One of the Community Arts Village should not be programmed in the same way as a traditional recreation or arts facility. Rather than offer services through direct service delivery (e.g. pre-determined instructional programs for which people would register), it was determined that the facility should be operated using the community cultural development approach adopted by the City for these services. This approach is fully consistent with the philosophical direction established in the 2001 *Cultural Policy and Plan*.

If the City is to proceed with Phase Two of the Leigh Square Community Arts Village it will first have to purchase the Elks Hall. The Port Coquitlam's Elks organization, however, has received "a shot in the arm" recently as a result of Leigh Square being upgraded. Discussions should be held with the Elks to determine their interest in either selling their property or participating in its redevelopment, with the city, in a public private partnership. The cost of acquiring and

renovating the building for use as an arts facility, as proposed in the November 2004 study, *Building the Arts: Leigh Square*, is currently \$2,340,000 (based on the 2005 assessment). Additional annual operating deficit is likely to be significant, and could be in the area of \$85,000. Redeveloping the site through a P3 arrangement could reduce costs and provide appropriate space for both the Elks and the City, with residential and/or professional space potentially subsidizing the costs of purchase and construction.

### **Recommendation #7**

- Proceed with Phase Two of Leigh Square Community Arts Village, but as a long term initiative given the other capital priorities in the Plan.

### **Rationale**

The Elks Hall occupies a key space on Leigh Square and the Arts Village will not be complete, either functionally or visually, until such time as the building is acquired and renovated as envisioned by the City. There are no alternative buildings or building sites adjacent to the square and acquiring a site elsewhere would be inefficient and counterproductive.

Not proceeding with Phase Two of the Leigh Square Community Arts Village will put pressure on Phase One to be operated in a way that it was never planned, designed, or funded to be. There may be pressure for the City to move more in the direction of direct service delivery in the arts. Although direct service delivery may have a place within the City's arts services, there is general agreement that community cultural development is the preferred approach.

### **Relationship to City and Department Objectives**

Proceeding with Phase Two of the City's Art Village will address two of the City's Strategic Objectives: #3 (Build a Complete Community) and #6 (Build Strategic Alliances).

Ten of the Department's own service objectives would also be addressed, including support to community groups, facilitating spectator experiences at arts events, beautifying the community, facilitating family leisure experiences, preschool recreation opportunities, both basic and advanced skills for children and adults and recreation for seniors.

## **6.2 Parks and Public Open Space**

Over the 17 years since the last Parks and Recreation Master Plan, the main components of Port Coquitlam's parks system have been set in place. With growth in the system and with the pace of development across the community, it is timely to consider not only the current key issues but also the long term parks and open space challenges, as well as opportunities to integrate cultural processes and elements, such as integrated arts, community art, and public art into their development. This section of the Master Plan provides an assessment of the parks system and brings forward key issues that need to be addressed over the next 10 years and beyond.

This assessment focuses on three significant open space components:

- Parkland to Meet Future Needs
- Connectivity
- Parks Contributing to a Sense of Community

## **Issues Related to Parkland to Meet Future Needs**

The 1988 Parks and Recreation Master Plan provided a classification system and series of standards based on the number of hectares per 1000 population. Over the last 17 years the parks system has grown along with community population growth. As a result, the amount of total parkland per 1000 people has declined by approximately 4.94% overall. Given the anticipated growth in population to 75 – 80,000 people over the next 25 years and the limited availability of land for park acquisition, the deficit of parks space needs to be addressed by ensuring that the security, quality and programming of parks space is optimized.

In order to meet current and future parkland needs, planning, management and maintenance activities need to address the following 5 issues:

- Securing parkland
- Classification and standards
- Athletic fields
- Enhancing City Parks
- Upgrading neighbourhood parks

### **6.2.1 Secure Parkland**

Securing adequate land for future parks is one of the major challenges a growing city like Port Coquitlam faces. Lands for parks are rarely available for long, let alone at affordable terms. As time passes, opportunities for land acquisitions decrease and costs increase. The resources required to address growth pressures that are facing the community need to also accommodate active and passive park needs for current and future residents.

A key organizational and workplace trend that was previously identified in this plan is the growth of internal partnerships within municipalities. Closer relationships between Parks and Recreation, Police, Planning and Engineering Departments in the development of greenways and active transportation systems typically result in coordination of objectives, land acquisition, planning and infrastructure development. Optimizing these partnerships will be even more important as parkland requirements and enhancements are balanced with those of other departments in the organization.

The *Greenway Plan*, adopted by Council in 1999, was a visionary document that brought forward proposed land acquisitions that would have significantly increased the City's biodiversity and potential for recreational trails. This is a significant initiative that needs to be completed. In the meantime, development and transportation pressures are compromising the ability of the plan to meet its intended environmental, recreation and open space objectives. The current plan to use "greenways lands" that fall within the "Dominion Triangle" area for flood management purposes is a good example of how the integrity of the greenways system could be compromised.

Through the course of the parks system's growth over the last 20 years, there are significant zoning, designation and dedication anomalies that have arisen and need to be addressed in order for the short term management and long term integrity of the City's parks system to be sustained. For example, some parks are designated as park but the land is zoned for uses other than park. In other situations parks are zoned but not identified in the OCP as a designated park.

Addressing these anomalies and implementing the Greenway Plan are the most important parks planning priorities facing the Department at this time.

**Recommendation #8**

- Complete the review of all park lands in the community to determine appropriate zoning, designation or dedication changes, and address the anomalies through zoning and parks bylaw amendments.
- Re-commit to the acquisition of those lands identified in the Greenway Plan that are still available.
- Integrate the goals of the Greenway Plan with those of other City departments where overlap of program goals and/or land requirements exist.

**Rationale**

This is a crucial issue that warrants dedicated effort by the Department. Given the pace of development and amount of parkland that has been brought into the system over the last 10 years, and the recurring loss of potential parkland and environmentally sensitive areas, addressing this initiative is imperative.

**Relationship to City and Department Objectives**

Properly securing parkland will address two of the City's Strategic Objectives: #1 (Improve Mobility and Access) and #3 (Build a Complete Community).

It will also help to meet several of the Department's service objectives: protecting natural resources, interpreting the environment and fostering reflection and escape from the urban form.

**6.2.2 Complete Parks Classification System and Update Maintenance Standards**

Figure Twenty-Five shows existing park areas per 1000 population. For comparison purposes, the useful measure is shown on the bottom row. Due to population growth, the amount of park area/1000 has declined by 4.94% since 1990.

**Figure Twenty-Five  
Parks Area per 1000 Population**

	1990	2006	Change (ha/1000)	Change of ha/1000 (%)
<b>Total Population</b>	<b>34500</b>	<b>57000</b>		
Neighbourhood Parks (ha/1000)		0.58		
City Wide Parks (ha/1000)		0.56		
City Athletic Parks (ha/1000)		0.59		
Trails & Open Spaces (ha/1000)		0.22		
Natural Parks (ha/1000)		1.96		
<b>Total Parklands (ha/1000)</b>	<b>4.11</b>	<b>3.92</b>	<b>-0.19</b>	<b>-4.94%</b>

Standards provide a longitudinal measure of how the system has changed over time and give a framework for land acquisition and management decisions. Standards alone, however, do not reflect the full picture. For example, for the purposes of this Master Plan, all the parks across the community were analyzed using a 5 minute walking radius - approximately 400 metres for a healthy adult. That analysis revealed that, in general, the community is well covered with parks that residents can walk to within 5 minutes. The exception is the Riverwood (Dominion Triangle) area, parts of the Glenwood area and the area east of Broadway and west of Kingsway.

With the advent of habitat conservation, the growing importance of biodiversity, and the increasing use of trails and walkways, the need to include and specify trails and open space areas in a new classification system has never been greater.

A parks classification and standards system that dovetails with the management and maintenance of the parks system is not currently in place. Although a complaints tracking and work order system exists, the maintenance standards, level of service requirements, scheduling, responsibility and monitoring of parks services have not been formalized.

**Figure Twenty-Six  
Inventory of Parks and Open Space in 1990 and 2006**

	1990	2006	Increase (ha)	Increase (%)
Neighbourhood Parks (ha)	24.9	33.2		
City Wide Parks (ha)		31.7		
City Recreation Parks (ha)	31.0			
City Athletic Parks (ha)	15.0	33.7		
Trails & Open Spaces (ha)		12.8		
Natural Parks (ha)	71.0	111.7		
Total Parkland (not including natural parks) (ha)	70.9	111.4		
Total Parklands (ha)	171.9	223.1	51.2	22.9%

The five types of parks within the recommended Parks Classification System are listed below. A brief description of each park type follows:

- **City Wide Parks**

These are passive and active park spaces that will serve the community as a whole. Although they also perform a neighbourhood parks function for those who live within a 5 minute walk, their primary purpose is to provide city-wide parks services and venues for park activities that will attract residents from across the City.

Standard: 1.0 ha/1000 population

Lions Park, Gates Park, Shaughnessy Park, and Veterans Park are examples of City Wide Parks.

- **Neighbourhood Parks**

Neighbourhood parks are smaller active and passive parks that meet the needs of residents within approximately 400 metres.

Standard: 1.4 ha/1000 population

Central Park, Blakeburn Park, and Routley Park are examples of Neighbourhood Parks.

- **City Athletic Parks**

These are parks that accommodate athletic activities such as soccer, baseball, tennis or lacrosse. They will also serve as Neighbourhood Parks for residents who live within 400 metres, but their primary purpose is to provide outdoor sports facilities that need to be serviced by parking, washrooms and other amenities.

Standard: 0.75 ha/1000 population

McLean Park, Cedar Drive Park, and Gates Park are examples of City Athletic Parks.

- **Trails and Open Space**

Trails and Open Space are a fundamental component of the City's parks system as they provide pedestrian and cycle linkages around and through the community, and also create places for quiet contemplation.

Standard: Conventional standards for this type of park space do not exist. Trails and Open Space should be based on strategies and plans that incorporate the specific opportunities and requirements in Port Coquitlam. The Master Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan, for example, provides a vision and site specific recommendations for on and off-street routes and trails.

Traboulay PoCo Trail, Brown Creek Trail, Port Coquitlam Cemetery, and Granny Smith Park are examples of Trails and Open Space.

- **Natural Parks**

Natural Parks are places that provide habitat and biodiversity values and ecosystem functions. They can also accommodate, in certain circumstances, passive recreation such as walking and hiking. If biking and dog walking are to be allowed in these areas, management controls will typically be required.

Standard: Conventional standards for natural areas do not exist. Environmentally Sensitive Area Plans, the Environmental Greenway Plan and other management tools should be used to identify, map and manage Natural Parks.

Hyde Creek Nature Reserve, Kilmer Park, and Wellington Park are examples of Natural Parks.

***Recommendation #9***

- Complete Parks Classification System and Update Maintenance Standards.

This should include formalizing park maintenance standards, life cycles and scheduling, and integrate this information with the automated work order system into a comprehensive Parks Maintenance Management System; as well as horticultural, facility and amenity maintenance standards, an updated park inventory and a maintenance management plan linked to a schedule.

## ***Rationale***

For cities like Port Coquitlam that are largely built-out, activity-specific strategies and management plans that utilize a standards based framework are effective ways to ensure adequate parkland is planned and designed. Implementing these standards through the Greenways Plan and other land acquisitions will meet the needs of the growing neighborhoods in the Downtown and Riverside areas.

## ***Relationship to City and Department Objectives***

Updated parks classification and standards will address two of the City's Strategic Objectives: #2 (Maintaining and Improving Infrastructure Assets), and #3 (Building a Complete Community).

Parks meet most of the Department's Service Objectives in a major way including special events, support to community groups, spectator sports and arts, social interaction, protecting natural resources, beautifying the city, family recreation, mixing sub-groups, fitness and wellbeing, pre-school opportunities, basic and advanced skills for children and adults, social opportunities for youth, recreation for seniors, interpreting the environment, reflection and escape, and education about the wise use of leisure time.

### **6.2.3 Improve Athletic Fields, Diamonds and Pitches**

An Athletic Field Strategy was prepared by Yates, Thorn and Associates in 2001. It projected a slowing demand for field sports and the population's proportion of school aged children, and focused on upgrading existing playing surfaces to meet needs instead of creating new parks. The Yates Thorn Report recommended a new artificial turf field at Aggie Park. Many, but not all, of the recommendations have been completed.

Although outdoor user group registrations have essentially flattened over the last 6 years (e.g. minor soccer currently has almost 1900 registered players), staff and user groups often struggle to find appropriate surfaces for practice and game play. Given the demographic trends, it is expected that this will be a short to medium term condition.

At present there are 33.7 ha of Athletic Parks in the City. This equates to 0.59 ha/1000 people.

It is also worth noting that in the public survey there was:

- Nearly 27% support for new or improved sports fields
- 17% indicated support for sports courts
- 15% for tennis courts
- 6.1% for lacrosse boxes
- 4.9% for skateboard parks

While the quality of some of the playing surfaces have been improved, additional upgrading is required, including:

- Some ball diamonds have poor drainage and have become too small for modern equipment and improved player's skills, which have grown beyond the design of standard baseball diamonds, backstops and dugouts.
- The City has responded to concerns about the quality of school fields by assuming responsibility for maintenance at some middle and senior school grounds. However, there are still school sites

operated by the School District that have sub-standard playing surfaces. This is not only a quality of play issue, but could be a risk management issue.

- In the past, the City encouraged sport groups to become stewards of their facilities and become more involved in management decisions. Minor soccer responded with the provision of a storage facility and the City has upgraded the Minnehada School site.
- The City's program of sport field redevelopment has slowed due to increased construction costs and historical under-funding, leaving significant parts of the original Sport Field Strategy still to be implemented.
- The extent to which changes to the British Columbia Soccer Association (BCSA) guidelines will affect the City's athletic fields system is yet to be determined. The BCSA regulates field sizes and the number of players per team who are 12 years old or younger; for other groups, FIFA guidelines apply and remain unchanged. The changes and their possible implications for City fields include:
  - U-12 and U-11 Divisions will have the number of players reduced from 11 per team to 8 per team. Increased demand for fields may result due to the potential increase in the number of teams.
  - U-12 and U-11 Divisions will play on smaller fields of 75m x 55m. Since the maximum dimensions for adult soccer fields are 120m x 90m, it will still not be possible to simultaneously play two U-12 or U11 games on one field.

#### **Recommendation #10**

- **#10a** – Continue to improve Athletic Fields, Diamonds and Pitches and Upgrade the Athletic Field Strategy.
- **#10b** - Commit the funding necessary to upgrade aging infrastructure such as drainage, fencing, sand based fields and backstops at sites including Thompson Park, Evergreen Park, McLean Park and Central Park.
- **#10c** – Construct one artificial turf surface.
- **#10d** – Secure funding for replacement of the existing artificial field surface to ensure its ongoing stability.

#### **Rationale**

Over the next 10 years, the number of field users may slow or even decline. However, expectations for good playing surfaces are high at the moment and consequently safe and playable surfaces are required.

As the parks system matures and is fine tuned, a range of outdoor fields and high quality, affordable hard court surfaces is a fundamental component of the City's infrastructure. As other urban infrastructure is renewed and future funding from senior governments becomes available, outdoor play surfaces and playing field facilities will need to be included.

### ***Relationship to City and Department Objectives***

More public access to fields, diamonds, courts and pitches addresses two of the City's Strategic Objectives: #2 (Maintaining and Improving Infrastructure Assets), and #3 (Building a Complete Community).

Nine of the Department's own service objectives would also be addressed, including fostering special events and celebrations, providing support to local groups, facilitating spectator experiences at sports events, fostering fitness and wellbeing, basic and advanced skills for school aged children, basic and advanced skills for adults, and recreation opportunities for seniors.

### **6.2.4 Enhancing City Wide Parks**

In order to meet current demands for services within City Wide Parks, enhancements are required that will optimize the ability of these areas to meet the needs of the community as a whole. As stated previously, residents that live within approximately 400 meters of these major parks will also use them as neighbourhood parks. Consequently, in those areas where neighbourhood parks are deficient and additional land is not available, such as in the Downtown area or Glenwood neighbourhood, the City Wide Parks need to be upgraded to meet the needs of the local residents as well as for the community as a whole.

At present, the total area of City Wide Parks is 31.7 hectares, or 0.56 ha/1000 people.

The following parks are City Wide Parks:

- Lions Park
- Castle Park
- Blakeburn Lagoons
- Leigh Square
- Veteran's Park
- Shaughnessy Park (Park needs to be developed)
- Marshall Lobb Park (Park needs to be developed)

Veteran's Park has been upgraded, is well maintained and is very well used. No significant changes are required or anticipated in this park over the next 10 years.

Leigh Square has been addressed in other aspects of this Plan. This area serves as a focal point in the City's parks and open space system. It is the primary gathering and community celebration space for Port Coquitlam. Its management, use and re-design (if any) should support the need for a place where the community can gather, listen, observe and celebrate.

Shaughnessy Park, Lions Park, Marshall Lobb Park, and Blakeburn Lagoons Parks are City Wide Parks that warrant design, development and/or re-development resources through the tenure of this Plan.

### **Recommendation #11**

Universal design principles should be incorporated into the planning and development of all parks. The maxim: "Design for the old and you include the young, design for the young and you exclude the old" should inform all new and re-developed parks, including City Recreation Areas.

Enhance city wide parks:

- **#11a** - Shaughnessy Park - This park will be a significant improvement to the open space and outdoor recreation opportunities in the City. The development plan should be implemented in a continuous series of phased improvements until it is completed.
- **#11b** - Lions Park – This park is crucial to the northern part of the downtown area and will be especially important when in-fill and re-development occurs north of the underpass and in the area adjacent to the park. An overall re-development plan is required which addresses CSA standards for playgrounds and new play areas. Consideration should be given to including a spray park (see recommendation 3d regarding Lions Park).
- **#11c** - Blakeburn Lagoons – This park has significant potential to enhance the range of natural history and ecosystem interpretation opportunities available to Port Coquitlam residents. The plan developed for this park should be executed in phases during the mid-through-long term.
- **#11d** – Marshall Lobb Park – This park is adjacent to the south side of downtown and should be incorporated into the development plan when the City sells these lands.

### **Rationale**

Lions Park is a "flagship" of the City's parks and once Shaughnessy Park is developed it will form another cornerstone of the system. Even so, the amount of City Wide park area will still be under the target of 1.0ha/1000. Improving the quality of these parks, in the absence of land available to increase quantity is an effective option.

The increased pressures on Lions Park - due to population increases in the Downtown area - justify a continued commitment to upgrading this site.

### **Relationship to City and Department Objectives**

Increased use, utility and access to City Wide Parks address two of the City's Strategic Objectives: #2 (Maintaining and Improving Infrastructure Assets), and #3 (Building a Complete Community).

Nine of the Department's service objectives would be addressed, including fostering special events and celebrations, social interaction, beautifying the City, family recreation, mixing subgroups within the community, fostering fitness and wellbeing, recreation opportunities for seniors, interpreting the environment, and respite from urban form.

## 6.2.5 Upgrade Neighbourhood Parks

The amount of neighbourhood park space in Port Coquitlam's system remains below the standard adopted in 1990. At that time, the standard for Neighbourhood Parks was 1.6 ha/1000 population. Currently, the area of Neighbourhood Parks is 0.58 ha/1000, which is still well below the current target of 1.4 ha/1000.

Although there are 33.2 hectares of neighbourhood parks in the City, some of the sites acquired in previous decades are located on lands "left over" after development has occurred. Fortress Park and Coutts Park are good examples of this issue. Unfortunately, this is a common problem across the region that is exacerbated by little or no design or programming of the parks after the land is acquired. Some parks have fallen into this realm and have become isolated "green deserts," disconnected from the existing matrix of park sites.

Furthermore, some of the original park components have either been superseded by new needs, no longer meet current standards or require infrastructure maintenance. Tot lots with older playground equipment, changing demographics and drainage issues are good examples of this condition. A chronic condition of underfunding for neighbourhood park upgrading in the capital budget process has hampered efforts to improve this situation.

Demographic changes and trends in the delivery of parks and recreation that will affect the manner in which neighbourhood parks are designed and re-developed include:

- The aging population
- Trends toward less strenuous physical activities
- Increasing diversity and the need for outdoor gathering places
- Trend towards more individualized and informal activities
- Inter-departmental partnering
- Accessibility and the advent of universal design

The public survey provided clear direction regarding Neighbourhood Parks. Over 67% of respondents supported new or improved parks or outdoor recreation facilities.

**Neighbourhood Park Improvement Priority Setting Criteria:** As the Master Plan recommendations are implemented and work programs defined, it will be necessary to set priorities. Upgrading Neighbourhood Parks has been a part of the Department's work program and capital budget – a commitment of resources that should continue throughout the duration of the Plan. The following criteria should be used in the application of the recommendations for Neighbourhood Parks Upgrading.

**System/Organizational Criteria:** When developing work programs and capital budgets, the following criteria should generally apply to prioritized projects:

- Meet City Strategic Objectives
- Improving the Department "Benefits" Objectives
- Are included in Parks Master Plans (e.g.: Shaughnessy Park Master Plan or Cemetery Master Plan)
- Are included in Parks "Strategies" (e.g.: Skateboard Opportunities Spectrum or Field Strategy)
- Address regional priorities (Biodiversity Action Plan or Livable Region Strategic Plan)

**Site/Service Criteria:** Specific improvements should generally be prioritized that:

- Address safety issues
- Move towards standards/regulation compliance (e.g.: CSA Playground Standards)
- Protect/sustain infrastructure assets (e.g.: drainage, fencing, walkways, buildings)
- Enhance service delivery equity (application of universal design principles)
- Enhance biodiversity/ecosystem function
- Enhance operational efficiencies
- Enhance quality of service for the timeframe of the Plan, including the following ranked criteria:
  - Elements/changes that enhance park use
  - Enhance walking/cycling opportunities
  - Horticultural enhancements
  - Water play opportunities (e.g. spray parks)
  - Elements/changes that service seniors (e.g. shade trees, benches, outdoor game boards)
  - Community gathering places (e.g. community gardens, picnic areas, family tables)
  - Multi-use sport courts (e.g. basketball, ball hockey, tennis, etc)
  - Elements/changes that service youth (e.g. range of skateboarding opportunities, "playground" equipment for young teens)
  - Elements that better reflect the changed demographics of a specific neighbourhood

In those circumstances where neighbourhood parks are acquired during development, clear criteria for the park, its intended audience, purpose, programming and design should be addressed during the development process. New developments in the downtown core - and across the community - need to accommodate a range of unstructured, passive use opportunities in the neighbourhood parks but also along the streets, sidewalks, greenways and other components within the public realm. This will require integration of objectives with other City Departments.

**Recommendation #12**

- Incorporate the needs of the disabled, children and the elderly in all parks and infrastructure improvements, utilizing universal design principles.
- Apply the above criteria to the improvement of the quality of recreation in Neighbourhood Parks in order to meet the needs that might otherwise not be met with the acquisition and development of additional sites.
- Develop criteria for public use and access to City owned properties that are to be used as Neighbourhood Parks. ("Off site" infrastructure improvements, streetscape amenities and improvements to City Wide and Neighbourhood Parks nearby should also be incorporated into the development projects.)

## ***Rationale***

The public survey cited 26% of residents who felt neighbourhood parks should be a priority. Given the amount of land they occupy, their present under-utilization, and the challenge in acquiring new lands, makes the care, attention and resources required to upgrade these parks a worthwhile expenditure.

Neighbourhood parks provide unstructured, "close by," recreation opportunities that will address unstructured recreation trends as well as serving an aging and more diverse population.

## ***Relationship to City and Department Objectives***

Enhancements to a number of neighbourhood parks address two of the City's Strategic Objectives: #2 (Maintaining and Improving Infrastructure Assets), and #3 (Building a Complete Community).

Eight of the Department's service objectives would also be addressed including social interaction, beautifying the City, family leisure services, integrating sub-groups, preschool leisure opportunities, social opportunities for teens, recreation for seniors, and reflection and escape from urban form.

## **Issues Related to Connectivity**

In the previous group of five issues (6.2.1 to 6.2.5), recommendations were brought forward to ensure there is adequate parkland for future generations and that the current needs of the community are addressed through improvement of the existing parklands. This section of the plan addresses the need to connect opportunities for cycling and walking in Port Coquitlam.

Trends that will have implications on walking and cycling opportunities in the community include:

- Movement away from strenuous sports and towards walking and cycling
- Shifts from organized, formal recreation to less formal and more individualized activities
- Wellness and chronic disease: addressing an increasingly overweight population and providing recreation opportunities for those recovering from injury and illness will mean that trails and connections of varying degrees of difficulty are required
- Children and youth inactivity is a worrisome trend that will have significant effects on future population health

The Public Survey, as part of the Master Plan process, highlighted several issues and areas of emphasis that relate directly to connectivity:

- Nearly 21% of the community believe trails improvement is needed
- Nearly 88% of the community believes trails are important or very important recreation opportunities

Four planning initiatives have been completed that have direct application to connectivity of pedestrian and cycling in Port Coquitlam. The findings of these plans, their vision and implementation recommendations will be very useful in the coming years. They include:

- The Northeast Sector Greenways Plan (GVRD, 2000)
- The Master Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan (Hamilton and Associates, 2005)

- The Downtown Plan '98 (Aplin and Martin Consultants Ltd, 1998)
- Upgrading Traboulay PoCo trail (1998)

Connectivity around and through the community is addressed in the Trails and Open Space component of the Parks Classification and Inventory system. At the present time there are approximately 12.8 hectares of land that fall within the Trails and Open Space component.

Two primary issues frame the discussion of connectivity within the context of Port Coquitlam's Parks system. These issues are discussed below.

### **6.2.6 Complete Upgrade of Traboulay PoCo Trail**

The Traboulay PoCo Trail forms a 25 kilometre necklace of green and vibrant activity around the community which few other cities in BC enjoy. Recreation activities along this trail have proven very successful, and although not yet fully upgraded, the trail offers multiple commuter and recreation opportunities. Trail users have not been counted, nor have their preferences, use patterns or concerns about the trail ever been surveyed.

Lands adjacent to the trail are essential buffers to adjacent uses and often extend the utility of the trail well outside the narrow footprint of its traveled portions. These buffer lands are also, in many cases, important habitat, the biodiversity of which enhances the livability for people, and the flora and fauna of the City.

Two primary issues need to be addressed in order for the Traboulay/PoCo trail to meet the needs of the community. In the first instance, the trail is not entirely upgraded. Given the existing and anticipated use of the trail, improved connections to adjacent roads, new washrooms and improved access are required. Secondly, a balance between the engineering and recreational needs of the trail and adjacent lands is needed. Recent plans to redevelop portions of the trail (raising the dyke) to protect against flooding could have a significant negative impact on the trail and its use. As well, plans in the Dominion Triangle area to breach the dyke and the trail would significantly impact its use in this part of Port Coquitlam. Recognition that the value of the trail is not just as a narrow walking and cycling corridor, but as a much broader buffer and conservation habitat corridor is required.

#### **Recommendation #13**

- **#13a** – Complete upgrade of Traboulay PoCo Trail.
- **#13b** – Construct washrooms and parking lot at DeBoville Slough.

#### **Rationale**

The Traboulay PoCo Trail must not be taken for granted. It is a crucial contributor to the sense of place and livability of the City and as time passes, the presence, care and stewardship of this resource will be that much more important. Increased access points as well as ongoing upgrading have been shown to increase the use of trails systems.

### ***Relationship to City and Department Objectives***

Enhancements to the City's trail systems will address three of the City's Strategic Objectives: #1 (Improving Mobility, #2 (Maintaining and Improving Infrastructure Assets), and #3 (Building a Complete Community).

Nine of the Department's Service objectives would also be addressed: social interaction, protection of natural and historic resources, beautify the community, family leisure services, integrate sub-groups, fitness and wellbeing, recreation for seniors, interpreting the environment, and reflection and escape from urban form.

### **6.2.7 Enhance Walking and Cycling Opportunities**

The City has embarked on several significant planning initiatives to enhance walking and cycling across the community. *Bicycle Facility Guidelines* were prepared by Urban Systems in June 2004, to address cycling design elements, signage on low volume roadways, curb lanes and road markers for shared bicycle lanes, and paved shoulders in rural areas of the City. This was a component of the *City of Port Coquitlam Master Transportation Plan*.

In 2005, Hamilton and Associates, in association with Perry + Associates, undertook the draft *Master Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan*. This is a plan and long-term strategy aimed at increasing alternative modes of transportation within the City, both for commuting and recreation. It includes roadway networks, transit services, pedestrian systems and cycling facilities. The plan was intended to integrate on-street and off-street routes and pathways, and leverage its utility as a framework for connectivity. As an added benefit, pedestrian and cycle friendly routes, enhanced with street trees and landscaped areas, seating, public art and other physical and aesthetic improvements will significantly increase livability in Port Coquitlam's downtown core.

These existing planning documents emphasize the importance of commuter and recreational trail routes that link to transportation systems outside the community, and the need to strengthen them through improved infrastructure. The Department is responsible for the "off-road" trails within the *Master Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan*.

Wellness, chronic disease and inactivity in children are relatively new trends that need to be addressed in these plans. Parks and Recreation Departments cannot assume full responsibility for dealing with these issues, but there are key roles, services and facilities that can be provided which will assist when considering these matters. Trends and demographics that link to walking and cycling opportunities in Port Coquitlam include:

- New trail development consistently ranks at or near the top of public surveys
- Walking and cycling are inexpensive, informal activities that can be enjoyed by a family unit
- Obesity rates tripled for children between 1981 and 1996
- Increasing inter-departmental and inter-agency partnerships

### **Recommendation #14**

Enhance Walking and Cycling Opportunities by:

- **#14a** - Undertaking conceptual route planning in conjunction with the Engineering Department, for specified priority routes, including costs estimates, as part of the Master Pedestrian and Cycling Plan.
- **#14b** - Formalizing an action plan for the Department's program for off-street trail construction and/or upgrading in the short, medium and long term capital budgets.
- **#14c** - Partnering with other City Departments and School District No.43 to create a pedestrian access to schools program, including pedestrian and cycling safety enhancements for elementary school children.

### **Rationale**

Linkages have been made between non-motorized movement and healthy communities, especially among children. Although further research in the application of the research is required, we do know that the more a population walks and cycles, generally the healthier it is. Addressing the non-motorized movement of people across the community ties directly to trends addressing obesity and unhealthy weights.

Walking and cycling opportunities exist across the community, not just on trails and in parks. Enhancing the capacity for residents to move in and through the community using non-motorized "green links" is an initiative that will become increasingly important over the next 10 years. Using the Master Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan as a vehicle through which green infrastructure such as the urban forest can be enhanced, would be an important contribution to the City's long term livability.

Monitoring users, user preferences and use patterns of pedestrians and cyclists will enhance the ability to ensure infrastructure resources are targeted and effective.

### **Relationship to City and Department Objectives**

Making the city more accessible for walkers and cyclists addresses two of the City's Strategic Objectives: #1 (Improving Mobility), and #3 (Building a Complete Community). Six of the Department's Service Objectives would also be addressed including social interaction, family leisure services, fitness and well being, recreation for seniors, interpreting the environment, and reflection and escape from urban form.

### **Issues Relating to Parks Contributing to a Sense of Community**

The parks, trails, natural areas and other open spaces help define neighbourhoods and are important contributors to the sense of community in Port Coquitlam. The personal and informal use of these spaces gives individuals a sense of their home and their community. When groups, teams, neighbourhoods and the community gather, a greater sense of community is further enhanced. Whether it be for Canada Day celebrations, family picnics or sports tournaments, the parks system provides both the "front porch" and the "rec room" in a community. In some instances, it is also the contemplative, memorial and civic space as well. As noted in the city's *Cultural Policy and Plan*, opportunities exist

throughout the parks system to increase community connections through integrated arts, public art, and community art initiatives.

This section of the Master Plan focuses on the way Port Coquitlam's parks system can be enhanced as a vehicle for community development; and as a way in which the individual and collective experience can be enriched.

The following trends need to be considered within this section of the Master Plan:

- Environmental Activation
- Growing Sense of Stewardship
- Increasing Interest in the Environment

A more diverse population, an aging population, and the pending increased density in the Downtown Area need to be taken into account. The items outlined below provide a framework for this discussion:

- Managing for Biodiversity
- Improved Downtown Parks
- Enhanced system-wide park elements and activities
- Riverfront Access
- Sustaining the Cemetery's financial viability and long-term capacity

### **6.2.8 Manage for Biodiversity**

Currently, Natural Parks within the Port Coquitlam parks system total 111.7 hectares (1.96 ha/1000 Population). The City's natural areas, when combined with habitats along the three rivers and lands within adjacent regional and city open space systems, create a matrix of habitats that are not only important for wildlife, but also provide important ecosystem "services." These natural areas augment storm-water management and ground water recharge, trap dust and other pollutants, sequester carbon, offset urban heating, shade us from ultra violet rays, and provide a host of other functions beneficial to the community. Management of these areas, as well as other open spaces within the community that fall under the Department's responsibility is a crucial function.

The urban forest is made up of individual back-yard trees, street trees, remnant groves and dense forest stands that occur in all types of open spaces across the community. With development, the loss of trees and changes to the urban forest can have dramatic effects on the aesthetics and the perception of a community. The urban forest is dynamic, and just like any growing entity requires planning, design and management.

A "no pesticides" departmental policy is in place that prohibits the use of pesticides in parks, but an integrated pest management program that responds to recent legislative changes is not in place.

Invasive species are one of the primary threats to biodiversity in the region and no less so in Port Coquitlam. A program to limit their spread and ultimately eradicate their presence is required.

The Hyde Creek Nature Reserve is a 55 hectare jewel in the system of natural areas in the City. It is one of many "natural" landscapes that contribute to the City's biodiversity. An inventory of all the lands within Port Coquitlam that contribute to biodiversity, including their present status, importance and management is required.

### **Recommendation #15**

Manage for Biodiversity by:

- **#15a** - Creating an Urban Forest Management Plan in the short to mid-term period, including:
  - A digital inventory of existing street trees and other elements of the urban forest
  - A long range urban forest vision
  - Annual planting targets
  - Management objectives
  - Pruning and maintenance schedules
  - Capital and operating budgets
- **#15b** - Supporting the Engineering Department in the creation of an Integrated Pest Management Program;
- **#15c** - Creating an Invasive Species Control Program, including the role of volunteers
- **#15d** - Adopting biodiversity enhancement programs for the Hyde Creek Nature Reserve and other significant natural areas and sensitive ecosystems in Port Coquitlam. The role of stewardship groups and other volunteers needs to be emphasized in these programs.

### **Rationale**

Biodiversity is an increasingly important aspect of parks management, planning and maintenance. Enhancing biodiversity will not only increase the ecological services in the community but also provide ideal volunteer opportunities.

### **Relationship to City and Department Objectives**

Enhancing biodiversity supports two of the City's Strategic Objectives: #2 (Maintain and Improve Public Infrastructure); and #3 (Build a Complete Community). It also addresses three of the Department's objectives: interpret the environment, reflection and escape from urban form, and support to community groups.

### **6.2.9 Improve Public Open Space in the Downtown Area**

The Downtown area will be accommodating more people through densification in the coming years. Population growth in this area between 1996 and 2001 was almost 17% with a total population of 6072 people living in this part of the City in 2001. A similar growth pattern (to be confirmed when the 2006 Census data is available) would result in nearly 7100 people living in the Downtown area in 2006. New, multi-unit developments have been built or are in the planning stages in this part of the City, including homes for seniors. This land use pattern was a key component of the *Downtown '98 Master Plan* prepared for the City by Aplin Martin Consultants et al.

The Downtown '98 plan calls for a park at the corner of Tyner and Kingsway that would form a 'gateway' at that location. This is the old City Works Yard site that is currently slated for sale and re-development. Significant park space at this location is not likely to occur.

Except for a small crescent in the southeast corner of the Downtown area, residents in this area all live within 400 metres of a Neighbourhood Park, City Wide Park or the Traboulay PoCo Trail. City Wide parks such as Lions Park and the athletic facilities at Gates Park are keystones of the downtown core open space system. Their utility as neighbourhood parks servicing this part of the community needs to be re-emphasized.

As the downtown core densifies, open space that meets aesthetic, recreational, non-motorized movement and cultural requirements is required. This will be a challenge given that new parks space is either not available or not affordable. Consequently, the "quality before quantity" maxim should prevail.

### **Recommendation #16**

Improve Public Open Space in the Downtown Area by:

- **#16a** - Completing Downtown Greenways Plan.
- **#16b** – Planning and designing the public realm (streetscape, boulevard, parks and other public open spaces) to enhance pedestrian movement, cultural events and social spaces.
- **#16c** - Integrating landscaping, pedestrian linkages and potential off site improvements near Lions Park with the retrofit plan.
- **#16d** – Continuing with ongoing infrastructure maintenance, walkway improvements and tree plantings at Gates Park.
- **#16e** – Completing a revised Central Park design that includes new park elements that will meet the needs of the changing downtown area demographics. (Also referred to in Section 6.2.3)

### **Rationale**

All parks within the Downtown area need to do "double duty." This means that their primary purpose (City Wide or Athletic Parks) also needs to accommodate neighbourhood uses. (See Neighbourhood Parks and City Wide Parks sections above.)

Densification of the core area is a central theme of Port Coquitlam's development strategy, and one that not only fits the scale of the community but will have long lasting impacts on the livability of the City. Ensuring that there is adequate well planned and built public open space will be a crucial aspect of the success of this strategy.

### **Relationship to City and Department Objectives**

Enhanced downtown open space would address one of the City's Strategic Objectives: #3 (Building a Complete Community).

Eight of the Department's own service objectives would also be addressed: social interaction, beautify the City, family leisure services, integrate sub-groups, fitness and wellbeing, pre-school leisure opportunities, social opportunities for teens, and recreation for seniors.

## 6.2.10 Enhance Activities in Parks

Satisfaction levels, as measured by the public survey, for parks and greenspaces is high; 85% of residents are either satisfied or very satisfied with parks/greenspaces in Port Coquitlam. However, the survey, combined with the trends analyses, indicate additional parks services and issues that need to be addressed.

Of those surveyed and who identified a barrier to use of parks, nearly 30% cited “concerns for personal safety” as a barrier. Fully 36% of females said that concerns regarding personal safety limited their use of parks and trails. Nearly 99% of respondents believe public safety is either important or very important.

Of the new or improved outdoor facilities that are needed, the following were the top three cited in the public survey:

- Spray pool/water park (35%)
- Gardens/horticultural areas (29%)
- Dog off-leash areas (28%).

Implications for parks programs and activities arising from the trends review, interviews and analyses include:

- Importance of environmental interpretation and education
- Popularity of horticultural and other parks programs. The existing community garden is meeting many more needs than simply growing vegetables. It has become an important experience and place of learning for all ages, for women in difficulty and others. The existing garden is over subscribed and has a waiting list
- Need to address the management of water in parks operations
- Need to create outdoor gathering places

### **Recommendation #17**

Enhance activity in parks by:

- **#17a** - Increasing safety in Parks and Trails by developing a review process that evaluates real and perceived safety in parks. Implement actions that address the primary safety issues, monitor the efficacy of those actions and adapt the safety enhancement measures.
- **#17b** – Creating at least two off leash dog areas. (One in the south and one in the north of the community, including a Dog in the Park education program.)
- **#17c** – Creating a community picnic area in Castle Park. As well, “group tables” should be installed that would accommodate 15 – 30 people.
- **#17d** – Incorporating two new Community Gardens.

## ***Rationale***

Safety and security may be primarily perceived issues, however, regardless of perceived or real, they are barriers to use of the parks and trails system. More work is required in this area in order to improve the use of parks.

For some users, safety can be compromised by the presence of dogs, especially un-controlled dogs. A 'Dogs in Parks' Program could provide an educational initiative emphasizing the need for responsible dog-walking. This program should address such issues as health hazards associated with dog waste and disposal; and the fact that some people are afraid of dogs. Creating a program that results in fewer people being intimidated by dogs and less waste (especially on playing fields) will be a significant improvement to the parks system.

Picnic areas and small scale gathering places are important in a community with growing diversity. They are inexpensive to build and manage and can include net revenue.

As the community continues to attract seniors and those with gardening backgrounds, community gardens should be considered an important program element in parks and open spaces in the downtown area. The Dominion Triangle/Riverwood area, at or near the new development/agriculture interface, would also be a good location for a community garden. These gardens will help create an open space system that integrates the principles of urban agriculture. This will require support and facilitation from the City which will likely have to work with local volunteers once sites are identified. A new garden site on ALR land, as well as at least one other site, should be identified and secured for interim uses. Community gardens are effective interim uses for lands that may be vacant for 2 or more years – a strategy that could be included in land management across the community.

Awareness, education programs, natural history, significant heritage landscapes, the effect of invasive species and a myriad of other interpretation opportunities abound in Port Coquitlam. The range of programs delivered by the Department should be reviewed with the goal of developing awareness and education opportunities. Marketing of these programs should also be increased, given that over 75% of residents find out about parks and leisure services in the newspaper, and consideration should be given to using this medium to further interpret the natural environment in the City.

## ***Relationship to City and Department Objectives***

These enhancements will address three of the City's Strategic Objectives: #3 (Building a Complete Community), #5 (Enhancing Customer Service), and # 4 Enhance Community Safety.

Eleven of the Department's service objectives would also be addressed: social interaction, beautifying the City, family leisure services, integrating sub-groups, fitness and wellbeing, preschool recreation opportunities, basic skills for children, basic skills for adults, recreation for seniors, and reflection and escape from urban form.

### **6.2.11 Riverfront Access**

Despite the presence of extensive river frontage in the City, there is no public boat launch or strong connection to the rivers or adjacent islands. There has been some demand expressed for a boat launch which might be either a full service facility, or merely a facility for launching kayaks and canoes.

Safety, environmental and operational issues will affect the extent and speed with which this vision could be implemented. Many cities located near waters that are far more complex and dangerous than Port Coquitlam's have been able to leverage the economic, social and environmental potential of their water-frontage.

A boat launch location needs to be identified as part of a strategy to improve access to the waterfront for non-motorized craft. It would provide a vision for use along the river that exploits this natural asset.

With the presence of Douglas Island just off-shore and increasing pleasure boat traffic on the Pitt River it is conceivable that in the not too distant future access to the river will not only be desired, but could be an economic benefit.

***Recommendation #18***

- Plan for a non-motorized boat launch in consultation with the Development Services and Engineering Departments and integrate this use with other trail and interpretive enhancements.

***Rationale***

Access to the Pitt River would significantly enhance the range of outdoor recreation opportunities in Port Coquitlam.

***Relationship to City and Department Objectives***

Improved access to river based recreation will address two of the City's Strategic Objectives: #2: (Maintaining and Improving Infrastructure Assets), and #3 (Building a Complete Community).

Six of the Department's own service objectives would also be addressed: special events and celebrations, providing support to local groups, family leisure services, fitness and well being, interpreting the environment and reflection and escape from urban form.

**6.2.12 Cemetery Business Case Analysis Plan**

The City Cemetery is a 4 hectare facility located at the northernmost corner of the City off Oxford Street. A Master Development Plan has been developed which addresses various land use aspects such as spatial allocations, vehicular routes, parking, memorialization and interment options.

By approximately 2020, the Port Coquitlam Municipal Cemetery will have used all available space for cremation and casket burials. Additional land is available adjacent to the existing cemetery and will be required in order to extend the lifespan of this cemetery to 2040.

A business case analysis that addresses the changing pattern of interments in the community, the rising interest in green burial and the incorporation of additional options for interment of cremated remains not presently included in the existing Cemetery Master Development Plan is required.

### **Recommendation #19**

- Undertake a Cemetery Business Case Analysis with detailed expansion and marketing plans for cemetery services, including:
  - Short and long-term land capacity
  - Grave yields per area
  - Perpetual care fun analysis
  - Capital program
  - Marketing plan
  - Cremated remains interment options

### **Rationale**

More cemetery capacity is required in the near term. As well, this is one of the few facilities and program areas that should be able to recover all operating and most capital costs over a reasonable payback period.

### **Relationship to City and Department Objectives**

A Cemetery Business Case Analysis will address three of the City's Strategic Objectives: #2 (Maintaining and Improving Infrastructure Assets), #3 (Building a Complete Community) and #7 (Maintaining Financial Stability).

Four of the Department's service objectives would also be addressed: protecting natural and historic resources, beautifying the City, family leisure services, and reflection and escape from the urban form.

## **6.3 Service Delivery**

These final five issues are less connected to the infrastructure and more aligned with how parks, recreation and cultural services can be provided.

### **6.3.1 New Partnership Agreements with School District**

The current Master Agreement between the City and School District No.43 was approved in 1996. A number of elements within the Agreement are outdated and need to be revised. In 2005, the City and the School District embarked on a process to update the Master Agreement, but have not yet signed off on the amendments. The Agreement places an emphasis on contiguous land acquisition and joint development and maintenance of facilities. The details of each joint project are identified in "Site Specific" agreements, including the community use of the school.

One of the most important issues appears to be the need to agree on a set of standards for the maintenance of grass playing fields (including ball diamonds), and general maintenance of school sites. The City has developed a set of proposed standards for the District's consideration, and agreement on a set of maintenance standards is essential to both clarify expectations and ensure that fields are playable. In addition, the current Master Agreement does not fully address joint use of facilities, or joint programming, and consideration should be given to include additional reference to these areas, either now or at a future date.

The two private Roman Catholic schools in Port Coquitlam, Our Lady of Assumption (elementary/middle) and Archbishop Carney (secondary), indicated their interest in developing a Master Joint Use Agreement with the City that is similar to the agreement with School District No.43. These two schools are part of the Lower Mainland Catholic School District and any agreement between the Catholic District and the City would only apply to the two Port Coquitlam schools. A joint-use agreement would potentially provide greater community use of the two schools, while encouraging their use of City facilities and programs such as the Grade 5 Activity Card. The benefits of such an agreement need to be explored to ensure that they will be mutual.

Also, the local school operated by the Francophone Education Authority has assets and needs that could be brought to a Joint Use Agreement which could help both the school and the City.

### **Recommendation #20**

- Develop new partnership agreements with School Districts – including School District No.43; the Lower Mainland Catholic School District; and the Francophone Education Authority.

### **Rationale**

The City and the School District have enjoyed a good working relationship and both have benefited from the Joint Use Agreement. The School District does not plan any new schools for the next ten years, but there are opportunities to jointly upgrade playing fields for the benefit of both partners. Creating a template for the Site Specific Maintenance Agreement, and maintenance standards and costs will bring needed clarification to these important issues.

Meeting with other school governing bodies (i.e. the Catholic School District and the Francophone Education Authority) will provide opportunities to explore joint-use agreements and other forms of cooperation.

### **Relationship to City and Department Objectives**

Finalizing the Joint Use Agreement with one School District and negotiating others relates directly to City Strategic Objectives #6 (Build Strategic Alliances). It also supports objective #2 (Maintain and Improve Infrastructure Assets). In this case, both the City and school authorities provide community assets and the agreement will support their maintenance and improvement.

The availability of school facilities to the community, and City facilities to school programs relate directly to the Department's skill development Service Objectives and the enhancement of services for seniors.

### **6.3.2 Community Development as a means of Delivering Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services**

The Department's philosophy is one that calls for leisure services to be used a vehicle for community development. Departmental staff working with arts and heritage organizations have enjoyed considerable success in working in a community development mode. However, direct service delivery is more the norm in other areas of the Department and many services (e.g. swimming and skating lessons) can only be delivered through that means. Nevertheless, considerable potential exists for staff in all areas of the Department to be trained in community development, to identify pilot projects, and to be supported and mentored as they develop their skills.

Community development is a method of service delivery that differs from direct service delivery in both practice and results. Rather than focusing on providing services *to* residents, the emphasis is on working *with* residents to

identify projects, to set priorities, and to develop solutions. Community development practices have the capacity to increase individual and group skill levels, to promote health and wellness, to reduce isolation, to address important social and community issues, and to foster interconnections between individual residents and among community groups. The community development process is one that assists participants to grow into skilled, inter-connected, socially responsible citizens while fostering the development of community identity, spirit, and pride.

At their best, community development initiatives may result in three significant outcomes:

- The fostering of individual growth
- The development of healthy, productive organizations
- The development of positive connections between individuals and among community organizations

Parks and recreation staff are generally not formally trained in community development. The day-to-day demands of facility operation and the momentum of traditional ways of doing things often hamper its implementation in community recreation systems. Further, some members of the public may not be familiar with the approach. Once exposed to it, however, residents often embrace it with enthusiasm.

The Department could take a number of steps – none of which are mutually exclusive – to encourage staff to work increasingly via a community development approach. This could include exposing staff to the approach by providing access to community development programs at local community colleges and other post-secondary educational institutions or by bringing in speakers who specialize in the field. Another approach would be to create a position of Community Development Specialist (i.e. someone who would focus on delivering services through a community development process, and assist others to work in a similar manner). A third approach would be to use existing staff who currently work in a community development mode to orient others to the theory and practice of this type of service, and to act as mentors in a series of pilot projects.

There are advantages and disadvantages to each approach. These relate to cost, commitment, and continuity. Sending staff out for training may expose them to leading edge thinking but may be costly and will not necessarily result in anything beyond an understanding of the theory of community development. Creating a specialist position could augment the Department's community development skill levels, but might also result in a perception that one person in the Department "will take care of it." Creating a system in which existing staff act as mentors may reduce the time those staff have to work on other initiatives, but has the capacity to increase the Department's overall understanding of, commitment to, and skills in the areas. A mentorship program also has the capacity to build a more efficient staff team, to increase communication and respect between disciplines, and to result in inter-disciplinary initiatives.

**Recommendation #21**

- Initiate a Community Development Training Program, utilizing outside resources where needed and focusing on intra-staff training and mentorship.

## ***Rationale***

Implementing a community development training program is a multi-stage process that requires planning, participation, commitment, and resources. While the Department's staff would design the details of the implementation process, there are several stages common to most community development training initiatives:

- Development of discussion paper with definitions, goals, and benefits
- Discussion with senior management
- Approval to proceed from senior management
- Initial staff orientation/building a Port Coquitlam model
- Establishment of priorities/pilot projects
- Development of staff steering committee
- Development and implementation of staff workshops, training, and mentoring programs
- Evaluation of program

The Department's philosophy is one that calls for parks, recreation, and cultural services to be used as a vehicle for community development. The application of a community development approach within the Department has been more successful in some areas of operations than in others. An intra-staff training and mentorship program has the capacity to use resources already existing in the Department to increase individual staff members' understanding of the theory and practice of community development. Such an approach is cost-effective and has the capacity to build stronger staff teams while improving services to the community.

## ***Relationship to City and Department Objectives***

Fostering a community development approach to service delivery among Departmental staff addresses three of the City's Strategic Objectives: #5 (Enhancing Customer Service), #6 (Building Strategic Alliances), and #8 (Building a Strong Organization).

It also addresses one of the Department's service objectives, providing support to local groups, in a direct manner.

### **6.3.3 Ensure Access to Public Services**

In the public survey, cost was presented as a significant barrier to accessing leisure services by 23% of the sample. While this perception is a relative thing, the consultants have asked this same question in a number of communities and typically find that cost is noted as a barrier by a much narrower cross section of households. This lends credence to cost being a substantive issue. There was also a relationship between age and household composition. Younger respondents and those with dependent children in the household were significantly more likely to indicate that cost was a barrier than older respondents or those without dependent children.

The assessment of demographics shows that there are a significant number of households (15%) below the Low Income Cut Off level for family income and that 11.2% of households received some form of financial assistance for low income families. The analysis also shows that single parent families have, on average, less than half the income than two parent families. These figures show that a significant portion of the population of the community is vulnerable to a situation where price or cost is a barrier to participating in public leisure services and many of these households have high needs for public parks, recreation and cultural services.

The Department has a Leisure for Less Program which is designed to reduce the cost of service for local citizens with lower ability to pay. Use of that program has increased in recent years; however the City still needs to address cost barriers to participants.

***Recommendation #22***

- Ensure access by all to public leisure services and review and strengthen the various supports currently in place which provide low cost access to leisure services.

***Rationale***

The Leisure for Less Program, the low cost access for students arranged with the School District and the many free services (e.g. special events) are all part of this system; as are the rentals of equipment (e.g. skates) which reduce the marginal cost of accessing public leisure facilities.

Those at the lowest end of the ability to pay continuum not only have a barrier to accessing public leisure services, but frequently have the highest needs for public service. Providing access to public services for all citizens must be a priority. There is evidence that what the Department is doing now is not fully adequate to meet the need.

***Relationship to City and Department Objectives***

Increasing supports for those most in need will help to achieve two of the City's Strategic Objectives: #1 (Improving Mobility and Access) and #5 (Enhancing Customer Service).

It will also help to achieve most of the existing Departmental objectives by increasing access generally to services by those who are not currently accessing them.

**6.3.4 Focus on Youth Services**

The community believes that services for youth are extremely important and that they should be one of the highest priorities of the Department. Stakeholder interviews constantly made reference to the priority that must be placed on youth services. The public survey reinforced this theme. The public meeting also provided support for youth services as a priority. While the Department already focuses a great deal of its resources on services for youth, even more resources should be brought to bear in this important area.

A staff led Task Force is currently conducting a "Youth Services Review Process" with the support of a consultant. The review will result in network development, a needs assessment, program development, and youth centre operational procedures development. Within this broad area of focus, one more specific priority emerges. It is to provide leisure services for youth at risk early in their growth so that recreation and culture can be a positive force in their lives at this critical time and help prevent antisocial behaviour. Even if services to adults have to be sacrificed to provide additional resources to meet this need, it must be done.

### **Recommendation #23**

- Focus on Youth Services – including allocating more resources to identifying youth at risk early in their development and to use recreation services as a vehicle for providing positive lifestyle choices.

### **Recommendation #24**

- Re-name the Parks and Recreation Department as the “Parks, Recreation and Culture Department”.

### **Rationale**

In the recent past in Port Coquitlam, as in many communities in BC, the incidence of antisocial behaviour by local youth has increased. Recreational and cultural activity can be an extremely cost effective way of addressing and reversing this trend. There is no greater priority for recreation services than to help young citizens to become fully functioning and responsible adults within our community.

The City is currently working on a Youth Services Review. As part of this renewed focus, more resources should be brought to bear to ensure that the youth centres in both Recreation complexes and – potentially – the Leigh Square Arts Village – become places where positive contributions are made to the lives of youth most in need.

It should be noted that there are already a great many recreation opportunities, and some cultural opportunities, available for mainstream youth that have skills, self confidence and an ability to socialize productively. The increased focus is not for these youth that are already participating and enjoying the benefits of mainstream recreation and cultural services. The increased focus is for those who do not fit the above mold, and those who have greater need, for the public good is greater if those youth can be directed onto a positive path.

### **Relationship to City and Department Objectives**

More success in dealing with youth at risk will greatly enhance the City's ability to Protect its Investment in Infrastructure (through reduced vandalism), Create Complete Communities, and Enhance Community Safety.

More success will also help the Department to realize the service objective of social opportunities for teens.

### **6.3.5 Culture Addressed in Department's Name**

In the last decade, a significant number of Parks and Recreation Departments across BC and Canada have added “Culture” to their name. Burnaby, Nanaimo, Surrey and Abbotsford are only a few examples. In each case, these communities had moved well beyond the simple provision of arts related programs within community recreation, and have made a strong commitment to cultural facilities, programs and organizations. In fact, the name change has usually been predicated by the development of major cultural amenities and programs,

including those for heritage, as well as the visual and performing arts. With the development of the Leigh Square Community Arts Village, Port Coquitlam has made a significant commitment to cultural amenities and services.

There is a perception among some members of the cultural community that the name of the Department is not all-encompassing, and that it reflects a lesser degree of interest in culture. While many in the parks and recreation field would argue that the term “recreation” includes all forms of leisure activity, including culture, this definition generally has little relevance to the cultural community. A re-naming of the Department would go a long way to affirm its commitment to serving the arts and heritage organizations of the community. The time is appropriate to consider a name change to the Parks, Recreation and Culture Department. This sends an important message to residents and cultural organizations.

The costs of the re-naming would be moderate and would include expenditures such as the replacement of signage and stationery and other consumables. To reduce the financial impact of the re-naming, supplies of the latter two items could be used until exhausted and more expensive items such as signs could be replaced or updated when damaged or decayed.

### ***Rationale***

This name change does not imply that organizational changes such as the creation of a separate culture division should take place.

The City of Port Coquitlam has made a significant commitment to culture through the development of the Leigh Square Arts Village and through other initiatives. The main advantage of adding “culture” to the Department name is that it reflects the inclusion of the arts, heritage and cultural diversity within the Department’s operational mandate. The name change also sends a positive message to the cultural organizations in Port Coquitlam that the City values its role as both a provider and partner in the cultural area. The addition of “culture” to Department names in other communities has been well received, especially by cultural organizations.

### ***Relationship to City and Department Objectives***

This name change may contribute to City Strategic Objectives #6 (Build Strategic Alliances), by sending a clear message to cultural organizations regarding the City’s commitment to heritage and the arts.

It also helps to achieve several Departmental service objectives, including support for community groups, educate about leisure, communicating about leisure opportunities.

### **6.3.6 Review Staffing Levels for Special Events**

Port Coquitlam is home to a number of special events and festivals. Some of these are deep-rooted, going back to the City’s earliest days, while others are of more recent foundation. Most are offered by community-based organizations with varying degrees of participation by and connection to the City and its staff. All provide value to the community in developing audiences, promoting participation, and presenting services that the City itself might be called upon to present if those organizations did not exist. In some cases, the organizations that present these events are progressively less able to do so, citing increasing levels of fatigue (“burnout”) and diminishing numbers of members. Representatives of some of these organizations have suggested that the City provide additional staff resources to ensure that such events continue into the future.

Special events and festivals presented in Port Coquitlam are currently offered through organizations such as the City’s May Day Committee (a task force of the City which includes community and city staff members), the Port Coquitlam Downtown BIA, and a number of not-for-profit societies whose activities include service delivery in the City. The city enjoys positive working relationships, assisted by partnership agreements, with a number of

organizations offering highly successful special events. A few not-for-profit societies with region-wide services, however, report reductions in service or have expressed concern about their continuing viability.

These events and festivals are an important aspect of community life, promoting participation by residents as organizers, presenters and audience members. Many take on a unique flavour reflective of their communities and thus help to foster a spirit of community identity, pride, and culture. The economic and social benefits they provide to Port Coquitlam are not insignificant. Their diminution or loss can have a negative effect on the community.

Addressing the need for staff support for organizations offering festivals and special events can be undertaken in a number of ways. These include the development of a Festival Society, the provision of additional staff support to existing organizations, and potentially, the direct provision of such events by City staff.

The development of a Festival Society was a recommendation of the 2001 Cultural Policy and Plan and has been an un-addressed objective of the Department ever since. At the time the Plan was developed, Department staff were devoting considerable time to the organization and presentation of special events and festivals, such as May Day (one of the oldest such celebrations in the province) as well as a Harvest Festival. In 2001, it was noted that the direct delivery of festivals was not consistent with the Department's philosophy of community development. Since that time, responsibility for May Day was increasingly devolved to the community. As a result, there seems to be a diminished requirement for an overall Festival Society. Further, anecdotal evidence suggests that societies with a responsibility for a number of diverse festivals are often less than successful. This is likely due to their members having an interest in a limited area of service, rather than the diverse range of interests and disciplines that festivals entail.

Some events are appropriate for direct service provision, while others are more appropriate for presentation through community groups. Organizing special events on behalf of community groups is contrary to the Department's philosophy of community development and does little to advance its goals of promoting the personal growth of individual citizens or developing stronger connections among community members. Given that public open space and recreation facilities are often used in the presentation of special events and festivals, however, and given the Department's goal of developing a stronger community, and given the benefits that accrue back to Port Coquitlam, it is entirely appropriate for Departmental staff to liaise with and offer advisory support to their organizers.

Rather than foster the creation of a separate Society dedicated to the presentation of a number of events, it may be more appropriate for the Department to act in the role of facilitator to existing organizations, some of which are currently experiencing difficulties. Additional staff resources, staff training, or a re-deployment of staff efforts may be necessary to accomplish the objective of providing increased support to the organizers. Additional resources could also be used to assist community organizations to develop the skills and membership resources they require to undertake their missions more successfully than at present.

**Recommendation #25**

- Continue to promote community development as a way to support local organizations and special events by allocating additional financial resources toward this area.

## ***Rationale***

Several community groups involved in the presentation of special events and festivals are increasingly hard-pressed to continue providing their services to the community. Allocating additional staff resources to support such organizations would not only ensure that the services are maintained, but also have the capacity to renew and strengthen the organizations and their memberships to a point where they become more self-sufficient.

## ***Relationship to City and Department Objectives***

Offering staff support to organizations involved in special events and festivals addresses City Strategic Direction #3 (Build a Complete Community).

It also addresses two of the Department's service objectives in a direct manner: encouraging special events and celebrations, and supporting local groups. Indirectly, it addresses a further three service objectives: facilitating spectator experiences at arts events, facilitating opportunities for social interaction, and supporting family-oriented leisure opportunities.

### **6.3.7 Provide Training and Organizational Support to Community Groups**

Numerous community sports, arts, and heritage services are offered through community organizations, many of which are registered not-for-profit organizations. These organizations are devoted to services such as minor sports, instruction in music and dance, performing arts presentations, and the preservation and presentations of the community's history. Some of these groups have deep roots in Port Coquitlam and play a vital role in the creation of a complete community.

A number of organizations advise that they are struggling, that they have been unable to renew or revitalize their memberships, and that volunteer burnout threatens their ability to continue their services, and in some cases, their ability to continue to survive as organizations. Several organizations also indicate a need for skills training in areas such as organizational revitalization, partnership development, voluntarism, fundraising, marketing, and publicity. Some have needs that go beyond skills training to include ongoing support and mentoring to assist them in "getting back on track." Without support, mentoring, and training, there is a possibility that several of these organizations will be forced to reduce or terminate their services to the community, leaving the City a less vibrant place, or alternatively, forcing the City to assume an additional service load.

As is the case with special events and festivals, allocating part-time staff resources to support and assist such organizations would assist greatly in improving their health and longer-term viability while contributing substantially, with minimal investment, to the overall health of the city and its residents. This could be accomplished through additional staff or through the redeployment of existing staff resources. The most appropriate response, however, may lie in the implementation of the City's volunteer strategy. It is the Department's hope to create one part-time position to assist in the implementation of the strategy, which provides for the development of voluntarism both in the City and in the community. These additional staff resources could be used to assist community organizations to develop the skills and membership resources they require to undertake their missions more successfully than at present.

### **Recommendation #26**

- Place priority on the implementation of the City's volunteer strategy, including the creation of one part-time Volunteer Coordinator staff position to assist with its implementation; and on an appropriate level of staff time being devoted to supporting skill development among the City's arts and heritage organizations, and that consideration be given to transforming the position to full-time when need dictates.

### **Rationale**

Several of the City's arts and heritage organizations report being increasingly hard pressed to continue their day-to-day operations and to maintain their services to the community. Allocating additional staff resources to assist such organizations with skills and other training has the capacity to renew and strengthen the organizations and their memberships to a point where they become more self-sufficient. The benefits to the City would be considerable, encompassing the enhanced growth of individuals, an increased sense of community and community pride, and increased connections among community organizations, as well as the benefits associated with increased cultural tourism and sports tourism.

### **Relationship to City and Department Objectives**

Offering staff support to assist arts and heritage organizations with training and organizational development addresses City Strategic Direction #3 (Build a Complete Community).

It also directly addresses the Department's Service Objective #2 (Supporting Local Groups). Indirectly, it addresses the following four service objectives: facilitating spectator experiences at arts events, facilitating opportunities for social interaction, protecting natural and historic Resources, and supporting family-oriented leisure opportunities.

### **6.3.8 Additional Directions**

In addition to the specific issues addressed above, there are several other general directions and smaller issues that the Department might consider in its annual work plans. They include:

- The existing practice of zero tolerance for graffiti should be continued. While it may be frustrating at times to continually eradicate vandalism and graffiti, the policy is a good one and keeps public assets in a visually pleasing state.
- Sport tourism was mentioned a number of times during the study as something that should be vigorously pursued. The consultants do not take that view. While existing special events and tournaments have some beneficial economic impact and will continue to attract non-residents, aggressively pursuing this very crowded and competitive market with relatively low levels of supporting infrastructure (e.g. hotel rooms) will not be cost effective and will divert attention from other important initiatives which have already been described.
- At the present time, space allocation (e.g. room rental, field allocation) is primarily an administrative function. However, understanding the type of need for space and the priority of that need requires some programming skills and competencies. The Department should augment its space allocation processes with some programming skill oversight.
- Every opportunity should be taken to mix generations at special events, within facilities, in programs and in how groups are supported. Bringing groups together within the community is something that needs to be proactively pursued within all Departmental activities.

- Every opportunity should be taken to incorporate leisure education into service delivery. Helping citizens to better understand the benefits of participating and how to make wise choices about the use of their leisure time can be enhanced if this is central to all service planning.

## **Summary**

The implementation of the recommendations outlined in this report will substantially enhance service levels, protect past gains in the provision of parks, recreation and culture, improve decision making by the Department and Council and more clearly justify expenditures to the public.

## 7. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The recommendations made by the consultants are summarized at a high level in *Figure Twenty-Seven*. It shows how the major recommendations should be prioritized and implemented. The key to the figure is provided below.

The **Type of Recommendation** column simply classifies it for Business Planning purposes. Sometimes an initiative begins as a Planning/Policy issue, and then migrates to another type once the policy is adopted.

**Priority** is assessed according to two factors. The first relates to how important the initiative is in realizing public good (i.e. achieving indirect benefits as indicated by the extent to which it can achieve service objectives). The second is how fundamental it is. In other words, the number of other initiatives that depend on this one are considered. While a subjective assessment, it is still valid and important. The priority assessment is used to allocate resources. Higher priorities should not be sacrificed at the expense of lower ones.

The **Timeline** column is used to determine when resources should be allocated. This may differ from priority in that sometimes even high priority items that have to occur, require some years to arrange financing or to secure partnerships. With respect to the Timeline column, there are three levels of priority and urgency. The highest is called **Short Term**. It refers the recommendations that need to be implemented in the immediate future. After that comes **Mid Term**. These should be completed toward the middle of the Plan timeframe. Finally, there is **Long Term**. These should be considered toward the end of the Plan timeframe.

Whatever is known about **Cost** associated with implementing each recommendation is provided. If costs cannot be estimated, they are categorized as **Minimal** (which would cost up to \$25,000 to implement), **Moderate** (which require public support in the range of \$25,000 to 100,000), and **Major** (which are above \$100,000).

### 7.1 Additional Skills Required in the Department

In order to be able to implement the recommendations noted in the previous section, the Department will require additional skills and abilities in a number of areas. Skills should be added within the following:

#### Parks Skills and Abilities

- Expertise in irrigation system maintenance
- Integrated pest management
- Landscape design
- Trail technician
- Environmental technician

### Department-wide Skills and Abilities

- Volunteer management and Special Event/Festival staffing
- Marketing (with a specific subset of ethno-cultural marketing to meet the increasing diversity of the City's population)
- Community development
- Fund raising
- Information technology (with a strong ability in the use of software within the Department)
- Space allocation

It should be noted (1) that some of these skills could be incorporated into existing staff positions, and some can be contracted as needed; and (2) that the above lists do not present a comprehensive overview of staff needs. Other requirements will undoubtedly be identified as the Plan evolves.

One other skill that will likely need to be enhanced within the Department is team building. Initial steps have been taken in this regard, and should continue and be enhanced in the future.

## **7.2 Additional Investment Required to Implement the Plan**

*Figure Twenty-Seven* provides a high level overview of areas of priority.

*Figure Twenty-Eight* identifies how various items in the plan can be incorporated into the City's capital and business planning processes.

**Figure Twenty-Seven  
Summary of Implementation Plan**

Report Section	Rec. #	Recommendations	Type of Recommendation	Priority	Timeline	Cost	Comments
5.0		<b>A BASIS FOR PLANNING</b>					
5.5	1	Adopt Decision Making Framework, Mission Statement, Goals and Objectives	Planning/Policy	High	Short Term	Minimal	Incorporating the framework into the Business Planning process will require some focus and consistency
6.1		<b>RECREATION AND CULTURAL INFRASTRUCTURE</b>					
6.1.1	2	Construct new ice surface at Port Coquitlam Recreation Complex; address type of surface required	Capital Infrastructure	Low	Long Term	Major	Capital costs are significant as are annual operating costs
3.1.2	3a	Delay indoor pool development for at least 10 years.	Planning/Policy	Low	Long Term	Major	Continue to monitor usage of existing pool to see if behaviour patterns change
6.1.2	3b	Assess Centennial Pool change rooms	Capital Infrastructure	High	Short Term	Minimal	Problems with deterioration of change room building need to be addressed as soon as possible
6.1.2	3c	Develop new south central splash park to replace two existing south side pools; decommission the two pools	Capital Infrastructure	High	Mid Term	Major	Develop replacement before existing facilities are phased out
6.1.2	3d	Develop a new splash park / washroom in Lions Park	Capital Infrastructure	Medium	Long Term	Major	Developer of adjacent land could be a partner in financing this project
6.1.2	3e	Decommission Sun Valley Outdoor Pool and enhance existing splash park	Capital Infrastructure	Low	Long Term	Major	Phase out wading pool over time
6.1.3	4	Proceed with Phase Two renovations and improvements to Terry Fox Library	Capital Infrastructure	High	Short Term	Major	Proceed once impact of Phase One retrofit is clear and stable
6.1.4	5	Develop new spaces at the Port Coquitlam Recreation Complex for the Wilson Centre as well as fitness, youth and multi purpose rooms	Capital Infrastructure	High	Mid Term	Major	Capital costs are significant as are annual operating costs
6.1.5	6	Upgrades to Terry Fox Theatre / confirm continued community access	Planning/Policy and Capital Infrastructure	Medium	Long Term	Minimal	Capital costs should not be a City responsibility

Report Section	Rec. #	Recommendations	Type of Recommendation	Priority	Timeline	Cost	Comments
6.1.6	7	Proceed with Phase Two of Leigh Square Community Arts Village	Capital Infrastructure	Medium	Long Term	Major	Capital costs are significant as are annual operating costs
<b>6.2</b>		<b>PARKS AND PUBLIC OPEN SPACE</b>					
6.2.1	8	Secure Parkland - amend zoning and park bylaws; expand Greenway Plan; integrate Greenway Plan with other City departments	Planning/Policy	High	Short Term	Minimal	Currently in Department workplans and considered by Consultants to be most important park priority at this time
6.2.2	9	Complete Parks Classification System and Update Maintenance Standards	Planning/Policy	High	Short Term	Minimal	New standards will take some time and effort to develop but should happen as soon as workloads permit
6.2.3	10a	Continue to improve Athletic Fields, Diamonds and Pitches and upgrade Athletic Field Strategy	Planning/Policy and Capital Infrastructure	Medium	Short Term	Minimal	
6.2.3	10b	Upgrade infrastructure at Thompson, Evergreen, McLean & Central Parks	Capital Infrastructure	Medium	Short Term / Long Term	Major	
6.2.3	10c	Construct one artificial turf surface, including a Business Case Analysis	Capital Infrastructure	Medium	Long Term	Major	
6.2.3	10d	Secure funding for replacement of existing artificial field surface to ensure its ongoing stability	Capital Infrastructure	Medium	Mid Term	Major	
6.2.4	11a	Develop Shaughnessy Park in a series of phased improvements	Capital Infrastructure	High	Short Term / Mid Term	Major	
6.2.4	11b	Upgrade Lions Park	Capital Infrastructure	High	Mid / Long Term	Major	
6.2.4	11c	Upgrade Blakeburn Lagoons	Capital Infrastructure	High	Long Term	Major	
6.2.4	11d	Incorporate Marshall Lobb Park into the development plan when the City sells adjacent downtown lands	Capital Infrastructure	High	Mid Term	Major	

Report Section	Rec. #	Recommendations	Type of Recommendation	Priority	Timeline	Cost	Comments
6.2.5	12	Upgrade Neighbourhood Parks with focus on quality, number and configuration; utilize universal design principles; adopt criteria regarding park priorities	Capital Infrastructure	Medium	Mid Term	Moderate	Upgrade one site at a time as resources are available
6.2.6	13a	Complete Upgrade of Troublay PoCo Trail	Capital Infrastructure	High	Short Term / ongoing	Moderate	Commitment to protecting wide corridor is urgent, but enhancing the corridor is a long term phased project
6.2.6	13b	Construct washrooms and parking lot at DeBoville Slough	Capital Infrastructure	High	Short Term	Major	
6.2.7	14a	Undertake conceptual route planning to enhance walking and cycling	Planning/Policy	Medium	Mid Term	Minimal	
6.2.7	14b	Formalize action plan for off-street trail construction and / or upgrading	Planning/Policy	Medium	Mid Term	Minimal	
6.2.7	14c	Create a pedestrian access to schools program	Planning/Policy	Medium	Long Term	Minimal	
6.2.8	15a	Create an Urban Forest Management Plan	Planning/Policy	Medium	Short Term	Minimal	Emphasize role of stewardship and volunteerism
6.2.8	15b	Support the Engineering Department in creation of Integrated Pest Management Program	Planning/Policy	Medium	Mid Term	Minimal	
6.2.8	15c	Create an Invasive Species Control Program	Planning/Policy	Medium	Mid Term	Minimal	
6.2.8	15d	Adopt enhancement programs for natural areas and sensitive ecosystems in the City	Planning/Policy	Medium	Long Term	Minimal	Emphasize role of stewardship and volunteerism
6.2.9	16a	Complete a Downtown Greenways Plan	Capital Infrastructure	High	Mid Term	Moderate	
6.2.9	16b	Plan and design for pedestrian movement, cultural events and social spaces	Capital Infrastructure	High	Short Term	Moderate	

Report Section	Rec. #	Recommendations	Type of Recommendation	Priority	Timeline	Cost	Comments
6.2.9	16c	Integrate landscaping, pedestrian linkages and potential off site improvements near Lions Park	Capital Infrastructure	High	Short Term	Moderate	
6.2.9	16d	Continue ongoing infrastructure maintenance, walkway improvements, tree plantings at Gates Park	Capital Infrastructure	High	Mid / Long Term	Moderate	
6.2.9	16e	Complete a revised Central Park design to meet changing demographics	Capital Infrastructure	High	Short Term	Moderate	
6.2.10	17a	Prepare a safety and security review of Parks and Trails	Planning/Policy	Medium	Short Term	Minimal	Public survey and trends analysis indicate additional services and issues need addressing
6.2.10	17b	Create at least two dog off leash areas and a Dog in Park Education Program	Capital Infrastructure	Medium	Mid / Long Term	Moderate	
6.2.10	17c	Create a community picnic area in Castle Park	Capital Infrastructure	Medium	Long Term	Major	
6.2.10	17d	Incorporate two new Community Gardens	Capital Infrastructure	Medium	Mid / Long Term	Minimal	
6.2.11	18	Improve Riverfront Access (non-motorized boat launch)	Planning/Policy	Medium	Long Term	Minimal	Implement in cooperation with other Municipal Departments and integrate with trail system
6.2.12	19	Prepare Cemetery Business Case Analysis	Planning/Policy	Medium	Short Term	Minimal	Develop expansion plans as space in the existing cemetery is in short supply
<b>6.3</b>		<b>SERVICE DELIVERY</b>					
6.3.1	20	Develop new partnership Agreements with School Districts	Planning/Policy	High	Short Term	Minimal	New School District agreements are seen as one of the Plan's most important recommendations
6.3.2	21	Initiate Community Development Training Program	Service Adjustments	High	Short Term / ongoing	Minimal	
6.3.3	22	Ensure access by all to public leisure services	Service Adjustments	High	Short Term / ongoing	Minimal	

Report Section	Rec. #	Recommendations	Type of Recommendation	Priority	Timeline	Cost	Comments
6.3.4	23	Focus on Youth Services	Service Adjustments	High	Short Term	Minimal	This is one of the more significant priorities
6.3.5	24	Add Culture to Department's name	Planning/Policy	Medium	Short Term	Minimal	Commit immediately, but phase in implementation slowly to reduce costs
6.3.6	25	Continue to promote community development as a way to support local organizations and special events	Service Adjustments	Medium	Mid Term	Minimal	
6.3.7	26	Create one part-time Volunteer Coordinator staff position to assist with implementation of volunteer strategy	Service Adjustments	High	Short Term	Moderate	

**Figure Twenty-Eight  
Public Investment Required**

Report Section	Rec. #	Recommendations - Short Term	Capital Project Funding	Operating Subsidy	Capital Infrastructure Funding	Transitional Funding
6.1.2	3b	Assess Centennial Pool change rooms				\$ 10,000
6.1.3	4	Proceed with Phase Two renovations and improvements to Terry Fox Library	\$ 500,000			
6.2.1	8	Secure Parkland - amend zoning and park bylaws; expand Greenway Plan; integrate Greenway Plan with other City departments				\$ 5,000
6.2.2	9	Complete Parks Classification System and update Maintenance Standards		\$ 10,000		
6.2.3	10a	Continue to improve Athletic Fields, Diamonds and Pitches - upgrade Athletic Field Strategy				\$ 15,000
6.2.3	10b	Increase athletic field infrastructure funding with priority projects at Thompson, Evergreen, McLean & Central Parks		\$ 5,000	\$ 100,000	
6.2.4	11a	Develop Shaughnessy Park (Phase I)	\$ 958,000	\$ 20,000		
6.2.6	13a	Increase infrastructure funding to complete upgrade of Traboulay PoCo Trail		\$ 5,000	\$ 50,000	
6.2.6	13b	Construct washrooms and parking lot at DeBoville Slough	\$ 150,000	\$ 6,000		
6.2.8	15a	Create an Urban Forest Management Plan		\$ 10,000		\$ 15,000
6.2.9	16b	Plan and design for pedestrian movement, cultural events and social spaces in Downtown Area	\$ 50,000	\$ 5,000		
6.2.9	16c	Integrate landscaping, pedestrian linkages and potential off site improvements near Lions Park	\$ 50,000	\$ 5,000		
6.2.9	16e	Complete a revised Central Park design to meet changing demographics	\$ 50,000	\$ 5,000		
6.2.10	17a	Prepare a safety and security review of parks and trails		\$ 15,000		\$ 10,000
6.2.12	19	Prepare Cemetery Business Case Analysis				\$ 20,000
6.3.2	21	Initiate Community Development Training Program				\$ 10,000
6.3.3	22	Ensure access by all to public leisure services		\$ 5,000		
6.3.4	23	Focus on Youth Services		\$ 10,000		
6.3.5	24	Add Culture to Department's name				\$ 5,000
6.3.7	26	Create one part-time Volunteer Coordinator staff position to assist with implementation of Department's volunteer strategy		\$ 32,000		
		<b>Sub-Total Short Term Investment</b>	<b>\$ 1,758,000</b>	<b>\$ 133,000</b>	<b>\$ 150,000</b>	<b>\$ 90,000</b>

Note – Costs are quoted in 2007 dollars; Study did not explore costing out the Life Cycle Program related issues

Report Section	Rec. #	Recommendations - Mid Term	Capital Project Funding	Operating Subsidy	Capital Infrastructure Funding	Transitional Funding
6.1.2	3c	Develop new south central splash park to replace two existing south side pools; decommission the two pools	\$ 550,000			
6.1.4	5	Develop new spaces at the Port Coquitlam Recreation Complex for the Wilson Centre as well as fitness, youth and multi purpose rooms	\$ 5,000,000			
6.2.3	10d	Secure funding for replacement of existing artificial field surface to ensure its ongoing stability	\$ 750,000			
6.2.4	11a	Develop Shaughnessy Park (Phase II)	\$ 958,000	\$ 25,000		
6.2.4	11b	Upgrade Lions Park (Phase I)	\$ 150,000	\$ 5,000		
6.2.4	11d	Incorporate Marshall Lobb Park into the development plan when the City sells adjacent downtown lands	\$ 800,000	\$ 25,000		
6.2.5	12	Increase infrastructure funding to upgrade Neighbourhood Parks		\$ 5,000	\$ 100,000	
6.2.7	14a	Undertake conceptual route planning to enhance walking and cycling		\$ 5,000	\$ 50,000	
6.2.7	14b	Formalize action plan for off-street trail construction and / or upgrading			\$ 25,000	\$ 10,000
6.2.8	15c	Create an Invasive Species Control Program				\$ 15,000
6.2.9	16a	Complete Downtown Greenways Plan				\$ 15,000
6.2.9	16d	Continue ongoing infrastructure maintenance, walkway improvements, tree plantings at Gates Park	\$ 50,000	\$ 5,000		
6.2.10	17b	Develop a dog off leash area and Dog in Park Education Program	\$ 20,000	\$ 2,500		
6.2.10	17d	Incorporate a new Community Garden	\$ 10,000			
6.3.6	25	Continue to promote community development as a way to support local organizations and special events		\$ 10,000		
		<b>Sub-Total Mid Term Investment</b>	<b>\$ 8,288,000</b>	<b>\$ 82,500</b>	<b>\$ 175,000</b>	<b>\$ 40,000</b>

Note – Costs are quoted in 2007 dollars; Study did not explore costing out the Life Cycle Program related issues

Report Section	Rec. #	Recommendations - Long Term	Capital Project Funding	Operating Subsidy	Capital Infrastructure Funding	Transitional Funding
6.1.1	2	Construct new ice surface at Port Coquitlam Recreation Complex; address type of surface required	\$ 8,000,000	\$ 50,000		
6.1.2	3d	Develop a new splash park / washroom in Lions Park	\$ 750,000	\$ 15,000		
6.1.2	3e	Decommission Sun Valley Outdoor Pool and enhance existing splash park	\$ 150,000			
6.1.5	6	Upgrades to Terry Fox Theatre / confirm continued community access				\$ 5,000
6.1.6	7	Proceed with Phase Two of Leigh Square Community Arts Village	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 85,000		
6.2.3	10b	Increase athletic field infrastructure funding with priority projects at Thompson, Evergreen, McLean & Central Parks		\$ 5,000	\$ 100,000	
6.2.3	10c	Construct one artificial turf surface, including a Business Case Analysis	\$ 1,750,000	\$ 20,000		
6.2.4	11b	Upgrade Lions Park (Phase II)	\$ 100,000	\$ 5,000		
6.2.4	11c	Upgrade Blakeburn Lagoons	\$ 880,000	\$ 20,000		
6.2.8	15d	Adopt enhancement programs for natural areas and sensitive ecosystems in the City		\$ 10,000		
6.2.9	16d	Continue ongoing infrastructure maintenance, walkway improvements, tree plantings at Gates Park	\$ 50,000	\$ 5,000		
6.2.10	17b	Develop a dog off leash area and Dog in Park Education Program	\$ 20,000	\$ 2,500		
6.2.10	17c	Create community picnic area in Castle Parks	\$ 150,000	\$ 5,000		
6.2.10	17d	Incorporate a new Community Garden	\$ 10,000			
		<b>Sub Total Long Term Investment</b>	<b>\$ 14,360,000</b>	<b>\$ 222,500</b>	<b>\$ 100,000</b>	<b>\$ 5,000</b>
		<b>Grand Totals</b>	<b>\$ 24,406,000</b>	<b>\$ 438,000</b>	<b>\$ 425,000</b>	<b>\$ 135,000</b>

Note – Costs are quoted in 2007 dollars; Study did not explore costing out the Life Cycle Program related issues

# Appendices

**Appendix A**  
**Transcript of Public Input**



# **Port Coquitlam Parks Recreation and Culture Plan 2015**

## **Public Workshop April 11<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

### **Transcript of Public Input**

At the workshop on April 11<sup>th</sup>, 2006 at the Wilson Centre a total of 25 people attended and provided input. The workshop was structured so that each person proceeded around the room to all nine stations and answered two questions at each station. The two questions were;

- What leisure experiences are not available to Port Coquitlam residents now and should be? (participants were instructed to think about the question under three headings; what do we have now but need more of, what do we have now but need higher quality of, and what new things do we not have now but need).
- Why don't we have those leisure experiences now? (participants were instructed to think about whether the reason why we don't have them now is a lack of spaces in which to accommodate the experience, a lack of money to operate or have sufficient quality, a lack of leadership, or some other barrier to provision)

The nine stations each represented one category of leisure service.

After answering the two questions at each of the nine stations, participants were asked how priorities should be set and what more needed to be said to the consultants preparing a long range leisure service plan. The facilitator wrote their comments down.

At the end of the evening, the facilitator reviewed the subsequent steps in the planning process, thanked the participants for their time and input, and adjourned the event.

The following represents all the participant input.

#### ***A. Fitness Activities***

##### **What experiences do we need and don't have now?**

- Training centre – not weight training but rather a centre which athletes can train (e.g.: Cloverdale.)
- Fitness opportunities on the south side of Port Coquitlam lacking.
- Fitness track needed.
- Need a pool on the south side.
- A fitness room that kids as well as teens can go workout because kids are not allowed at anywhere else (workout centre!)

##### **Why don't we have those leisure experiences?**

- Cost of services too high – young people can't afford.
- Lack of interest to move forward with it.
- Lack of leadership to tell the council how to use the money right (use money right!)
- Lack of public interest.

## ***B. Recreational Level Sports***

### **What experiences do we need and don't have now?**

- A hockey box with real hockey nets and only for hockey. No lacrosse (outdoor hockey!)
- 1 or 2 more ice rinks, even a planet ice type public/private.
- For ice hockey, have an arena just like 8 rinks in Burnaby. (More ice for Port Coquitlam hockey!)
- BMX track for kids and adults (we need one!)
- More outdoor pools for summer (pool!)
- More ice.
- Extra ice sheet for figure skating and other recreational sports.
- Extra outdoor park for hockey and ball games.
- More ice rinks.

### **Why don't we have those leisure experiences?**

- Don't know how to use money right.
- Lack of space.
- Lack of interest.
- Not enough money.
- Lack of leadership.
- Facilitating the money on the wrong projects.
- Lack of public interest.
- They do not listen period...

## ***C. Competitive Level Sports***

### **What experiences do we need and don't have now?**

- Friday night hometown H.S. football culture
  - community half-time involvement.
  - parent/community booster club.
  - opportunity to showcase Port Coquitlam football culture ie: media involvement.
  - opportunity to involve seniors in the community.
  - opportunities for youth ie: volunteerism, mentoring, training, etc.
  - promotion of healthy lifestyles for youth.
- Year-round opportunities for tennis.
  - ie: opportunities for year-round training, senior programs, youth development, leagues.
  - host municipal events/provincial tournaments.
- Expand access to tournaments.
- Promotion/increase tourism through quality facilities/programs.
- Artificial soccer field.
- Partnership between city and schools to promote schools based activities – provide positive environment for youth to participate and watch. (builds community spirit).
- I agree!!

### **Why don't we have those leisure experiences?**

- Space is available but the facilities aren't designed/ made to do or experience the atmosphere/culture that is desired.
  - ie: spectator seating.
  - lighting.
  - environmental considerations.
- Turf fields (we have one that will not allow certain sports to be played on).
- Low priority, money and leadership is necessary to ensure such initiatives.
- I agree\*\*

## ***D. Social activities and events***

### **What experiences do we need and don't have now?**

- Dog park facility that provides leash-free exercise (socializing for dogs and owners).
- Ditto – off leash for dogs.
- Picnic type park on South-side (Robert Hope Park).
- Redevelopment of community schools.
- Use schools for recreational activities in evenings and on weekends.
- Community folk dances.
- More green space in downtown core.
- Better parking enforcement in downtown core.
- Improved facilities for seniors.

### **Why don't we have those leisure experiences?**

- Funding.
- Lack of an overall plan.
- Seniors – lack of space and funding.
- Lack of public interest.
- Wilson Centre too small to meet needs of upcoming baby boomers.

## ***E. Special Events***

### **What experiences do we need and don't have now?**

- Application to BC Summer Games and Canada Games
- Olympic opportunities
- Multicultural events to cover special community days
- More access to Fraser and Pitt Rivers – there's always log booms blocking the waterfront.
- Competitive sports and activities between Port Coquitlam and other areas within the mainland.

### **Why don't we have those leisure experiences?**

- Lack of leadership or knowledge to make application for events listed.
- Lack of public interest.

## ***F. Performing Arts***

### **What experiences do we need and don't have now?**

- Arts Centre to host live plays, musicals or musical events in the evenings or weekend matinees.
- More use of the Leigh Square Bandshell and of Leigh Square – wooden benches.
- More use of bandshell but must remember impact on residences nearby – noise!
- Affordable meeting space for use of various stakeholders ie: sports clubs, service organizations.
- More programming/meeting space in library.

### **Why don't we have those leisure experiences?**

- Money.
- Staff time.
- Facility.
- Lack of public interest.

## ***G. Visual Arts and Crafts (and Hobbies)***

### **What experiences do we need and don't have now?**

- Look forward to what Leigh Square will be able to offer.
- Lack of arts and crafts for adults.
- Seniors and children have opportunities through Wilson Centre, Parks and Rec program.
- Library
  - larger facility
  - a clean facility
  - it should represent Terry Fox, Canada's greatest hero. A facility named after Terry Fox should be kept in excellent shape, many tourists come to see the memorabilia displayed in the library.
  - the statue is not clean, it was green with moss all winter. It should be properly maintained.
  
  - larger library.
  - library doesn't take donations for use in library only to sell.
  - more DVDs at Port Coquitlam library.
  - library should look more friendly and welcoming – right now it has it's back turned.
  - more videos, fames and tapes for kids – bilingual.

### **Why don't we have those leisure experiences?**

- Space to accommodate the infrastructure within the boundaries of Port Coquitlam.
- The desire by the citizens to see the possibilities.
- Money.
- Priorities (city) – city spends \$ building new buildings but 1<sup>st</sup> priority should be maintaining existing buildings (will bandshell and Arts building get run down also?)

## ***H. Outdoor Recreation***

### **What experiences do we need and don't have now?**

- Off leash dog parks both sides of town, nothing expensive, just a chain link fence, water tap. (if possible).
- I agree!

- Me too.
- Water park "kayak" Coquitlam River.
- More walking trails.
- Another outside swimming pool.
- Enforcement of leash bylaw on city trails and dykes.
- Participark renewed.
- Off-leash area to enjoy a walk with your dog(s). Preferably el natural with distance.
- Another Lions Park type area (south-side).
- Places for non-structured play.
- Playground equipment for toddlers/preschool age children on north side of Mary Hill (ie "Robert Hope Park").

### ***Why don't we have those leisure experiences?***

- Lack of initiative from City – re: off leash. Unless someone screams, it doesn't happen.
- Dog parks are a new thing and Port Coquitlam is a little behind.
- Lack of public interest.
- Space is available at Robert Hope Park for Participark and/or Toddlers play area.

### ***I. Other Activities (that don't fit under a heading above)***

#### **What experiences do we need and don't have now?**

- Preservation of history – museum/archives

#### **Why don't we have those leisure experiences?**

- Large enough building
- More volunteers to man the station
- Money to provide more artifacts and cases and shelving to display them. Money to provide special teas and activities.
- School participation
- Advertisement and public information.

## **How should we prioritize community needs if we cannot do it all?**

### **We should make something higher priority if**

- It impacts the most people.
- There is Community Need.
- We consider how much things we have now are used.
- We look at what other cities offer.
- Determine what is our goal?
- Determine what does Port Coquitlam represent?
- Is it unique? New and unique is higher priority.
- Do we have the land?
- Spinoff benefits can be shown
- Sustainability/ longevity are proven.

### **Is there anything else that we need to know to do the project right?**

- Get impact from the front lines of the large agencies – not the management. (eg: School District)
- A new library instead of adding to the existing one.

Smart use of money.

# Appendices

---

**Appendix B**  
**Port Coquitlam Stakeholder Interviews**



P E R C

### Port Coquitlam Stakeholder Interviews

	<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Individual</b>	<b>Greatest Needs and Issues</b>
1.	Port Coquitlam Mens' Fastball	Fred Sabatine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need one good diamond</li> <li>• Would like separate complete high quality parks for each sport</li> <li>• Not enough volunteers to run the sport</li> </ul>
2.	Port Coquitlam Minor Softball Association	Richard Bridges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At ball parks we need all the amenities to make it functional (e.g. washrooms)</li> <li>• Have resources to upgrade parks but need technical help from the City</li> <li>• Improve drainage at Gates Park and uneven outfield at Evergreen</li> <li>• Dog droppings on our diamonds are a real problem</li> </ul>
3.	Port Coquitlam Marlins Swim Club	Rick Sieb	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We need a new outdoor pool; preferably a 50M pool with all the support spaces for all outdoor swimming sports</li> </ul>
4.	Port Coquitlam Slo-Pitch	Don Kesperich	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need more ball diamonds</li> <li>• Better maintenance of existing diamonds</li> <li>• Separate parks for separate sports</li> </ul>
5.	Port Coquitlam Mens' Baseball League	Steven Rizzo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At Thompson Park we don't have ownership of our diamond so it's hard to keep the commitment to upgrading and maintaining it</li> <li>• Separate parks for separate sports and leagues</li> </ul>
6.	Port Coquitlam Blues Over 40's (soccer)	Frank Perner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Things are going well for us</li> <li>• No real needs or issues</li> </ul>
7.	West Coast Sr. Soccer	Fred Sabatine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need more soccer pitches and better quality pitches</li> <li>• Cost for field rental goes up each year</li> </ul>
8.	Port Coquitlam FC Soccer	Mick Burgess	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need much better maintenance of school fields</li> <li>• Could also use access to another artificial turf field</li> <li>• Lack of volunteers is a big problem</li> <li>• Would like to have an indoor training facility</li> <li>• Will continue to upgrade Minnehada site</li> </ul>
9.	BC Christian Soccer League	John Davidson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Things are going quite well for us</li> <li>• Would like one or two more winter game slots</li> </ul>
10.	Port Coquitlam Minor Hockey	Julie Fitzgerald	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desperately need more ice time in Port Coquitlam</li> </ul>
11.	Port Coquitlam Figure Skating Club	Alison Johansen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need more prime time ice</li> </ul>
12.	Coachman Hockey Club	Bruce Bradley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would prefer an earlier ice time and one additional weekend ice slot</li> </ul>
13.	Lightning Speed Skating Club	Michelle Gagnon Ellen Thiel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need more ice time centralized in one location</li> <li>• Larger changerooms and equipment room enhanced</li> <li>• Would love to have an Olympic sized ice sheet</li> </ul>
14.	Golden Ears Women's Fastball	Julie Gill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need significantly better maintenance of diamonds</li> <li>• Need more diamonds</li> <li>• Different leagues need different diamonds and should be separated; each with a "home" park</li> <li>• Need washrooms at Aggie Park</li> </ul>
15.	Touch Football BC	John Weingand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need more field time</li> <li>• The 80% local player rule hurts a sport that is organized on a regional level</li> </ul>

	<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Individual</b>	<b>Greatest Needs and Issues</b>
16.	Port Coquitlam Tennis Club	Milo Hanzl	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No support facilities at Gates Park tennis courts</li> <li>• Would love to have a clubhouse and tools to maintain the courts much better</li> <li>• Courts need to be improved</li> </ul>
17.	Tri-Cities Cycling Coalition	John Seinen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need cycle lanes to support more use of bikes as transportation option</li> </ul>
18.	Art Focus	Colin Craig	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need venue for meetings and workshops</li> <li>• Need storage space for teaching mirror</li> <li>• Need for a heritage inventory and heritage management plan</li> <li>• Wants to be part of activities at Leigh Square Arts Village</li> </ul>
19.	B.C. Artists in Healthcare Society	Linda Thiessen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires an exhibition space superior to that found in the Terry Fox Library</li> <li>• Wants to be part of activities at Leigh Square Arts Village</li> </ul>
20.	ArtsConnect Tri-Cities Arts Council	Helen Daniels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs storage space for files, supplies, and banners</li> <li>• Could use a non-dedicated office at Leigh Square Arts Village</li> <li>• Wants to see development of Phase II of Leigh Square Arts Village</li> <li>• Supports the development of a larger theatre for the Northeast Sector (e.g. 700 seats)</li> <li>• Need for federal Tax Law reform to support the arts and participation in the arts</li> <li>• Need for more communication and co-ordination of activities of Northeast Sector municipalities. Port Coquitlam has a reputation for opting out of regional initiatives</li> <li>• Need for a more effective volunteer bureau in the Tri-Cities, one that includes a Port Coquitlam focus and a focus on a wider range of volunteer opportunities/needs</li> </ul>
21.	Burnaby Symphony Orchestra	Dennis Lysack	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs to be able to book Terry Fox Theatre 3 and 4 years into the future, as at Michael J. Fox Theatre in Burnaby</li> <li>• Acoustics at Terry Fox Theatre need to be upgraded</li> <li>• Supports the development of a larger theatre for the Northeast Sector (e.g. 700 seats)</li> <li>• Need for federal Tax Law reform to support the arts and participation in the arts</li> <li>• Would like inclusion (free) in city's leisure guide, for its concerts in Port Coquitlam</li> </ul>
22.	CDMF Performing Arts Festival Society	Thelka Wright	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scheduling of Terry Fox Theatre is problematic due to school use</li> <li>• Would like access to non-dedicated office space at Leigh Square Arts Village</li> <li>• Volunteers are burning out and need to be renewed or supplemented</li> </ul>

	<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Individual</b>	<b>Greatest Needs and Issues</b>
23.	Coastal Sound Music Academy	Dan Mattinson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs office space</li> <li>• Access to individual schools is currently good but subject to change</li> <li>• Needs access to a 150 to 200 seat rehearsal space or space performance space</li> <li>• Would like a dance facility so that it can expand its services</li> <li>• Hopes to acquire Ecole des Pionniers for a more comprehensive fine arts academy</li> <li>• Wants to be part of activities at Leigh Square Arts Village</li> <li>• Supports the development of a larger theatre for the Northeast Sector (e.g. 800 to 1,000 seats)</li> <li>• Needs additional operating funding</li> <li>• Training in capacity building and volunteer management would be useful</li> </ul>
24.	Community Cultural Development Advisory Committee	Linda Kozina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for additional volunteers in cultural sector and for training in volunteer management</li> <li>• Operational funding for the Leigh Square Arts Village</li> <li>• Need for public education about the value of Leigh Square Arts Village and role/benefits of arts related activities and services</li> <li>• Need for succession planning on the committee</li> <li>• Need to engage multicultural newcomers in arts activities in the city</li> </ul>
25.	Friends of Leigh Square	Karen Kurnaedy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the development of Phase II of the Leigh Square Arts Village</li> <li>• Need to develop policies and procedures for operation of the new Arts Village facilities</li> <li>• Need for a volunteer management programme for Leigh Square</li> </ul>
26.	Port Coquitlam Heritage and Cultural Society	Pippa van Velzen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Society wants part time staff paid by City</li> <li>• Society wants City to provide a museum facility</li> <li>• Current artifact storage space is inaccessible and lacks environmental controls</li> <li>• Need for a City-supplied Internet connection at the existing Heritage Centre</li> <li>• Need for renewal of volunteers in the society</li> <li>• Need for a volunteer management program</li> <li>• Need for a heritage inventory and heritage management plan</li> <li>• Need for clarification of the society's future role in the archives at Leigh Square</li> <li>• Need to revisit the society's strategic plan</li> </ul>

	<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Individual</b>	<b>Greatest Needs and Issues</b>
27.	B.C. Registered Music Teachers Association	Liz Munro	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for renewal of branch as a few members do all the work</li> <li>• Rental of Terry Fox Theatre piano is expensive</li> </ul>
28.	Terry Fox Action Group	Marilyn Sander	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need ability to book facility for renters more than 1 year ahead of time</li> <li>• Need to physically separate the theatre's access from the school for more efficient operation</li> <li>• Theatre needs larger lobby, concession, dressing rooms, and a box office</li> </ul>
29.	Society for Community Development	Cheryl McKeever	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location of offices at Riverview is not ideal (inaccessible and less visible)</li> <li>• Need for a Festival Society in Port Coquitlam</li> <li>• Need for a more effective volunteer recruitment and referral system</li> <li>• Need for a leisure access program to address fee issues</li> <li>• Need to involve residents as participants in the arts, not just as spectators</li> <li>• Need for more dialogue between programmers and potential registrants</li> </ul>
30.	West Coast Chocolate Festival	Linda Baker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs a paid co-ordinator for the society's festival and its volunteers</li> <li>• Need for a Port Coquitlam Festival Society</li> <li>• Need for more effective volunteer recruitment and referral system</li> <li>• Need for public education about the value of arts related activities and services</li> </ul>
31.	Stage 43	Dave Fiddler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to involve multicultural newcomers in arts activities in the community</li> <li>• Needs own facility in which to meet, administer, rehearse, build, and store, i.e. a clubhouse</li> <li>• Evergreen Theatre needs a fly tower and lobby needs upgrading</li> <li>• Community needs a small black box theatre, such as proposed for Phase II at Leigh Square Arts Village</li> <li>• Needs more operating, not project, funds</li> </ul>
32.	Centrestage Productions	Marilyn Sander	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loading area at Terry Fox Theatre needs upgrading</li> <li>• Evergreen Theatre needs carpeting on stairs</li> <li>• Community needs a small black box theatre, such as proposed for Phase II at Leigh Square Arts Village</li> <li>• Needs training in capacity building and volunteer management</li> <li>• Need for more effective volunteer recruitment and referral system</li> <li>• Needs logistical support: e.g. low cost rehearsal space, community inventory of equipment, costumes, and supplies</li> <li>• Needs free access to promotional publications such as leisure guide and local press</li> <li>• Needs training in marketing</li> </ul>

	<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Individual</b>	<b>Greatest Needs and Issues</b>
33.	Theatrix	Deb Solberg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transportation within community is a problem due to train tracks</li> <li>• Leigh Square Community Arts Workroom has columns that prevent Theatrix's use of facility</li> <li>• Dispute with Terry Fox Theatre Action Group has caused Theatrix to move performances to Maple Ridge</li> <li>• Need a large theatre in the Northeast Sector, with height above stage, full backstage facilities</li> <li>• Need dedicated space for office, storage, meetings</li> <li>• Need to develop fundraising capacity within the organization</li> <li>• Could use volunteer management services</li> <li>• Lots of studies in community but nothing changes</li> <li>• Municipal grants not available from the 3 cities, only from city of postal address and highest population participation</li> </ul>
34.	Time Step Cloggers	Helen LeCounte	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cooling system in room used at Wilson Centre does not work quickly enough</li> <li>• Time Step Cloggers are not given full opportunities to perform at City and community events such as River Days</li> </ul>
35.	Friends of the Terry Fox Library	Margaret Owens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued existence of organization is in jeopardy due to inactivity</li> <li>• Public is unaware of group's existence</li> <li>• (Regional Library does not appear to encourage voluntarism)</li> <li>• Need for program in City to provide supports and training for not for profit sector in the area of voluntarism</li> <li>• Significant loss of programming space in library to staff offices</li> <li>• Need for lawn bowling facility in Port Coquitlam</li> </ul>
36.	S.D. #43	Lorcan O'Melinn, Sec. Treas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are seeing some decreases in elementary enrolment levels, but are not anticipating school closures</li> <li>• Doing some school renovation projects, but are not looking at a new school for 10 years</li> <li>• Would like to explore School Community Connections Program opportunities</li> <li>• Currently working with Dept. on updating Joint-Use Agreement – report it has a good relationship</li> <li>• Would like to explore field maintenance with Dept.</li> <li>• Explore more program partnerships in youth activity, pleased with Grade 5 initiative</li> </ul>

	Name of Group	Individual	Greatest Needs and Issues
37.	Triad Concert Society Champagne Concerts	Gay Northey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor acoustics at Terry Fox Theatre (especially for quieter music, such as chamber orchestras and for choral performances)</li> <li>• Can't plan performance seasons years in advance, as is a school-affiliated facility with no long range scheduling process</li> <li>• Lobby at Terry Fox Theatre is too small</li> <li>• Need for better physical separation of theatre from school instructional space</li> <li>• No volunteer staff at Terry Fox Theatre, unlike Evergreen Theatre where volunteer support is available</li> <li>• No concession/water access or box office at Terry Fox Theatre</li> <li>• The community needs a larger theatre for the Northeast Sector</li> <li>• Need for better understanding of cultural needs on the part of City staff and Council</li> <li>• Need for succession planning and organizational renewal in Triad</li> <li>• Young people are not instilled with a sense of volunteer obligations to community</li> <li>• City's free concerts at Leigh Square compete with Triad's concerts</li> </ul>
38.	DPAC	Brenda Seaman, Heather	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about inequities in SD 43 regarding use of Gaming funds for playgrounds between Coq. And Port Coquitlam schools</li> <li>• Would like to see more school playgrounds developed jointly with Dept., Robert Hope is a priority</li> <li>• See good joint programming at some schools, would like more to improve skill development</li> <li>• More pre-school programs in evenings for working parents</li> <li>• See additional need for after-school programs</li> <li>• Quality of Minnekada field is a concern</li> <li>• In terms of community facilities, would like to see more high quality soccer field, one additional ice sheet and a second pool</li> <li>• Would like to see Robert Hope pool open earlier in June for use by schools</li> </ul>
39.	Terry Fox Library	Pat Dawson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have a new vision, values, and tactical plan</li> <li>• Community development has a high priority</li> <li>• Main concern is Terry Fox facility, interior is in bad shape and contracted cleaning service is inadequate</li> <li>• Repairs, regular maintenance poor, vandalism</li> <li>• Are pleased renovations are planned</li> <li>• Good relationship with Dept., sees more opportunities to partner on literacy, other programs</li> <li>• Terry Fox memorabilia need to be archived and displayed properly</li> </ul>

	<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Individual</b>	<b>Greatest Needs and Issues</b>
40.	Masters Field Lacrosse	Daryl Fernquist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have 6 teams and cap of 108 players, largest masters program that grew from 2 teams</li> <li>• Really pleased with new artificial field at Gates Park</li> <li>• Parks staff are very helpful as field booking staff.</li> <li>• Club encourages all levels of players, emphasizes fun and volunteer commitment by players</li> <li>• Ensure that teams are even and everyone plays</li> <li>• While their needs are met would like to see an additional artificial field in Port Coquitlam (north)</li> </ul>
41.	Saints Jr. and Intermediate Lacrosse	Reg Thompson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program has resulted in 14 players in NLL</li> <li>• Season is from end of April until Minto Cup</li> <li>• Use a school gym for pre-season, but practice and play at Port Coquitlam Rec. Complex</li> <li>• Would like an additional practice time, questions time for other groups (ball hockey)</li> <li>• Main concern with facility is lack of a home dressing room for teams, add to west side of facility</li> <li>• Need for 2 new change rooms (25 person), storage and trainers area</li> <li>• Would like to see a new Arena added to existing 2 on adjacent old works yard site, new arena should be Copeland size 1,800-2,200</li> </ul>
42.	BIA	Pat Dales	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BIA involved in a number of beautification projects in downtown, banners, flower baskets, street signage</li> <li>• Promotes special events – Harvest Festival, etc.</li> <li>• Looking to do a Legacy Project – potential partnership with City or Dept.</li> <li>• One option is improving underpass as entry, make it pedestrian friendly</li> <li>• Another option is PoCo Trail at McCallister as Gateway</li> <li>• Leigh Square Arts Village partnerships in future such as concerts, etc., to bring people to downtown.</li> </ul>
43.	Legion 133	Fran Roberts, Ken Coupe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Puts about \$60,00 back into community each year</li> <li>• Includes Meals on Wheels, Hospice, scholarships, cadets, soccer, etc.</li> <li>• Their new building is under construction, includes 54 assisted living units operated by Chelsea Society</li> <li>• Ideally would like to see a park near the facility that is accessible to seniors who use scooters/chairs</li> <li>• Has a very good relationship with the City and Dept.</li> <li>• Work together on joint projects and community events</li> <li>• Likes the things the Dept is doing</li> </ul>
44.	Knights of Columbus	Ed Nault	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribute to a number of charities, hospitals, etc.</li> <li>• Major connection is to Port Coquitlam Youth Group</li> <li>• Also contribute to Seniors Week</li> <li>• Would look at additional partnerships, Dept could make a presentation at their meeting</li> <li>• Personally uses the Wilson Centre and likes parks and trails in community</li> </ul>

	<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Individual</b>	<b>Greatest Needs and Issues</b>
45.	Our Lady of Assumption, Archbishop Carney	Alice Hale, Len DeJulius, Sandy Battle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OLA is doing a phase 3 addition of an art centre</li> <li>• Field space is at a premium for both schools, ideally like to see an artificial turf field somewhere in North</li> <li>• Would like to see a joint-use agreement between Dept and Catholic Board</li> <li>• Do use community facilities, but are not part of Grade 5 initiative</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
46.	Girl Guides	Sue Stephens and Linda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have 470 girls involved. Do a lot of community outreach, leadership and service</li> <li>• Work with Dept on Rivers Day, other events</li> <li>• Feel there is a need for more multi-purpose spaces for meetings (20-40) people and active training</li> <li>• Also see need for active space (small gym), as well as a larger, nice area for ceremonies</li> <li>• Use a park for outdoor skills training and would ideally like to see a park with a covered shelter, water, washrooms – Castle Park would be a good location</li> </ul>
47.	General Comments made as residents		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More fields are needed, especially quality ones</li> <li>• Another artificial turf field</li> <li>• One more ice surface</li> <li>• Consider additional pool in future (in South)</li> <li>• More child and youth outdoor facilities – roller hockey, designated mountain bike trail, skate park is seen as plus</li> <li>• Dog off-leash areas</li> <li>• Traboulay Trail is well received and used</li> <li>• More pre-school programs in evenings and on weekends</li> <li>• Need to hook up Burke Mountain and Port Coquitlam with trails</li> <li>• Water access to rivers for canoes/kayaks</li> </ul>

## Issues Raised in Departmental Staff Meetings

1.	Department Management staff	Barry, Bill, Bev, Cheryl, Jill, and Larry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public expectations for service are increasing</li> <li>• There are more homeless and disadvantaged people and more people with special needs</li> <li>• We'll need more public open space and services to respond to population increases in medium density developments</li> <li>• Increased transportation time is impacting where people look for leisure services</li> <li>• There is reduced volunteerism in many parts of the leisure service system</li> <li>• There is more sensitivity about environmental issues</li> <li>• A new bridge will likely consume all available capital for a few years and limit what we can do in our department</li> <li>• Most of our buildings are in the last half of their functional lifespan and therefore take more maintenance effort and resources to keep up</li> <li>• Growth on Burke Mountain will impact us in Port Coquitlam</li> <li>• Use of our facilities has increased to the point where we cannot accommodate all need</li> <li>• Our Information Technology systems have problems that need to be addressed</li> </ul>
2.	Department Admin staff	Marie, Sonja, Paula, Kim, Ann, Sheryl, Pat, Alana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personal safety while working in and around facilities is becoming an issue – this affects our users as much as our staff</li> <li>• Demand for facility bookings has increased significantly in recent years and we can no longer accommodate all need</li> <li>• Vandalism is increasing, as is homelessness and safety issues within our facilities – we spend too much time dealing with these things that we never used to have to deal with</li> <li>• Our processes for providing financial aid are no longer sufficient to respond to the need</li> <li>• There are problems with our Youth Centre – mainstream kids don't go there any more</li> <li>• We need more communication within the department – sometimes we have to relay decisions that we cannot interpret</li> <li>• Our process for reimbursing our contractors is far too cumbersome and needs to be fixed</li> </ul>

## Issues Raised in Departmental Staff Meetings

3.	Department Program Staff	Alette, Rob, Janis, Susan, Deanna and Glen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expectations to deal with problem youth and other social issues grows and takes up more of our time – we are becoming a community services department without the realization of that nor the resources to respond to these expectations</li> <li>• There is increasing polarization between those that don't want change and those that want massive change in our community</li> <li>• Our relationship with the local School Board is not as strong as it used to be and not as strong as it needs to be</li> <li>• There is a trend toward more services in arts and culture but no clarity about what the end point of this shift will be or really means – for example, do we have the resources to properly operate what we are getting into</li> <li>• Our programming staff is expected to provide IT support but doesn't have sufficient expertise to do that</li> <li>• It takes far to long to hire new staff</li> <li>• We need to make and implement decisions faster</li> </ul>
4.	Department Maintenance staff	Bob, Paul, Dean, Dan, Vern and Kelly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have less staff to do the work and far more work (more use of existing facilities, less time between uses and between seasons of use, and many more buildings to maintain) to do</li> <li>• We are becoming too "top heavy" in the department</li> <li>• Technical facility operations reports to a Parks Manager who isn't expected to know much about such operations</li> <li>• Our focus is shifting from maintenance to security of the buildings and the personnel in them; especially late at night</li> <li>• There isn't enough money each year to do the kinds of preventative maintenance and repairs that is required</li> <li>• Our input on maintenance issues isn't used when new buildings are developed – we still cut corners in construction and pay for that many times over in ongoing maintenance</li> <li>• There isn't enough collaboration between the programmers and the maintenance staff</li> <li>• We need to make decisions more quickly in the department</li> </ul>

## Issues Raised in Departmental Staff Meetings

5. Parks Staff
- Needs an apprenticeship program
  - Resources are stretched at the moment due to casual specs in the works
  - Lacking in arboriculture
  - Arboriculture – also need inventories/meet schedules and designate resources
  - Inventories and schedules need updating
  - No IPM program in place / no formal process
  - Increase on tailgate meetings and reminders required
  - Working alone; reporting schedule in place
  - Equipment quality and type – very good and well maintained
  - Irrigation needs improvement
  - Would like a centralized irrigation system
  - Communications process – email is limited
  - Drainage an issue at some facilities
  - Need capital
  - Life cycle plan coming to an end
  - School field pressures
  - Maintenance management – have given input into new building about vandalism but not heard
  - Maintenance management schedules – not formalized
  - Customer service – good feed back from sports field users
  - Cemetery emphasis should be picked up/ staff resources
  - More fields are required especially for adults
  - More ground ways / walkways / and pedestrian friendly routes.
  - Dog problem at Gates Park and other parks
  - Dogs – no off leash area
  - Land Acquisition – needs to grab additional land no/ water frontage
  - Reforestation of urban forest areas should be a priority
  - Hiring and training of seasonal staff could be improved
  - Lack of education / educational resources a barrier
  - Schedule and inventory updates is required
  - A “work above” policy is underway
  - Water system not centralized or computerized
  - Access to water fountain in the future
  - Public market near river or near wild duck site would be a good idea
  - An Irrigation technician is required
  - The ten year life cycle maintenance is coming to an end
  - The School District's joint agreement is expired
  - Replace aging buildings

# Appendices

Appendix C  
Results of Public Survey



PORT COQUITLAM  
PARKS AND RECREATION



*experience it!*

2015 PLAN

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Quantitative Results	4
1. How does your family find out about parks, recreation and cultural services and opportunities in Port Coquitlam? (Please circle all that apply)	4
2. Do any of the following limit your household's participation in recreation and cultural programs and services provided by the City of Port Coquitlam? (Please circle all that apply)	5
3. Do any of the following limit your household's use of Port Coquitlam parks and trails? (Please circle all that apply)	6
4. In your opinion, are any new or improved parks or outdoor recreation facilities needed in Port Coquitlam?	7
4a. If YES, which new or improved outdoor facilities are needed? (Please circle all that apply)	7
5. In your opinion, are new or improved indoor recreation and cultural facilities needed in Port Coquitlam? (Please circle one number)	9
5a. If YES, which new or improved indoor recreation and cultural facilities are needed? (Please circle all that apply)	9
6. If you indicated that a new ice surface is needed, please indicate the activities that you or your household would likely participate in at the arena. (Please circle all that apply)	10
7. For the new or improved facilities you identified in #4a and 5a, would you support any tax increases (or rent, if a renter) to help pay for new or improved facilities? (Please circle one number)	11
7a. If YES, what is the maximum increase in your annual property taxes (or rent, if a renter) you would be willing to pay in order to help build and / or operate new or improved facilities? (Please circle one number)	11
8. Would you support any of the following in order to improve parks, recreation and cultural services in Port Coquitlam? (Please circle all that apply)	12
9. If you or anyone in your household has taken part in City of Port Coquitlam programs or services, please indicate how you would rate each of the following. (Please circle one number for each line)	12
Customer Service	12
Program Fees	13
Program Quality	13
Registration Process	14
10. For each of the following activity categories, do you believe current opportunities in Port Coquitlam are more than adequate, adequate or lacking? (Please circle one number for each line)	14
Fitness / Health	14
Performing Arts	15
Recreational Sports	15
Competitive Sports	16
Outdoor / Nature	17
Special Events	17
Visual Arts / Crafts	18
11. How satisfied are you with the quality of recreation and cultural facilities in Port Coquitlam? (Please circle one number for each line: VS (Very Satisfied), SS (Somewhat Satisfied), SD (Somewhat Dissatisfied), VD (Very Dissatisfied), NO (No Opinion))	19
Ice Surfaces	19

**Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey**

	Indoor Swimming Pools.....	19
	Outdoor Swimming Pools.....	20
	Terry Fox Library.....	20
	Seniors Centre.....	21
	Recreation Centres.....	21
	Health and Fitness Facilities.....	22
	Youth Centres.....	22
12.	How satisfied are you with the quality of public parks and open space areas in Port Coquitlam? (Please circle one number for each line: VS (Very Satisfied), SS (Somewhat Satisfied), SD (Somewhat Dissatisfied), VD (Very Dissatisfied), NO (No Opinion))	23
	Bicycle / Pedestrian Routes.....	23
	Parks / Green Space.....	23
	Sports Fields.....	24
	Playgrounds.....	24
	Tennis Courts.....	25
	Lacrosse Boxes.....	25
	Sports Courts.....	26
	Spray Pool / Water Parks.....	26
13.	To what extent do you feel that parks, recreation and cultural services in Port Coquitlam provide benefits to your household or to the community? (Please circle one number for each line)	27
	Benefits Your Household.....	27
	Benefits the Community.....	27
14.	Please rank the following in terms of importance to your household. (Please circle one number for each line: VI (Very Important), I (Important), NI (Not Important), NO (No Opinion))	28
	Streets / Roads.....	28
	Water / Sewer System.....	28
	Recreation Facilities.....	29
	Public Safety.....	30
	Trails / Parks.....	30
	Other	31
15.	What is your gender? (Please circle one number)	31
16.	In which age group are you? (Please circle one number)	31
17.	What best describes the type of household in which you live? (Please circle one number)	33
18.	Where do you live? (Please circle one number)	33

**Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey**

Qualitative Results

34

1. How does your family find out about parks, recreation and cultural services and opportunities in Port Coquitlam? (Other responses) 34
2. Do any of the following limit your household's participation in recreation and cultural programs and services provided by the City of Port Coquitlam?  
(Other responses).....34
3. Do any of the following limit your household's use of Port Coquitlam parks and trails? (Other responses) 36
4. In your opinion, are any new or improved parks or outdoor recreation facilities needed in Port Coquitlam? (Other responses) 36
5. In your opinion, are new or improved indoor recreation and cultural facilities needed in Port Coquitlam? (Other responses) 37
6. If you indicated that a new ice surface is needed, please indicate the activities that you or your household would likely participate in at the arena.  
(Other responses).....38
7. For the new or improved facilities you identified in #4a and 5a, would you support any tax increases (or rent, if a renter) to help pay for new or improved facilities? (Other responses) .....38
8. Would you support any of the following in order to improve parks, recreation and cultural services in Port Coquitlam? (Other responses)38
14. Please rank the following in terms of importance to your household. (Please circle one number for each line:  
VI (Very Important), I (Important), NI (Not Important), NO (No Opinion)) (Other responses) 39
19. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about parks, recreation and cultural services in Port Coquitlam? If so, please use the space below. 41

## Quantitative Results

1. How does your family find out about parks, recreation and cultural services and opportunities in Port Coquitlam? (Please circle **all** that apply)

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	702	340	353	693	79	368	133	115	695	159	203	291	36	689	342	344	686
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Local newspapers	531	266	259	525	57	276	102	90	525	123	143	225	29	520	253	264	517
	75.6%	78.2%	73.4%	75.8%	72.2%	75.0%	76.7%	78.3%	75.5%	77.4%	70.4%	77.3%	80.6%	75.5%	74.0%	76.7%	75.4%
Seasonal leisure guide	479	249	227	476	55	264	91	66	476	96	127	222	28	473	247	224	471
	68.2%	73.2%	64.3%	68.7%	69.6%	71.7%	68.4%	57.4%	68.5%	60.4%	62.6%	76.3%	77.8%	68.7%	72.2%	65.1%	68.7%
Word-of-mouth	310	146	162	308	44	168	57	39	308	73	81	135	16	305	149	158	307
	44.2%	42.9%	45.9%	44.4%	55.7%	45.7%	42.9%	33.9%	44.3%	45.9%	39.9%	46.4%	44.4%	44.3%	43.6%	45.9%	44.8%
Recreation program flyers	278	130	145	275	18	149	63	45	275	61	79	121	13	274	126	145	271
	39.6%	38.2%	41.1%	39.7%	22.8%	40.5%	47.4%	39.1%	39.6%	38.4%	38.9%	41.6%	36.1%	39.8%	36.8%	42.2%	39.5%
Through activities at recreation centres	149	80	67	147	15	82	19	30	146	24	39	72	11	146	63	84	147
	21.2%	23.5%	19.0%	21.2%	19.0%	22.3%	14.3%	26.1%	21.0%	15.1%	19.2%	24.7%	30.6%	21.2%	18.4%	24.4%	21.4%
Notices through schools	105	54	51	105	9	81	11	4	105	4	7	82	11	104	51	54	105
	15.0%	15.9%	14.4%	15.2%	11.4%	22.0%	8.3%	3.5%	15.1%	2.5%	3.4%	28.2%	30.6%	15.1%	14.9%	15.7%	15.3%
City website	99	58	38	96	21	58	10	9	98	16	27	53	2	98	48	47	95
	14.1%	17.1%	10.8%	13.9%	26.6%	15.8%	7.5%	7.8%	14.1%	10.1%	13.3%	18.2%	5.6%	14.2%	14.0%	13.7%	13.8%
On-line registration	40	22	18	40	6	27	5	2	40	6	3	29	2	40	14	26	40
	5.7%	6.5%	5.1%	5.8%	7.6%	7.3%	3.8%	1.7%	5.8%	3.8%	1.5%	10.0%	5.6%	5.8%	4.1%	7.6%	5.8%
Other	22	12	10	22	3	14	2	3	22	6	6	10	0	22	7	15	22
	3.1%	3.5%	2.8%	3.2%	3.8%	3.8%	1.5%	2.6%	3.2%	3.8%	3.0%	3.4%	.0%	3.2%	2.0%	4.4%	3.2%

Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

2. Do any of the following limit your household's participation in **recreation and cultural programs and services** provided by the City of Port Coquitlam? (Please circle **all** that apply)

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	697 100.0%	336 100.0%	351 100.0%	687 100.0%	78 100.0%	365 100.0%	137 100.0%	110 100.0%	690 100.0%	161 100.0%	199 100.0%	288 100.0%	36 100.0%	684 100.0%	341 100.0%	340 100.0%	681 100.0%
Nothing limits participation	248 35.6%	103 30.7%	141 40.2%	244 35.5%	16 20.5%	115 31.5%	58 42.3%	56 50.9%	245 35.5%	72 44.7%	90 45.2%	63 21.9%	16 44.4%	241 35.2%	113 33.1%	127 37.4%	240 35.2%
Lack of time	210 30.1%	98 29.2%	111 31.6%	209 30.4%	28 35.9%	132 36.2%	36 26.3%	14 12.7%	210 30.4%	34 21.1%	59 29.6%	109 37.8%	8 22.2%	210 30.7%	106 31.1%	102 30.0%	208 30.5%
Program times & days	189 27.1%	112 33.3%	75 21.4%	187 27.2%	30 38.5%	118 32.3%	27 19.7%	12 10.9%	187 27.1%	24 14.9%	40 20.1%	115 39.9%	9 25.0%	188 27.5%	90 26.4%	95 27.9%	185 27.2%
Cost	159 22.8%	83 24.7%	72 20.5%	155 22.6%	22 28.2%	91 24.9%	24 17.5%	20 18.2%	157 22.8%	28 17.4%	32 16.1%	83 28.8%	13 36.1%	156 22.8%	79 23.2%	77 22.6%	156 22.9%
Lack of facilities	71 10.2%	36 10.7%	34 9.7%	70 10.2%	10 12.8%	45 12.3%	11 8.0%	4 3.6%	70 10.1%	10 6.2%	11 5.5%	44 15.3%	4 11.1%	69 10.1%	32 9.4%	37 10.9%	69 10.1%
Quality of facilities	40 5.7%	19 5.7%	21 6.0%	40 5.8%	9 11.5%	24 6.6%	5 3.6%	2 1.8%	40 5.8%	4 2.5%	9 4.5%	25 8.7%	2 5.6%	40 5.8%	17 5.0%	23 6.8%	40 5.9%
Lack of transportation	41 5.9%	23 6.8%	17 4.8%	40 5.8%	1 1.3%	18 4.9%	11 8.0%	10 9.1%	40 5.8%	14 8.7%	7 3.5%	15 5.2%	3 8.3%	39 5.7%	17 5.0%	23 6.8%	40 5.9%
Access/disability	31 4.4%	14 4.2%	15 4.3%	29 4.2%	1 1.3%	13 3.6%	4 2.9%	12 10.9%	30 4.3%	8 5.0%	10 5.0%	9 3.1%	2 5.6%	29 4.2%	13 3.8%	16 4.7%	29 4.3%
Other	24 3.4%	12 3.6%	12 3.4%	24 3.5%	6 7.7%	10 2.7%	5 3.6%	3 2.7%	24 3.5%	12 7.5%	4 2.0%	8 2.8%	0 .0%	24 3.5%	10 2.9%	14 4.1%	24 3.5%
Lack of childcare services	18 2.6%	10 3.0%	8 2.3%	18 2.6%	3 3.8%	13 3.6%	1 .7%	1 .9%	18 2.6%	2 1.2%	0 .0%	12 4.2%	4 11.1%	18 2.6%	7 2.1%	11 3.2%	18 2.6%

*Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey*

3. Do any of the following limit your household's use of Port Coquitlam **parks and trails**? (Please circle **all** that apply)

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	681 100.0%	325 100.0%	348 100.0%	673 100.0%	76 100.0%	360 100.0%	133 100.0%	105 100.0%	674 100.0%	153 100.0%	199 100.0%	283 100.0%	34 100.0%	669 100.0%	335 100.0%	331 100.0%	666 100.0%
Nothing limits participation	373 54.8%	157 48.3%	211 60.6%	368 54.7%	31 40.8%	201 55.8%	79 59.4%	58 55.2%	369 54.7%	98 64.1%	112 56.3%	139 49.1%	17 50.0%	366 54.7%	187 55.8%	178 53.8%	365 54.8%
Concerns regarding personal safety	202 29.7%	119 36.6%	81 23.3%	200 29.7%	27 35.5%	102 28.3%	40 30.1%	31 29.5%	200 29.7%	43 28.1%	53 26.6%	92 32.5%	11 32.4%	199 29.7%	105 31.3%	92 27.8%	197 29.6%
Location not known	102 15.0%	57 17.5%	43 12.4%	100 14.9%	18 23.7%	60 16.7%	14 10.5%	9 8.6%	101 15.0%	13 8.5%	29 14.6%	55 19.4%	3 8.8%	100 14.9%	39 11.6%	58 17.5%	97 14.6%
Lack of amenities	46 6.8%	19 5.8%	27 7.8%	46 6.8%	5 6.6%	25 6.9%	10 7.5%	6 5.7%	46 6.8%	8 5.2%	14 7.0%	23 8.1%	1 2.9%	46 6.9%	22 6.6%	24 7.3%	46 6.9%
Quality of amenities	35 5.1%	18 5.5%	17 4.9%	35 5.2%	7 9.2%	23 6.4%	2 1.5%	3 2.9%	35 5.2%	2 1.3%	8 4.0%	23 8.1%	2 5.9%	35 5.2%	16 4.8%	19 5.7%	35 5.3%
Other	30 4.4%	19 5.8%	11 3.2%	30 4.5%	6 7.9%	15 4.2%	5 3.8%	4 3.8%	30 4.5%	5 3.3%	11 5.5%	13 4.6%	1 2.9%	30 4.5%	18 5.4%	11 3.3%	29 4.4%
Access/disability	22 3.2%	8 2.5%	13 3.7%	21 3.1%	0 .0%	5 1.4%	3 2.3%	12 11.4%	20 3.0%	7 4.6%	10 5.0%	2 .7%	1 2.9%	20 3.0%	7 2.1%	14 4.2%	21 3.2%

Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

4. In your opinion, are any new or improved parks or outdoor recreation facilities needed in Port Coquitlam?

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	701 100.0%	339 100.0%	352 100.0%	691 100.0%	78 100.0%	370 100.0%	135 100.0%	111 100.0%	694 100.0%	163 100.0%	200 100.0%	290 100.0%	36 100.0%	689 100.0%	343 100.0%	342 100.0%	685 100.0%
Yes	473 67.5%	230 67.8%	238 67.6%	468 67.7%	61 78.2%	272 73.5%	85 63.0%	51 45.9%	469 67.6%	77 47.2%	125 62.5%	234 80.7%	30 83.3%	466 67.6%	230 67.1%	233 68.1%	463 67.6%
No	228 32.5%	109 32.2%	114 32.4%	223 32.3%	17 21.8%	98 26.5%	50 37.0%	60 54.1%	225 32.4%	86 52.8%	75 37.5%	56 19.3%	6 16.7%	223 32.4%	113 32.9%	109 31.9%	222 32.4%

4a. If YES, which new or improved outdoor facilities are needed? (Please circle all that apply)

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	473 100.0%	230 100.0%	238 100.0%	468 100.0%	61 100.0%	272 100.0%	85 100.0%	51 100.0%	469 100.0%	77 100.0%	125 100.0%	234 100.0%	30 100.0%	466 100.0%	230 100.0%	233 100.0%	463 100.0%
Spray pool/water parks	165 34.9%	91 39.6%	73 30.7%	164 35.0%	34 55.7%	107 39.3%	14 16.5%	9 17.6%	164 35.0%	15 19.5%	29 23.2%	105 44.9%	13 43.3%	162 34.8%	77 33.5%	85 36.5%	162 35.0%
Gardens/horticultural areas	136 28.8%	74 32.2%	61 25.6%	135 28.8%	16 26.2%	69 25.4%	29 34.1%	22 43.1%	136 29.0%	27 35.1%	44 35.2%	53 22.6%	9 30.0%	133 28.5%	65 28.3%	68 29.2%	133 28.7%
Dog off leash areas	131 27.7%	76 33.0%	55 23.1%	131 28.0%	20 32.8%	72 26.5%	22 25.9%	16 31.4%	130 27.7%	31 40.3%	42 33.6%	47 20.1%	10 33.3%	130 27.9%	68 29.6%	62 26.6%	130 28.1%
Outdoor swimming pools	128 27.1%	70 30.4%	57 23.9%	127 27.1%	17 27.9%	78 28.7%	23 27.1%	9 17.6%	127 27.1%	15 19.5%	26 20.8%	76 32.5%	9 30.0%	126 27.0%	60 26.1%	66 28.3%	126 27.2%
Sports fields	127 26.8%	58 25.2%	68 28.6%	126 26.9%	22 36.1%	76 27.9%	19 22.4%	9 17.6%	126 26.9%	19 24.7%	25 20.0%	74 31.6%	8 26.7%	126 27.0%	65 28.3%	59 25.3%	124 26.8%
Neighbourhood parks/playgrounds	113 23.9%	53 23.0%	60 25.2%	113 24.1%	24 39.3%	60 22.1%	17 20.0%	12 23.5%	113 24.1%	13 16.9%	30 24.0%	61 26.1%	7 23.3%	111 23.8%	63 27.4%	50 21.5%	113 24.4%
Trails	99 20.9%	40 17.4%	58 24.4%	98 20.9%	11 18.0%	59 21.7%	22 25.9%	7 13.7%	99 21.1%	18 23.4%	40 32.0%	39 16.7%	2 6.7%	99 21.2%	56 24.3%	42 18.0%	98 21.2%
Sport Courts	82 17.3%	34 14.8%	48 20.2%	82 17.5%	11 18.0%	55 20.2%	12 14.1%	4 7.8%	82 17.5%	14 18.2%	13 10.4%	49 20.9%	6 20.0%	82 17.6%	41 17.8%	40 17.2%	81 17.5%
Tennis courts	71 15.0%	34 14.8%	37 15.5%	71 15.2%	10 16.4%	46 16.9%	13 15.3%	2 3.9%	71 15.1%	6 7.8%	17 13.6%	45 19.2%	2 6.7%	70 15.0%	31 13.5%	39 16.7%	70 15.1%
Other	44 9.3%	15 6.5%	27 11.3%	42 9.0%	4 6.6%	24 8.8%	12 14.1%	2 3.9%	42 9.0%	7 9.1%	9 7.2%	22 9.4%	4 13.3%	42 9.0%	22 9.6%	20 8.6%	42 9.1%
Lacrosse boxes	29 6.1%	12 5.2%	16 6.7%	28 6.0%	5 8.2%	19 7.0%	1 1.2%	3 5.9%	28 6.0%	3 3.9%	3 2.4%	21 9.0%	1 3.3%	28 6.0%	9 3.9%	19 8.2%	28 6.0%
Skateboard parks	23 4.9%	12 5.2%	11 4.6%	23 4.9%	2 3.3%	15 5.5%	6 7.1%	0 0%	23 4.9%	6 7.8%	5 4.0%	10 4.3%	2 6.7%	23 4.9%	11 4.8%	11 4.7%	22 4.8%



Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

5. In your opinion, are **new or improved indoor recreation and cultural facilities** needed in Port Coquitlam? (Please circle **one** number)

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	687 100.0%	332 100.0%	347 100.0%	679 100.0%	78 100.0%	358 100.0%	135 100.0%	111 100.0%	682 100.0%	162 100.0%	199 100.0%	283 100.0%	35 100.0%	679 100.0%	335 100.0%	338 100.0%	673 100.0%
Yes	439 63.9%	219 66.0%	215 62.0%	434 63.9%	51 65.4%	247 69.0%	86 63.7%	52 46.8%	436 63.9%	86 53.1%	119 59.8%	202 71.4%	27 77.1%	434 63.9%	204 60.9%	227 67.2%	431 64.0%
No	248 36.1%	113 34.0%	132 38.0%	245 36.1%	27 34.6%	111 31.0%	49 36.3%	59 53.2%	246 36.1%	76 46.9%	80 40.2%	81 28.6%	8 22.9%	245 36.1%	131 39.1%	111 32.8%	242 36.0%

5a. If YES, which new or improved indoor recreation and cultural facilities are needed? (Please circle **all** that apply)

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	437 100.0%	217 100.0%	215 100.0%	432 100.0%	51 100.0%	246 100.0%	86 100.0%	51 100.0%	434 100.0%	84 100.0%	119 100.0%	202 100.0%	27 100.0%	432 100.0%	203 100.0%	227 100.0%	430 100.0%
Health/fitness/weight training area	178 40.7%	95 43.8%	82 38.1%	177 41.0%	18 35.3%	108 43.9%	37 43.0%	14 27.5%	177 40.8%	39 46.4%	47 39.5%	79 39.1%	11 40.7%	176 40.7%	81 39.9%	94 41.4%	175 40.7%
Indoor swimming pool	177 40.5%	88 40.6%	88 40.9%	176 40.7%	23 45.1%	107 43.5%	31 36.0%	15 29.4%	176 40.6%	30 35.7%	37 31.1%	91 45.0%	17 63.0%	175 40.5%	65 32.0%	107 47.1%	172 40.0%
Ice surface	152 34.8%	63 29.0%	88 40.9%	151 35.0%	25 49.0%	96 39.0%	22 25.6%	9 17.6%	152 35.0%	23 27.4%	24 20.2%	93 46.0%	11 40.7%	151 35.0%	73 36.0%	77 33.9%	150 34.9%
Arts/cultural facility	118 27.0%	75 34.6%	43 20.0%	118 27.3%	9 17.6%	70 28.5%	27 31.4%	12 23.5%	118 27.2%	22 26.2%	38 31.9%	47 23.3%	9 33.3%	116 26.9%	57 28.1%	61 26.9%	118 27.4%
Seniors centre	97 22.2%	54 24.9%	39 18.1%	93 21.5%	3 5.9%	33 13.4%	30 34.9%	28 54.9%	94 21.7%	32 38.1%	35 29.4%	20 9.9%	5 18.5%	92 21.3%	48 23.6%	44 19.4%	92 21.4%
Youth centre	83 19.0%	45 20.7%	38 17.7%	83 19.2%	11 21.6%	54 22.0%	11 12.8%	7 13.7%	83 19.1%	17 20.2%	16 13.4%	42 20.8%	8 29.6%	83 19.2%	28 13.8%	54 23.8%	82 19.1%
Gymnasium	74 16.9%	30 13.8%	43 20.0%	73 16.9%	11 21.6%	45 18.3%	14 16.3%	3 5.9%	73 16.8%	14 16.7%	12 10.1%	41 20.3%	6 22.2%	73 16.9%	28 13.8%	43 18.9%	71 16.5%
Preschool/childrens program area	52 11.9%	35 16.1%	17 7.9%	52 12.0%	21 41.2%	26 10.6%	4 4.7%	1 2.0%	52 12.0%	5 6.0%	8 6.7%	35 17.3%	4 14.8%	52 12.0%	21 10.3%	30 13.2%	51 11.9%
Other	37 8.5%	16 7.4%	20 9.3%	36 8.3%	3 5.9%	17 6.9%	10 11.6%	7 13.7%	37 8.5%	8 9.5%	16 13.4%	11 5.4%	2 7.4%	37 8.6%	21 10.3%	16 7.0%	37 8.6%

Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

6. If you indicated that a new **ice surface** is needed, please indicate the activities that you or your household would likely participate in at the arena. (Please circle **all** that apply)

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	233 100.0%	92 100.0%	138 100.0%	230 100.0%	35 100.0%	138 100.0%	39 100.0%	19 100.0%	231 100.0%	41 100.0%	46 100.0%	128 100.0%	14 100.0%	229 100.0%	112 100.0%	116 100.0%	228 100.0%
Public skating	173 74.2%	74 80.4%	97 70.3%	171 74.3%	27 77.1%	105 76.1%	29 74.4%	11 57.9%	172 74.5%	26 63.4%	28 60.9%	103 80.5%	14 100.0%	171 74.7%	82 73.2%	87 75.0%	169 74.1%
Skating lessons	93 39.9%	40 43.5%	52 37.7%	92 40.0%	20 57.1%	61 44.2%	10 25.6%	2 10.5%	93 40.3%	11 26.8%	7 15.2%	69 53.9%	6 42.9%	93 40.6%	42 37.5%	49 42.2%	91 39.9%
Minor hockey	68 29.2%	27 29.3%	40 29.0%	67 29.1%	7 20.0%	50 36.2%	7 17.9%	4 21.1%	68 29.4%	11 26.8%	7 15.2%	46 35.9%	4 28.6%	68 29.7%	33 29.5%	34 29.3%	67 29.4%
Adult hockey	63 27.0%	24 26.1%	38 27.5%	62 27.0%	11 31.4%	43 31.2%	6 15.4%	3 15.8%	63 27.3%	15 36.6%	7 15.2%	36 28.1%	5 35.7%	63 27.5%	34 30.4%	29 25.0%	63 27.6%
Lacrosse	35 15.0%	12 13.0%	22 15.9%	34 14.8%	4 11.4%	25 18.1%	2 5.1%	3 15.8%	34 14.7%	6 14.6%	1 2.2%	27 21.1%	0 .0%	34 14.8%	17 15.2%	17 14.7%	34 14.9%
Ball hockey	30 12.9%	14 15.2%	16 11.6%	30 13.0%	5 14.3%	24 17.4%	1 2.6%	0 .0%	30 13.0%	4 9.8%	2 4.3%	20 15.6%	3 21.4%	29 12.7%	18 16.1%	12 10.3%	30 13.2%
Figure skating	26 11.2%	10 10.9%	15 10.9%	25 10.9%	4 11.4%	15 10.9%	4 10.3%	2 10.5%	25 10.8%	4 9.8%	3 6.5%	17 13.3%	1 7.1%	25 10.9%	12 10.7%	12 10.3%	24 10.5%
Other	19 8.2%	3 3.3%	16 11.6%	19 8.3%	2 5.7%	8 5.8%	6 15.4%	3 15.8%	19 8.2%	2 4.9%	13 28.3%	4 3.1%	0 .0%	19 8.3%	11 9.8%	8 6.9%	19 8.3%
Ringette	14 6.0%	5 5.4%	9 6.5%	14 6.1%	0 .0%	10 7.2%	3 7.7%	1 5.3%	14 6.1%	4 9.8%	0 .0%	8 6.3%	2 14.3%	14 6.1%	7 6.3%	7 6.0%	14 6.1%

Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

7. For the new or improved facilities you identified in #4a and 5a, would you support any tax increases (or rent, if a renter) to help pay for new or improved facilities? (Please circle **one** number)

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	647 100.0%	313 100.0%	325 100.0%	638 100.0%	76 100.0%	339 100.0%	123 100.0%	103 100.0%	641 100.0%	146 100.0%	186 100.0%	273 100.0%	34 100.0%	639 100.0%	310 100.0%	323 100.0%	633 100.0%
Yes	333 51.5%	168 53.7%	160 49.2%	328 51.4%	39 51.3%	184 54.3%	63 51.2%	42 40.8%	328 51.2%	64 43.8%	87 46.8%	155 56.8%	22 64.7%	328 51.3%	145 46.8%	182 56.3%	327 51.7%
No	314 48.5%	145 46.3%	165 50.8%	310 48.6%	37 48.7%	155 45.7%	60 48.8%	61 59.2%	313 48.8%	82 56.2%	99 53.2%	118 43.2%	12 35.3%	311 48.7%	165 53.2%	141 43.7%	306 48.3%

7a. If YES, what is the maximum increase in your annual property taxes (or rent, if a renter) you would be willing to pay in order to help build and / or operate new or improved facilities? (Please circle **one** number)

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	328 100.0%	165 100.0%	158 100.0%	323 100.0%	39 100.0%	182 100.0%	61 100.0%	41 100.0%	323 100.0%	60 100.0%	86 100.0%	155 100.0%	22 100.0%	323 100.0%	144 100.0%	178 100.0%	322 100.0%
\$15-\$30 per year	151 46.0%	77 46.7%	71 44.9%	148 45.8%	18 46.2%	80 44.0%	30 49.2%	21 51.2%	149 46.1%	30 50.0%	35 40.7%	73 47.1%	11 50.0%	149 46.1%	74 51.4%	74 41.6%	148 46.0%
\$31-\$45 per year	69 21.0%	38 23.0%	30 19.0%	68 21.1%	9 23.1%	40 22.0%	11 18.0%	8 19.5%	68 21.1%	12 20.0%	20 23.3%	32 20.6%	4 18.2%	68 21.1%	28 19.4%	40 22.5%	68 21.1%
\$46-\$60 per year	58 17.7%	27 16.4%	31 19.6%	58 18.0%	8 20.5%	30 16.5%	13 21.3%	7 17.1%	58 18.0%	11 18.3%	18 20.9%	25 16.1%	3 13.6%	57 17.6%	31 21.5%	26 14.6%	57 17.7%
\$61-\$85 per year	8 2.4%	5 3.0%	3 1.9%	8 2.5%	1 2.6%	6 3.3%	1 1.6%	0 .0%	8 2.5%	2 3.3%	0 .0%	6 3.9%	0 .0%	8 2.5%	3 2.1%	5 2.8%	8 2.5%
\$86-\$100 per year	30 9.1%	15 9.1%	15 9.5%	30 9.3%	2 5.1%	20 11.0%	5 8.2%	3 7.3%	30 9.3%	2 3.3%	12 14.0%	12 7.7%	4 18.2%	30 9.3%	8 5.6%	22 12.4%	30 9.3%
\$101 or more per year	8 2.4%	1 .6%	6 3.8%	7 2.2%	0 .0%	6 3.3%	0 .0%	1 2.4%	7 2.2%	1 1.7%	0 .0%	6 3.9%	0 .0%	7 2.2%	0 .0%	7 3.9%	7 2.2%
Other	4 1.2%	2 1.2%	2 1.3%	4 1.2%	1 2.6%	0 .0%	1 1.6%	1 2.4%	3 .9%	2 3.3%	1 1.2%	1 .6%	0 .0%	4 1.2%	0 .0%	4 2.2%	4 1.2%

Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

8. Would you support any of the following in order to improve parks, recreation and cultural services in Port Coquitlam? (Please circle **all** that apply)

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	633 100.0%	297 100.0%	330 100.0%	627 100.0%	71 100.0%	337 100.0%	127 100.0%	94 100.0%	629 100.0%	144 100.0%	185 100.0%	261 100.0%	35 100.0%	625 100.0%	307 100.0%	314 100.0%	621 100.0%
Seek corporate/private sponsorships	455 71.9%	219 73.7%	235 71.2%	454 72.4%	50 70.4%	252 74.8%	93 73.2%	58 61.7%	453 72.0%	99 68.8%	127 68.6%	196 75.1%	28 80.0%	450 72.0%	223 72.6%	227 72.3%	450 72.5%
Increase admission and membership fees	268 42.3%	110 37.0%	155 47.0%	265 42.3%	19 26.8%	149 44.2%	55 43.3%	43 45.7%	266 42.3%	76 52.8%	79 42.7%	104 39.8%	7 20.0%	266 42.6%	125 40.7%	138 43.9%	263 42.4%
Increase rental charges for facilities	203 32.1%	80 26.9%	123 37.3%	203 32.4%	19 26.8%	114 33.8%	44 34.6%	26 27.7%	203 32.3%	53 36.8%	51 27.6%	90 34.5%	8 22.9%	202 32.3%	97 31.6%	102 32.5%	199 32.0%
Raise property taxes	157 24.8%	79 26.6%	77 23.3%	156 24.9%	13 18.3%	91 27.0%	33 26.0%	19 20.2%	156 24.8%	33 22.9%	44 23.8%	69 26.4%	9 25.7%	155 24.8%	68 22.1%	88 28.0%	156 25.1%
Reduce hours of facility operation	37 5.8%	21 7.1%	15 4.5%	36 5.7%	7 9.9%	17 5.0%	10 7.9%	3 3.2%	37 5.9%	8 5.6%	8 4.3%	18 6.9%	3 8.6%	37 5.9%	18 5.9%	17 5.4%	35 5.6%
Other	18 2.8%	7 2.4%	9 2.7%	16 2.6%	2 2.8%	11 3.3%	3 2.4%	1 1.1%	17 2.7%	4 2.8%	2 1.1%	8 3.1%	3 8.6%	17 2.7%	7 2.3%	10 3.2%	17 2.7%

9. If you or anyone in your household has taken part in City of Port Coquitlam programs or services, please indicate how you would rate each of the following. (Please circle **one** number for **each** line)

Customer Service

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	551 100.0%	266 100.0%	280 100.0%	546 100.0%	63 100.0%	299 100.0%	97 100.0%	87 100.0%	546 100.0%	104 100.0%	150 100.0%	257 100.0%	31 100.0%	542 100.0%	270 100.0%	271 100.0%	541 100.0%
Excellent	126 22.9%	64 24.1%	61 21.8%	125 22.9%	13 20.6%	70 23.4%	20 20.6%	22 25.3%	125 22.9%	21 20.2%	28 18.7%	64 24.9%	8 25.8%	121 22.3%	56 20.7%	68 25.1%	124 22.9%
Good	307 55.7%	148 55.6%	158 56.4%	306 56.0%	32 50.8%	177 59.2%	54 55.7%	42 48.3%	305 55.9%	56 53.8%	81 54.0%	146 56.8%	22 71.0%	305 56.3%	154 57.0%	149 55.0%	303 56.0%
Fair	47 8.5%	25 9.4%	20 7.1%	45 8.2%	10 15.9%	25 8.4%	9 9.3%	1 1.1%	45 8.2%	9 8.7%	9 6.0%	26 10.1%	1 3.2%	45 8.3%	25 9.3%	18 6.6%	43 7.9%
Poor	6 1.1%	2 .8%	4 1.4%	6 1.1%	2 3.2%	3 1.0%	1 1.0%	0 .0%	6 1.1%	1 1.0%	1 .7%	4 1.6%	0 .0%	6 1.1%	4 1.5%	2 .7%	6 1.1%
Don't know	65 11.8%	27 10.2%	37 13.2%	64 11.7%	6 9.5%	24 8.0%	13 13.4%	22 25.3%	65 11.9%	17 16.3%	31 20.7%	17 6.6%	0 .0%	65 12.0%	31 11.5%	34 12.5%	65 12.0%

Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

Program Fees

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	553 100.0%	267 100.0%	281 100.0%	548 100.0%	63 100.0%	295 100.0%	99 100.0%	91 100.0%	548 100.0%	105 100.0%	150 100.0%	258 100.0%	31 100.0%	544 100.0%	270 100.0%	273 100.0%	543 100.0%
Excellent	53 9.6%	23 8.6%	30 10.7%	53 9.7%	6 9.5%	29 9.8%	10 10.1%	8 8.8%	53 9.7%	5 4.8%	13 8.7%	31 12.0%	3 9.7%	52 9.6%	21 7.8%	32 11.7%	53 9.8%
Good	235 42.5%	127 47.6%	106 37.7%	233 42.5%	26 41.3%	141 47.8%	31 31.3%	34 37.4%	232 42.3%	48 45.7%	58 38.7%	112 43.4%	13 41.9%	231 42.5%	117 43.3%	113 41.4%	230 42.4%
Fair	183 33.1%	85 31.8%	95 33.8%	180 32.8%	22 34.9%	96 32.5%	40 40.4%	23 25.3%	181 33.0%	29 27.6%	41 27.3%	95 36.8%	15 48.4%	180 33.1%	96 35.6%	83 30.4%	179 33.0%
Poor	15 2.7%	5 1.9%	10 3.6%	15 2.7%	5 7.9%	3 1.0%	4 4.0%	3 3.3%	15 2.7%	4 3.8%	5 3.3%	6 2.3%	0 .0%	15 2.8%	6 2.2%	8 2.9%	14 2.6%
Don't know	67 12.1%	27 10.1%	40 14.2%	67 12.2%	4 6.3%	26 8.8%	14 14.1%	23 25.3%	67 12.2%	19 18.1%	33 22.0%	14 5.4%	0 .0%	66 12.1%	30 11.1%	37 13.6%	67 12.3%

Program Quality

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	548 100.0%	262 100.0%	282 100.0%	544 100.0%	62 100.0%	294 100.0%	99 100.0%	89 100.0%	544 100.0%	106 100.0%	147 100.0%	258 100.0%	30 100.0%	541 100.0%	268 100.0%	271 100.0%	539 100.0%
Excellent	63 11.5%	29 11.1%	34 12.1%	63 11.6%	4 6.5%	39 13.3%	13 13.1%	7 7.9%	63 11.6%	8 7.5%	13 8.8%	36 14.0%	4 13.3%	61 11.3%	25 9.3%	37 13.7%	62 11.5%
Good	292 53.3%	149 56.9%	141 50.0%	290 53.3%	36 58.1%	160 54.4%	48 48.5%	45 50.6%	289 53.1%	52 49.1%	74 50.3%	141 54.7%	21 70.0%	288 53.2%	146 54.5%	142 52.4%	288 53.4%
Fair	111 20.3%	50 19.1%	60 21.3%	110 20.2%	14 22.6%	65 22.1%	21 21.2%	10 11.2%	110 20.2%	21 19.8%	25 17.0%	59 22.9%	5 16.7%	110 20.3%	59 22.0%	48 17.7%	107 19.9%
Poor	10 1.8%	4 1.5%	6 2.1%	10 1.8%	2 3.2%	3 1.0%	3 3.0%	2 2.2%	10 1.8%	3 2.8%	3 2.0%	4 1.6%	0 .0%	10 1.8%	6 2.2%	4 1.5%	10 1.9%
Don't know	72 13.1%	30 11.5%	41 14.5%	71 13.1%	6 9.7%	27 9.2%	14 14.1%	25 28.1%	72 13.2%	22 20.8%	32 21.8%	18 7.0%	0 .0%	72 13.3%	32 11.9%	40 14.8%	72 13.4%

Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

Registration Process

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	551 100.0%	266 100.0%	281 100.0%	547 100.0%	63 100.0%	298 100.0%	99 100.0%	87 100.0%	547 100.0%	104 100.0%	149 100.0%	259 100.0%	31 100.0%	543 100.0%	269 100.0%	273 100.0%	542 100.0%
Excellent	91 16.5%	48 18.0%	42 14.9%	90 16.5%	10 15.9%	51 17.1%	17 17.2%	12 13.8%	90 16.5%	12 11.5%	18 12.1%	51 19.7%	7 22.6%	88 16.2%	43 16.0%	46 16.8%	89 16.4%
Good	254 46.1%	131 49.2%	122 43.4%	253 46.3%	26 41.3%	145 48.7%	39 39.4%	42 48.3%	252 46.1%	48 46.2%	62 41.6%	123 47.5%	18 58.1%	251 46.2%	124 46.1%	127 46.5%	251 46.3%
Fair	113 20.5%	49 18.4%	63 22.4%	112 20.5%	17 27.0%	64 21.5%	23 23.2%	8 9.2%	112 20.5%	20 19.2%	29 19.5%	59 22.8%	4 12.9%	112 20.6%	56 20.8%	53 19.4%	109 20.1%
Poor	16 2.9%	8 3.0%	7 2.5%	15 2.7%	3 4.8%	8 2.7%	4 4.0%	1 1.1%	16 2.9%	2 1.9%	4 2.7%	8 3.1%	2 6.5%	16 2.9%	11 4.1%	5 1.8%	16 3.0%
Don't know	77 14.0%	30 11.3%	47 16.7%	77 14.1%	7 11.1%	30 10.1%	16 16.2%	24 27.6%	77 14.1%	22 21.2%	36 24.2%	18 6.9%	0 .0%	76 14.0%	35 13.0%	42 15.4%	77 14.2%

10. For each of the following activity categories, do you believe current opportunities in Port Coquitlam are more than adequate, adequate or lacking? (Please circle **one** number for each line)

Fitness / Health

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	657 100.0%	318 100.0%	334 100.0%	652 100.0%	76 100.0%	351 100.0%	123 100.0%	102 100.0%	652 100.0%	148 100.0%	186 100.0%	277 100.0%	36 100.0%	647 100.0%	319 100.0%	328 100.0%	647 100.0%
More than adequate	64 9.7%	31 9.7%	31 9.3%	62 9.5%	8 10.5%	34 9.7%	14 11.4%	6 5.9%	62 9.5%	14 9.5%	16 8.6%	26 9.4%	3 8.3%	59 9.1%	40 12.5%	21 6.4%	61 9.4%
Adequate	335 51.0%	165 51.9%	169 50.6%	334 51.2%	39 51.3%	179 51.0%	67 54.5%	49 48.0%	334 51.2%	71 48.0%	98 52.7%	143 51.6%	21 58.3%	333 51.5%	171 53.6%	162 49.4%	333 51.5%
Lacking	164 25.0%	74 23.3%	89 26.6%	163 25.0%	18 23.7%	98 27.9%	31 25.2%	16 15.7%	163 25.0%	32 21.6%	40 21.5%	79 28.5%	11 30.6%	162 25.0%	67 21.0%	94 28.7%	161 24.9%
Don't know	94 14.3%	48 15.1%	45 13.5%	93 14.3%	11 14.5%	40 11.4%	11 8.9%	31 30.4%	93 14.3%	31 20.9%	32 17.2%	29 10.5%	1 2.8%	93 14.4%	41 12.9%	51 15.5%	92 14.2%

Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

Performing Arts

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	636 100.0%	312 100.0%	319 100.0%	631 100.0%	75 100.0%	343 100.0%	120 100.0%	94 100.0%	632 100.0%	143 100.0%	177 100.0%	272 100.0%	34 100.0%	626 100.0%	311 100.0%	315 100.0%	626 100.0%
More than adequate	29 4.6%	13 4.2%	15 4.7%	28 4.4%	2 2.7%	15 4.4%	8 6.7%	3 3.2%	28 4.4%	7 4.9%	9 5.1%	9 3.3%	1 2.9%	26 4.2%	15 4.8%	12 3.8%	27 4.3%
Adequate	205 32.2%	100 32.1%	104 32.6%	204 32.3%	22 29.3%	115 33.5%	41 34.2%	26 27.7%	204 32.3%	42 29.4%	58 32.8%	91 33.5%	12 35.3%	203 32.4%	107 34.4%	94 29.8%	201 32.1%
Lacking	215 33.8%	112 35.9%	103 32.3%	215 34.1%	26 34.7%	120 35.0%	40 33.3%	29 30.9%	215 34.0%	50 35.0%	53 29.9%	99 36.4%	12 35.3%	214 34.2%	100 32.2%	115 36.5%	215 34.3%
Don't know	187 29.4%	87 27.9%	97 30.4%	184 29.2%	25 33.3%	93 27.1%	31 25.8%	36 38.3%	185 29.3%	44 30.8%	57 32.2%	73 26.8%	9 26.5%	183 29.2%	89 28.6%	94 29.8%	183 29.2%

Recreational Sports

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	640 100.0%	309 100.0%	326 100.0%	635 100.0%	76 100.0%	347 100.0%	122 100.0%	90 100.0%	635 100.0%	140 100.0%	179 100.0%	278 100.0%	34 100.0%	631 100.0%	314 100.0%	316 100.0%	630 100.0%
More than adequate	55 8.6%	25 8.1%	29 8.9%	54 8.5%	5 6.6%	33 9.5%	10 8.2%	6 6.7%	54 8.5%	11 7.9%	13 7.3%	24 8.6%	4 11.8%	52 8.2%	26 8.3%	28 8.9%	54 8.6%
Adequate	365 57.0%	171 55.3%	192 58.9%	363 57.2%	46 60.5%	204 58.8%	72 59.0%	42 46.7%	364 57.3%	83 59.3%	96 53.6%	163 58.6%	20 58.8%	362 57.4%	194 61.8%	167 52.8%	361 57.3%
Lacking	108 16.9%	46 14.9%	61 18.7%	107 16.9%	16 21.1%	60 17.3%	25 20.5%	6 6.7%	107 16.9%	10 7.1%	27 15.1%	63 22.7%	7 20.6%	107 17.0%	45 14.3%	60 19.0%	105 16.7%
Don't know	112 17.5%	67 21.7%	44 13.5%	111 17.5%	9 11.8%	50 14.4%	15 12.3%	36 40.0%	110 17.3%	36 25.7%	43 24.0%	28 10.1%	3 8.8%	110 17.4%	49 15.6%	61 19.3%	110 17.5%

Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

Competitive Sports

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	632 100.0%	304 100.0%	323 100.0%	627 100.0%	75 100.0%	340 100.0%	119 100.0%	93 100.0%	627 100.0%	136 100.0%	181 100.0%	272 100.0%	34 100.0%	623 100.0%	308 100.0%	314 100.0%	622 100.0%
More than adequate	51 8.1%	23 7.6%	27 8.4%	50 8.0%	6 8.0%	29 8.5%	9 7.6%	6 6.5%	50 8.0%	9 6.6%	14 7.7%	22 8.1%	4 11.8%	49 7.9%	24 7.8%	26 8.3%	50 8.0%
Adequate	283 44.8%	126 41.4%	155 48.0%	281 44.8%	33 44.0%	151 44.4%	60 50.4%	38 40.9%	282 45.0%	60 44.1%	87 48.1%	119 43.8%	14 41.2%	280 44.9%	149 48.4%	130 41.4%	279 44.9%
Lacking	100 15.8%	38 12.5%	61 18.9%	99 15.8%	14 18.7%	65 19.1%	17 14.3%	3 3.2%	99 15.8%	10 7.4%	17 9.4%	65 23.9%	6 17.6%	98 15.7%	45 14.6%	53 16.9%	98 15.8%
Don't know	198 31.3%	117 38.5%	80 24.8%	197 31.4%	22 29.3%	95 27.9%	33 27.7%	46 49.5%	196 31.3%	57 41.9%	63 34.8%	66 24.3%	10 29.4%	196 31.5%	90 29.2%	105 33.4%	195 31.4%

Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

Outdoor / Nature

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	640 100.0%	309 100.0%	326 100.0%	635 100.0%	76 100.0%	342 100.0%	126 100.0%	91 100.0%	635 100.0%	142 100.0%	182 100.0%	272 100.0%	35 100.0%	631 100.0%	314 100.0%	316 100.0%	630 100.0%
More than adequate	122 19.1%	60 19.4%	59 18.1%	119 18.7%	16 21.1%	71 20.8%	26 20.6%	7 7.7%	120 18.9%	22 15.5%	34 18.7%	59 21.7%	4 11.4%	119 18.9%	68 21.7%	52 16.5%	120 19.0%
Adequate	345 53.9%	172 55.7%	173 53.1%	345 54.3%	44 57.9%	185 54.1%	66 52.4%	49 53.8%	344 54.2%	65 45.8%	102 56.0%	153 56.3%	23 65.7%	343 54.4%	167 53.2%	174 55.1%	341 54.1%
Lacking	98 15.3%	39 12.6%	58 17.8%	97 15.3%	8 10.5%	53 15.5%	24 19.0%	12 13.2%	97 15.3%	25 17.6%	27 14.8%	39 14.3%	5 14.3%	96 15.2%	51 16.2%	45 14.2%	96 15.2%
Don't know	75 11.7%	38 12.3%	36 11.0%	74 11.7%	8 10.5%	33 9.6%	10 7.9%	23 25.3%	74 11.7%	30 21.1%	19 10.4%	21 7.7%	3 8.6%	73 11.6%	28 8.9%	45 14.2%	73 11.6%

Special Events

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	635 100.0%	307 100.0%	323 100.0%	630 100.0%	76 100.0%	342 100.0%	120 100.0%	92 100.0%	630 100.0%	141 100.0%	178 100.0%	274 100.0%	34 100.0%	627 100.0%	309 100.0%	316 100.0%	625 100.0%
More than adequate	50 7.9%	29 9.4%	20 6.2%	49 7.8%	5 6.6%	30 8.8%	8 6.7%	6 6.5%	49 7.8%	10 7.1%	8 4.5%	28 10.2%	2 5.9%	48 7.7%	27 8.7%	22 7.0%	49 7.8%
Adequate	327 51.5%	163 53.1%	164 50.8%	327 51.9%	38 50.0%	178 52.0%	66 55.0%	44 47.8%	326 51.7%	66 46.8%	95 53.4%	144 52.6%	19 55.9%	324 51.7%	155 50.2%	168 53.2%	323 51.7%
Lacking	119 18.7%	55 17.9%	61 18.9%	116 18.4%	20 26.3%	68 19.9%	16 13.3%	13 14.1%	117 18.6%	21 14.9%	33 18.5%	52 19.0%	11 32.4%	117 18.7%	54 17.5%	62 19.6%	116 18.6%
Don't know	139 21.9%	60 19.5%	78 24.1%	138 21.9%	13 17.1%	66 19.3%	30 25.0%	29 31.5%	138 21.9%	44 31.2%	42 23.6%	50 18.2%	2 5.9%	138 22.0%	73 23.6%	64 20.3%	137 21.9%

Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

Visual Arts / Crafts

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	634 100.0%	309 100.0%	320 100.0%	629 100.0%	74 100.0%	343 100.0%	117 100.0%	95 100.0%	629 100.0%	142 100.0%	174 100.0%	273 100.0%	35 100.0%	624 100.0%	309 100.0%	316 100.0%	625 100.0%
More than adequate	27 4.3%	9 2.9%	17 5.3%	26 4.1%	1 1.4%	18 5.2%	6 5.1%	1 1.1%	26 4.1%	6 4.2%	7 4.0%	12 4.4%	1 2.9%	26 4.2%	10 3.2%	16 5.1%	26 4.2%
Adequate	206 32.5%	100 32.4%	105 32.8%	205 32.6%	24 32.4%	104 30.3%	43 36.8%	34 35.8%	205 32.6%	46 32.4%	57 32.8%	87 31.9%	12 34.3%	202 32.4%	90 29.1%	112 35.4%	202 32.3%
Lacking	168 26.5%	92 29.8%	75 23.4%	167 26.6%	21 28.4%	101 29.4%	28 23.9%	16 16.8%	166 26.4%	33 23.2%	40 23.0%	79 28.9%	13 37.1%	165 26.4%	87 28.2%	80 25.3%	167 26.7%
Don't know	233 36.8%	108 35.0%	123 38.4%	231 36.7%	28 37.8%	120 35.0%	40 34.2%	44 46.3%	232 36.9%	57 40.1%	70 40.2%	95 34.8%	9 25.7%	231 37.0%	122 39.5%	108 34.2%	230 36.8%

Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

11. How satisfied are you with the quality of recreation and cultural facilities in Port Coquitlam? (Please circle **one** number for each **line**: VS (Very Satisfied), SS (Somewhat Satisfied), SD (Somewhat Dissatisfied), VD (Very Dissatisfied), NO (No Opinion))

Ice Surfaces

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	639 100.0%	311 100.0%	325 100.0%	636 100.0%	75 100.0%	349 100.0%	125 100.0%	88 100.0%	637 100.0%	140 100.0%	179 100.0%	278 100.0%	36 100.0%	633 100.0%	314 100.0%	318 100.0%	632 100.0%
Very satisfied	81 12.7%	37 11.9%	43 13.2%	80 12.6%	4 5.3%	49 14.0%	16 12.8%	12 13.6%	81 12.7%	13 9.3%	16 8.9%	44 15.8%	6 16.7%	79 12.5%	46 14.6%	33 10.4%	79 12.5%
Somewhat satisfied	220 34.4%	106 34.1%	113 34.8%	219 34.4%	38 50.7%	126 36.1%	35 28.0%	21 23.9%	220 34.5%	35 25.0%	51 28.5%	117 42.1%	17 47.2%	220 34.8%	103 32.8%	115 36.2%	218 34.5%
Somewhat dissatisfied	81 12.7%	33 10.6%	48 14.8%	81 12.7%	11 14.7%	46 13.2%	18 14.4%	6 6.8%	81 12.7%	22 15.7%	17 9.5%	39 14.0%	3 8.3%	81 12.8%	38 12.1%	43 13.5%	81 12.8%
Very dissatisfied	17 2.7%	5 1.6%	12 3.7%	17 2.7%	1 1.3%	12 3.4%	3 2.4%	1 1.1%	17 2.7%	2 1.4%	2 1.1%	11 4.0%	2 5.6%	17 2.7%	6 1.9%	11 3.5%	17 2.7%
No opinion	240 37.6%	130 41.8%	109 33.5%	239 37.6%	21 28.0%	116 33.2%	53 42.4%	48 54.5%	238 37.4%	68 48.6%	93 52.0%	67 24.1%	8 22.2%	236 37.3%	121 38.5%	116 36.5%	237 37.5%

Indoor Swimming Pools

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	657 100.0%	319 100.0%	335 100.0%	654 100.0%	76 100.0%	355 100.0%	128 100.0%	96 100.0%	655 100.0%	146 100.0%	184 100.0%	285 100.0%	36 100.0%	651 100.0%	324 100.0%	324 100.0%	648 100.0%
Very satisfied	121 18.4%	57 17.9%	63 18.8%	120 18.3%	16 21.1%	69 19.4%	21 16.4%	15 15.6%	121 18.5%	18 12.3%	28 15.2%	67 23.5%	7 19.4%	120 18.4%	70 21.6%	51 15.7%	121 18.7%
Somewhat satisfied	268 40.8%	136 42.6%	131 39.1%	267 40.8%	33 43.4%	149 42.0%	54 42.2%	32 33.3%	268 40.9%	50 34.2%	76 41.3%	129 45.3%	12 33.3%	267 41.0%	133 41.0%	131 40.4%	264 40.7%
Somewhat dissatisfied	114 17.4%	58 18.2%	55 16.4%	113 17.3%	20 26.3%	59 16.6%	24 18.8%	10 10.4%	113 17.3%	28 19.2%	25 13.6%	47 16.5%	13 36.1%	113 17.4%	54 16.7%	57 17.6%	111 17.1%
Very dissatisfied	39 5.9%	14 4.4%	25 7.5%	39 6.0%	0 .0%	26 7.3%	10 7.8%	3 3.1%	39 6.0%	6 4.1%	9 4.9%	23 8.1%	1 2.8%	39 6.0%	15 4.6%	24 7.4%	39 6.0%
No opinion	115 17.5%	54 16.9%	61 18.2%	115 17.6%	7 9.2%	52 14.6%	19 14.8%	36 37.5%	114 17.4%	44 30.1%	46 25.0%	19 6.7%	3 8.3%	112 17.2%	52 16.0%	61 18.8%	113 17.4%

Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

Outdoor Swimming Pools

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	637 100.0%	310 100.0%	325 100.0%	635 100.0%	72 100.0%	350 100.0%	122 100.0%	91 100.0%	635 100.0%	142 100.0%	176 100.0%	277 100.0%	36 100.0%	631 100.0%	314 100.0%	317 100.0%	631 100.0%
Very satisfied	50 7.8%	21 6.8%	29 8.9%	50 7.9%	5 6.9%	29 8.3%	6 4.9%	10 11.0%	50 7.9%	13 9.2%	7 4.0%	26 9.4%	3 8.3%	49 7.8%	30 9.6%	20 6.3%	50 7.9%
Somewhat satisfied	187 29.4%	99 31.9%	88 27.1%	187 29.4%	21 29.2%	108 30.9%	37 30.3%	21 23.1%	187 29.4%	33 23.2%	45 25.6%	94 33.9%	14 38.9%	186 29.5%	88 28.0%	97 30.6%	185 29.3%
Somewhat dissatisfied	150 23.5%	74 23.9%	76 23.4%	150 23.6%	24 33.3%	88 25.1%	26 21.3%	12 13.2%	150 23.6%	30 21.1%	40 22.7%	67 24.2%	12 33.3%	149 23.6%	68 21.7%	82 25.9%	150 23.8%
Very dissatisfied	50 7.8%	16 5.2%	34 10.5%	50 7.9%	3 4.2%	30 8.6%	13 10.7%	4 4.4%	50 7.9%	4 2.8%	11 6.3%	33 11.9%	2 5.6%	50 7.9%	27 8.6%	23 7.3%	50 7.9%
No opinion	200 31.4%	100 32.3%	98 30.2%	198 31.2%	19 26.4%	95 27.1%	40 32.8%	44 48.4%	198 31.2%	62 43.7%	73 41.5%	57 20.6%	5 13.9%	197 31.2%	101 32.2%	95 30.0%	196 31.1%

Terry Fox Library

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	663 100.0%	322 100.0%	338 100.0%	660 100.0%	75 100.0%	358 100.0%	129 100.0%	99 100.0%	661 100.0%	151 100.0%	185 100.0%	286 100.0%	35 100.0%	657 100.0%	325 100.0%	329 100.0%	654 100.0%
Very satisfied	200 30.2%	102 31.7%	98 29.0%	200 30.3%	20 26.7%	110 30.7%	43 33.3%	27 27.3%	200 30.3%	44 29.1%	47 25.4%	88 30.8%	17 48.6%	196 29.8%	99 30.5%	99 30.1%	198 30.3%
Somewhat satisfied	271 40.9%	125 38.8%	144 42.6%	269 40.8%	35 46.7%	145 40.5%	53 41.1%	37 37.4%	270 40.8%	51 33.8%	76 41.1%	128 44.8%	14 40.0%	269 40.9%	134 41.2%	131 39.8%	265 40.5%
Somewhat dissatisfied	79 11.9%	39 12.1%	40 11.8%	79 12.0%	6 8.0%	45 12.6%	16 12.4%	12 12.1%	79 12.0%	23 15.2%	19 10.3%	36 12.6%	1 2.9%	79 12.0%	30 9.2%	49 14.9%	79 12.1%
Very dissatisfied	20 3.0%	10 3.1%	9 2.7%	19 2.9%	1 1.3%	10 2.8%	5 3.9%	4 4.0%	20 3.0%	5 3.3%	5 2.7%	9 3.1%	1 2.9%	20 3.0%	8 2.5%	12 3.6%	20 3.1%
No opinion	93 14.0%	46 14.3%	47 13.9%	93 14.1%	13 17.3%	48 13.4%	12 9.3%	19 19.2%	92 13.9%	28 18.5%	38 20.5%	25 8.7%	2 5.7%	93 14.2%	54 16.6%	38 11.6%	92 14.1%

Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

Seniors Centre

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	638 100.0%	307 100.0%	329 100.0%	636 100.0%	73 100.0%	340 100.0%	124 100.0%	99 100.0%	636 100.0%	143 100.0%	180 100.0%	275 100.0%	33 100.0%	631 100.0%	317 100.0%	315 100.0%	632 100.0%
Very satisfied	76 11.9%	39 12.7%	37 11.2%	76 11.9%	4 5.5%	32 9.4%	16 12.9%	24 24.2%	76 11.9%	25 17.5%	19 10.6%	24 8.7%	7 21.2%	75 11.9%	39 12.3%	37 11.7%	76 12.0%
Somewhat satisfied	148 23.2%	67 21.8%	80 24.3%	147 23.1%	7 9.6%	58 17.1%	44 35.5%	38 38.4%	147 23.1%	42 29.4%	46 25.6%	53 19.3%	5 15.2%	146 23.1%	69 21.8%	77 24.4%	146 23.1%
Somewhat dissatisfied	55 8.6%	23 7.5%	32 9.7%	55 8.6%	5 6.8%	24 7.1%	12 9.7%	13 13.1%	54 8.5%	16 11.2%	22 12.2%	15 5.5%	1 3.0%	54 8.6%	24 7.6%	31 9.8%	55 8.7%
Very dissatisfied	13 2.0%	5 1.6%	8 2.4%	13 2.0%	0 .0%	6 1.8%	5 4.0%	2 2.0%	13 2.0%	3 2.1%	4 2.2%	4 1.5%	1 3.0%	12 1.9%	5 1.6%	7 2.2%	12 1.9%
No opinion	346 54.2%	173 56.4%	172 52.3%	345 54.2%	57 78.1%	220 64.7%	47 37.9%	22 22.2%	346 54.4%	57 39.9%	89 49.4%	179 65.1%	19 57.6%	344 54.5%	180 56.8%	163 51.7%	343 54.3%

Recreation Centres

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	638 100.0%	309 100.0%	326 100.0%	635 100.0%	73 100.0%	345 100.0%	126 100.0%	92 100.0%	636 100.0%	141 100.0%	182 100.0%	274 100.0%	35 100.0%	632 100.0%	313 100.0%	318 100.0%	631 100.0%
Very satisfied	78 12.2%	40 12.9%	37 11.3%	77 12.1%	8 11.0%	52 15.1%	8 6.3%	10 10.9%	78 12.3%	13 9.2%	16 8.8%	41 15.0%	7 20.0%	77 12.2%	44 14.1%	33 10.4%	77 12.2%
Somewhat satisfied	305 47.8%	158 51.1%	146 44.8%	304 47.9%	37 50.7%	167 48.4%	59 46.8%	41 44.6%	304 47.8%	58 41.1%	85 46.7%	140 51.1%	19 54.3%	302 47.8%	147 47.0%	154 48.4%	301 47.7%
Somewhat dissatisfied	115 18.0%	50 16.2%	65 19.9%	115 18.1%	15 20.5%	66 19.1%	26 20.6%	7 7.6%	114 17.9%	26 18.4%	24 13.2%	59 21.5%	5 14.3%	114 18.0%	54 17.3%	60 18.9%	114 18.1%
Very dissatisfied	26 4.1%	11 3.6%	15 4.6%	26 4.1%	1 1.4%	11 3.2%	10 7.9%	4 4.3%	26 4.1%	8 5.7%	6 3.3%	11 4.0%	1 2.9%	26 4.1%	11 3.5%	15 4.7%	26 4.1%
No opinion	114 17.9%	50 16.2%	63 19.3%	113 17.8%	12 16.4%	49 14.2%	23 18.3%	30 32.6%	114 17.9%	36 25.5%	51 28.0%	23 8.4%	3 8.6%	113 17.9%	57 18.2%	56 17.6%	113 17.9%

Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

Health and Fitness Facilities

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	645 100.0%	313 100.0%	330 100.0%	643 100.0%	75 100.0%	351 100.0%	125 100.0%	92 100.0%	643 100.0%	145 100.0%	182 100.0%	276 100.0%	36 100.0%	639 100.0%	316 100.0%	322 100.0%	638 100.0%
Very satisfied	63 9.8%	26 8.3%	37 11.2%	63 9.8%	5 6.7%	39 11.1%	10 8.0%	9 9.8%	63 9.8%	12 8.3%	14 7.7%	32 11.6%	4 11.1%	62 9.7%	40 12.7%	23 7.1%	63 9.9%
Somewhat satisfied	255 39.5%	139 44.4%	116 35.2%	255 39.7%	38 50.7%	130 37.0%	51 40.8%	36 39.1%	255 39.7%	58 40.0%	69 37.9%	111 40.2%	15 41.7%	253 39.6%	123 38.9%	128 39.8%	251 39.3%
Somewhat dissatisfied	130 20.2%	59 18.8%	71 21.5%	130 20.2%	14 18.7%	83 23.6%	22 17.6%	10 10.9%	129 20.1%	22 15.2%	38 20.9%	59 21.4%	9 25.0%	128 20.0%	65 20.6%	64 19.9%	129 20.2%
Very dissatisfied	48 7.4%	22 7.0%	26 7.9%	48 7.5%	3 4.0%	27 7.7%	13 10.4%	5 5.4%	48 7.5%	12 8.3%	10 5.5%	23 8.3%	3 8.3%	48 7.5%	16 5.1%	32 9.9%	48 7.5%
No opinion	149 23.1%	67 21.4%	80 24.2%	147 22.9%	15 20.0%	72 20.5%	29 23.2%	32 34.8%	148 23.0%	41 28.3%	51 28.0%	51 18.5%	5 13.9%	148 23.2%	72 22.8%	75 23.3%	147 23.0%

Youth Centres

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	632 100.0%	308 100.0%	322 100.0%	630 100.0%	74 100.0%	345 100.0%	122 100.0%	89 100.0%	630 100.0%	137 100.0%	177 100.0%	277 100.0%	35 100.0%	626 100.0%	311 100.0%	314 100.0%	625 100.0%
Very satisfied	29 4.6%	13 4.2%	16 5.0%	29 4.6%	1 1.4%	21 6.1%	4 3.3%	3 3.4%	29 4.6%	3 2.2%	5 2.8%	19 6.9%	2 5.7%	29 4.6%	15 4.8%	14 4.5%	29 4.6%
Somewhat satisfied	123 19.5%	54 17.5%	69 21.4%	123 19.5%	8 10.8%	66 19.1%	31 25.4%	18 20.2%	123 19.5%	30 21.9%	26 14.7%	61 22.0%	5 14.3%	122 19.5%	56 18.0%	65 20.7%	121 19.4%
Somewhat dissatisfied	83 13.1%	41 13.3%	42 13.0%	83 13.2%	11 14.9%	45 13.0%	9 7.4%	18 20.2%	83 13.2%	23 16.8%	17 9.6%	38 13.7%	5 14.3%	83 13.3%	48 15.4%	34 10.8%	82 13.1%
Very dissatisfied	47 7.4%	22 7.1%	25 7.8%	47 7.5%	4 5.4%	30 8.7%	12 9.8%	1 1.1%	47 7.5%	8 5.8%	9 5.1%	23 8.3%	6 17.1%	46 7.3%	22 7.1%	25 8.0%	47 7.5%
No opinion	350 55.4%	178 57.8%	170 52.8%	348 55.2%	50 67.6%	183 53.0%	66 54.1%	49 55.1%	348 55.2%	73 53.3%	120 67.8%	136 49.1%	17 48.6%	346 55.3%	170 54.7%	176 56.1%	346 55.4%

Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

12. How satisfied are you with the quality of public parks and open space areas in Port Coquitlam? (Please circle **one** number for **each** line: VS (Very Satisfied), SS (Somewhat Satisfied), SD (Somewhat Dissatisfied), VD (Very Dissatisfied), NO (No Opinion))

Bicycle / Pedestrian Routes

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	658 100.0%	319 100.0%	335 100.0%	654 100.0%	76 100.0%	360 100.0%	128 100.0%	92 100.0%	656 100.0%	146 100.0%	189 100.0%	281 100.0%	36 100.0%	652 100.0%	323 100.0%	327 100.0%	650 100.0%
Very satisfied	188 28.6%	94 29.5%	92 27.5%	186 28.4%	20 26.3%	116 32.2%	25 19.5%	26 28.3%	187 28.5%	39 26.7%	50 26.5%	87 31.0%	9 25.0%	185 28.4%	96 29.7%	89 27.2%	185 28.5%
Somewhat satisfied	297 45.1%	142 44.5%	153 45.7%	295 45.1%	31 40.8%	157 43.6%	70 54.7%	38 41.3%	296 45.1%	67 45.9%	85 45.0%	125 44.5%	17 47.2%	294 45.1%	147 45.5%	146 44.6%	293 45.1%
Somewhat dissatisfied	80 12.2%	44 13.8%	36 10.7%	80 12.2%	15 19.7%	50 13.9%	9 7.0%	6 6.5%	80 12.2%	15 10.3%	22 11.6%	39 13.9%	4 11.1%	80 12.3%	32 9.9%	48 14.7%	80 12.3%
Very dissatisfied	31 4.7%	15 4.7%	16 4.8%	31 4.7%	3 3.9%	15 4.2%	9 7.0%	4 4.3%	31 4.7%	6 4.1%	10 5.3%	13 4.6%	2 5.6%	31 4.8%	15 4.6%	15 4.6%	30 4.6%
No opinion	62 9.4%	24 7.5%	38 11.3%	62 9.5%	7 9.2%	22 6.1%	15 11.7%	18 19.6%	62 9.5%	19 13.0%	22 11.6%	17 6.0%	4 11.1%	62 9.5%	33 10.2%	29 8.9%	62 9.5%

Parks / Green Space

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	668 100.0%	322 100.0%	342 100.0%	664 100.0%	77 100.0%	360 100.0%	130 100.0%	99 100.0%	666 100.0%	149 100.0%	193 100.0%	284 100.0%	36 100.0%	662 100.0%	326 100.0%	333 100.0%	659 100.0%
Very satisfied	213 31.9%	104 32.3%	109 31.9%	213 32.1%	22 28.6%	125 34.7%	36 27.7%	30 30.3%	213 32.0%	49 32.9%	60 31.1%	89 31.3%	12 33.3%	210 31.7%	106 32.5%	102 30.6%	208 31.6%
Somewhat satisfied	351 52.5%	168 52.2%	179 52.3%	347 52.3%	47 61.0%	181 50.3%	73 56.2%	48 48.5%	349 52.4%	73 49.0%	107 55.4%	149 52.5%	20 55.6%	349 52.7%	168 51.5%	180 54.1%	348 52.8%
Somewhat dissatisfied	67 10.0%	33 10.2%	34 9.9%	67 10.1%	7 9.1%	41 11.4%	10 7.7%	9 9.1%	67 10.1%	16 10.7%	10 5.2%	37 13.0%	3 8.3%	66 10.0%	30 9.2%	36 10.8%	66 10.0%
Very dissatisfied	19 2.8%	10 3.1%	9 2.6%	19 2.9%	0 .0%	10 2.8%	5 3.8%	4 4.0%	19 2.9%	4 2.7%	6 3.1%	8 2.8%	1 2.8%	19 2.9%	10 3.1%	9 2.7%	19 2.9%
No opinion	18 2.7%	7 2.2%	11 3.2%	18 2.7%	1 1.3%	3 .8%	6 4.6%	8 8.1%	18 2.7%	7 4.7%	10 5.2%	1 .4%	0 .0%	18 2.7%	12 3.7%	6 1.8%	18 2.7%

Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

Sports Fields

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	642	309	331	640	76	351	123	90	640	140	182	279	35	636	314	320	634
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Very satisfied	106	50	55	105	11	61	20	14	106	24	26	47	8	105	54	50	104
	16.5%	16.2%	16.6%	16.4%	14.5%	17.4%	16.3%	15.6%	16.6%	17.1%	14.3%	16.8%	22.9%	16.5%	17.2%	15.6%	16.4%
Somewhat satisfied	278	139	138	277	33	154	51	38	276	60	81	117	17	275	136	139	275
	43.3%	45.0%	41.7%	43.3%	43.4%	43.9%	41.5%	42.2%	43.1%	42.9%	44.5%	41.9%	48.6%	43.2%	43.3%	43.4%	43.4%
Somewhat dissatisfied	91	33	58	91	11	55	19	6	91	16	21	47	6	90	41	48	89
	14.2%	10.7%	17.5%	14.2%	14.5%	15.7%	15.4%	6.7%	14.2%	11.4%	11.5%	16.8%	17.1%	14.2%	13.1%	15.0%	14.0%
Very dissatisfied	34	15	19	34	6	23	4	1	34	2	4	26	2	34	14	20	34
	5.3%	4.9%	5.7%	5.3%	7.9%	6.6%	3.3%	1.1%	5.3%	1.4%	2.2%	9.3%	5.7%	5.3%	4.5%	6.3%	5.4%
No opinion	133	72	61	133	15	58	29	31	133	38	50	42	2	132	69	63	132
	20.7%	23.3%	18.4%	20.8%	19.7%	16.5%	23.6%	34.4%	20.8%	27.1%	27.5%	15.1%	5.7%	20.8%	22.0%	19.7%	20.8%

Playgrounds

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	640	307	330	637	76	346	123	93	638	139	184	276	35	634	312	320	632
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Very satisfied	109	47	61	108	14	60	17	18	109	20	25	55	7	107	54	53	107
	17.0%	15.3%	18.5%	17.0%	18.4%	17.3%	13.8%	19.4%	17.1%	14.4%	13.6%	19.9%	20.0%	16.9%	17.3%	16.6%	16.9%
Somewhat satisfied	269	141	127	268	31	150	59	28	268	50	76	124	17	267	127	140	267
	42.0%	45.9%	38.5%	42.1%	40.8%	43.4%	48.0%	30.1%	42.0%	36.0%	41.3%	44.9%	48.6%	42.1%	40.7%	43.8%	42.2%
Somewhat dissatisfied	115	56	59	115	23	64	13	15	115	18	20	71	5	114	53	61	114
	18.0%	18.2%	17.9%	18.1%	30.3%	18.5%	10.6%	16.1%	18.0%	12.9%	10.9%	25.7%	14.3%	18.0%	17.0%	19.1%	18.0%
Very dissatisfied	17	5	12	17	0	9	7	1	17	4	4	7	2	17	9	8	17
	2.7%	1.6%	3.6%	2.7%	.0%	2.6%	5.7%	1.1%	2.7%	2.9%	2.2%	2.5%	5.7%	2.7%	2.9%	2.5%	2.7%
No opinion	130	58	71	129	8	63	27	31	129	47	59	19	4	129	69	58	127
	20.3%	18.9%	21.5%	20.3%	10.5%	18.2%	22.0%	33.3%	20.2%	33.8%	32.1%	6.9%	11.4%	20.3%	22.1%	18.1%	20.1%

Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

Tennis Courts

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	630 100.0%	301 100.0%	327 100.0%	628 100.0%	76 100.0%	344 100.0%	119 100.0%	89 100.0%	628 100.0%	135 100.0%	179 100.0%	276 100.0%	34 100.0%	624 100.0%	309 100.0%	314 100.0%	623 100.0%
Very satisfied	64 10.2%	28 9.3%	35 10.7%	63 10.0%	3 3.9%	34 9.9%	15 12.6%	12 13.5%	64 10.2%	16 11.9%	14 7.8%	28 10.1%	4 11.8%	62 9.9%	28 9.1%	36 11.5%	64 10.3%
Somewhat satisfied	189 30.0%	87 28.9%	102 31.2%	189 30.1%	30 39.5%	90 26.2%	44 37.0%	24 27.0%	188 29.9%	49 36.3%	51 28.5%	77 27.9%	10 29.4%	187 30.0%	91 29.4%	95 30.3%	186 29.9%
Somewhat dissatisfied	99 15.7%	47 15.6%	52 15.9%	99 15.8%	11 14.5%	65 18.9%	13 10.9%	10 11.2%	99 15.8%	18 13.3%	16 8.9%	60 21.7%	5 14.7%	99 15.9%	47 15.2%	51 16.2%	98 15.7%
Very dissatisfied	34 5.4%	13 4.3%	21 6.4%	34 5.4%	2 2.6%	24 7.0%	7 5.9%	1 1.1%	34 5.4%	1 .7%	10 5.6%	22 8.0%	1 2.9%	34 5.4%	19 6.1%	15 4.8%	34 5.5%
No opinion	244 38.7%	126 41.9%	117 35.8%	243 38.7%	30 39.5%	131 38.1%	40 33.6%	42 47.2%	243 38.7%	51 37.8%	88 49.2%	89 32.2%	14 41.2%	242 38.8%	124 40.1%	117 37.3%	241 38.7%

Lacrosse Boxes

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	620 100.0%	300 100.0%	318 100.0%	618 100.0%	75 100.0%	340 100.0%	118 100.0%	85 100.0%	618 100.0%	132 100.0%	175 100.0%	273 100.0%	34 100.0%	614 100.0%	303 100.0%	311 100.0%	614 100.0%
Very satisfied	45 7.3%	14 4.7%	30 9.4%	44 7.1%	4 5.3%	23 6.8%	11 9.3%	7 8.2%	45 7.3%	14 10.6%	7 4.0%	19 7.0%	3 8.8%	43 7.0%	23 7.6%	22 7.1%	45 7.3%
Somewhat satisfied	130 21.0%	69 23.0%	61 19.2%	130 21.0%	21 28.0%	63 18.5%	28 23.7%	17 20.0%	129 20.9%	37 28.0%	33 18.9%	51 18.7%	8 23.5%	129 21.0%	59 19.5%	70 22.5%	129 21.0%
Somewhat dissatisfied	78 12.6%	29 9.7%	49 15.4%	78 12.6%	10 13.3%	50 14.7%	10 8.5%	8 9.4%	78 12.6%	13 9.8%	14 8.0%	48 17.6%	3 8.8%	78 12.7%	42 13.9%	36 11.6%	78 12.7%
Very dissatisfied	25 4.0%	10 3.3%	15 4.7%	25 4.0%	3 4.0%	17 5.0%	3 2.5%	2 2.4%	25 4.0%	5 3.8%	4 2.3%	15 5.5%	1 2.9%	25 4.1%	10 3.3%	15 4.8%	25 4.1%
No opinion	342 55.2%	178 59.3%	163 51.3%	341 55.2%	37 49.3%	187 55.0%	66 55.9%	51 60.0%	341 55.2%	63 47.7%	117 66.9%	140 51.3%	19 55.9%	339 55.2%	169 55.8%	168 54.0%	337 54.9%

Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

Sports Courts

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	621 100.0%	300 100.0%	319 100.0%	619 100.0%	75 100.0%	344 100.0%	117 100.0%	83 100.0%	619 100.0%	131 100.0%	173 100.0%	276 100.0%	35 100.0%	615 100.0%	304 100.0%	311 100.0%	615 100.0%
Very satisfied	43 6.9%	18 6.0%	24 7.5%	42 6.8%	5 6.7%	21 6.1%	11 9.4%	6 7.2%	43 6.9%	11 8.4%	10 5.8%	17 6.2%	4 11.4%	42 6.8%	24 7.9%	19 6.1%	43 7.0%
Somewhat satisfied	151 24.3%	80 26.7%	71 22.3%	151 24.4%	23 30.7%	74 21.5%	32 27.4%	21 25.3%	150 24.2%	34 26.0%	43 24.9%	63 22.8%	10 28.6%	150 24.4%	76 25.0%	74 23.8%	150 24.4%
Somewhat dissatisfied	108 17.4%	38 12.7%	70 21.9%	108 17.4%	13 17.3%	79 23.0%	10 8.5%	6 7.2%	108 17.4%	20 15.3%	15 8.7%	69 25.0%	3 8.6%	107 17.4%	52 17.1%	55 17.7%	107 17.4%
Very dissatisfied	24 3.9%	8 2.7%	16 5.0%	24 3.9%	3 4.0%	16 4.7%	4 3.4%	1 1.2%	24 3.9%	3 2.3%	6 3.5%	14 5.1%	1 2.9%	24 3.9%	9 3.0%	15 4.8%	24 3.9%
No opinion	295 47.5%	156 52.0%	138 43.3%	294 47.5%	31 41.3%	154 44.8%	60 51.3%	49 59.0%	294 47.5%	63 48.1%	99 57.2%	113 40.9%	17 48.6%	292 47.5%	143 47.0%	148 47.6%	291 47.3%

Spray Pool / Water Parks

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	629 100.0%	301 100.0%	326 100.0%	627 100.0%	76 100.0%	345 100.0%	118 100.0%	88 100.0%	627 100.0%	135 100.0%	176 100.0%	276 100.0%	35 100.0%	622 100.0%	309 100.0%	312 100.0%	621 100.0%
Very satisfied	40 6.4%	18 6.0%	22 6.7%	40 6.4%	1 1.3%	26 7.5%	6 5.1%	7 8.0%	40 6.4%	7 5.2%	9 5.1%	18 6.5%	5 14.3%	39 6.3%	24 7.8%	16 5.1%	40 6.4%
Somewhat satisfied	134 21.3%	69 22.9%	65 19.9%	134 21.4%	18 23.7%	65 18.8%	31 26.3%	19 21.6%	133 21.2%	36 26.7%	36 20.5%	53 19.2%	8 22.9%	133 21.4%	61 19.7%	70 22.4%	131 21.1%
Somewhat dissatisfied	141 22.4%	72 23.9%	67 20.6%	139 22.2%	29 38.2%	75 21.7%	22 18.6%	14 15.9%	140 22.3%	23 17.0%	31 17.6%	76 27.5%	10 28.6%	140 22.5%	71 23.0%	68 21.8%	139 22.4%
Very dissatisfied	88 14.0%	36 12.0%	52 16.0%	88 14.0%	11 14.5%	62 18.0%	13 11.0%	2 2.3%	88 14.0%	7 5.2%	14 8.0%	60 21.7%	5 14.3%	86 13.8%	43 13.9%	45 14.4%	88 14.2%
No opinion	226 35.9%	106 35.2%	120 36.8%	226 36.0%	17 22.4%	117 33.9%	46 39.0%	46 52.3%	226 36.0%	62 45.9%	86 48.9%	69 25.0%	7 20.0%	224 36.0%	110 35.6%	113 36.2%	223 35.9%

Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

13. To what extent do you feel that parks, recreation and cultural services in Port Coquitlam provide benefits to your household or to the community? (Please circle **one** number for each line)

Benefits Your Household

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	670 100.0%	323 100.0%	343 100.0%	666 100.0%	78 100.0%	362 100.0%	130 100.0%	98 100.0%	668 100.0%	150 100.0%	194 100.0%	284 100.0%	36 100.0%	664 100.0%	331 100.0%	329 100.0%	660 100.0%
Great benefit	198 29.6%	104 32.2%	93 27.1%	197 29.6%	26 33.3%	128 35.4%	21 16.2%	22 22.4%	197 29.5%	22 14.7%	53 27.3%	108 38.0%	12 33.3%	195 29.4%	89 26.9%	103 31.3%	192 29.1%
2	205 30.6%	100 31.0%	104 30.3%	204 30.6%	27 34.6%	115 31.8%	38 29.2%	25 25.5%	205 30.7%	46 30.7%	47 24.2%	97 34.2%	15 41.7%	205 30.9%	107 32.3%	97 29.5%	204 30.9%
Some benefit	221 33.0%	97 30.0%	122 35.6%	219 32.9%	20 25.6%	107 29.6%	53 40.8%	40 40.8%	220 32.9%	60 40.0%	77 39.7%	72 25.4%	9 25.0%	218 32.8%	118 35.6%	101 30.7%	219 33.2%
4	19 2.8%	9 2.8%	10 2.9%	19 2.9%	3 3.8%	7 1.9%	8 6.2%	1 1.0%	19 2.8%	5 3.3%	9 4.6%	5 1.8%	0 .0%	19 2.9%	4 1.2%	14 4.3%	18 2.7%
No benefit	27 4.0%	13 4.0%	14 4.1%	27 4.1%	2 2.6%	5 1.4%	10 7.7%	10 10.2%	27 4.0%	17 11.3%	8 4.1%	2 .7%	0 .0%	27 4.1%	13 3.9%	14 4.3%	27 4.1%

Benefits the Community

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	682 100.0%	325 100.0%	352 100.0%	677 100.0%	77 100.0%	362 100.0%	132 100.0%	109 100.0%	680 100.0%	155 100.0%	200 100.0%	284 100.0%	36 100.0%	675 100.0%	334 100.0%	337 100.0%	671 100.0%
Great benefit	294 43.1%	163 50.2%	129 36.6%	292 43.1%	37 48.1%	171 47.2%	45 34.1%	40 36.7%	293 43.1%	55 35.5%	91 45.5%	131 46.1%	13 36.1%	290 43.0%	142 42.5%	145 43.0%	287 42.8%
2	246 36.1%	106 32.6%	139 39.5%	245 36.2%	28 36.4%	133 36.7%	52 39.4%	33 30.3%	246 36.2%	57 36.8%	63 31.5%	107 37.7%	18 50.0%	245 36.3%	120 35.9%	124 36.8%	244 36.4%
Some benefit	127 18.6%	47 14.5%	78 22.2%	125 18.5%	10 13.0%	53 14.6%	32 24.2%	31 28.4%	126 18.5%	34 21.9%	41 20.5%	45 15.8%	5 13.9%	125 18.5%	62 18.6%	63 18.7%	125 18.6%
4	5 .7%	5 1.5%	0 .0%	5 .7%	1 1.3%	3 .8%	0 .0%	1 .9%	5 .7%	2 1.3%	2 1.0%	1 .4%	0 .0%	5 .7%	3 .9%	2 .6%	5 .7%
No benefit	10 1.5%	4 1.2%	6 1.7%	10 1.5%	1 1.3%	2 .6%	3 2.3%	4 3.7%	10 1.5%	7 4.5%	3 1.5%	0 .0%	0 .0%	10 1.5%	7 2.1%	3 .9%	10 1.5%

Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

14. Please rank the following in terms of importance to your household. (Please circle **one** number for **each** line: VI (Very Important), I (Important), NI (Not Important), NO (No Opinion))

Streets / Roads

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	693 100.0%	334 100.0%	355 100.0%	689 100.0%	77 100.0%	367 100.0%	134 100.0%	113 100.0%	691 100.0%	159 100.0%	202 100.0%	289 100.0%	36 100.0%	686 100.0%	342 100.0%	341 100.0%	683 100.0%
Very important	485 70.0%	238 71.3%	244 68.7%	482 70.0%	43 55.8%	251 68.4%	106 79.1%	83 73.5%	483 69.9%	116 73.0%	152 75.2%	186 64.4%	25 69.4%	479 69.8%	236 69.0%	242 71.0%	478 70.0%
Important	197 28.4%	93 27.8%	103 29.0%	196 28.4%	33 42.9%	108 29.4%	28 20.9%	28 24.8%	197 28.5%	43 27.0%	48 23.8%	96 33.2%	10 27.8%	197 28.7%	99 28.9%	95 27.9%	194 28.4%
Not important	10 1.4%	3 .9%	7 2.0%	10 1.5%	1 1.3%	8 2.2%	0 .0%	1 .9%	10 1.4%	0 .0%	1 .5%	7 2.4%	1 2.8%	9 1.3%	6 1.8%	4 1.2%	10 1.5%
No opinion	1 .1%	0 .0%	1 .3%	1 .1%	0 .0%	0 .0%	0 .0%	1 .9%	1 .1%	0 .0%	1 .5%	0 .0%	0 .0%	1 .1%	1 .3%	0 .0%	1 .1%

Water / Sewer System

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	687 100.0%	333 100.0%	352 100.0%	685 100.0%	77 100.0%	367 100.0%	134 100.0%	107 100.0%	685 100.0%	157 100.0%	198 100.0%	289 100.0%	36 100.0%	680 100.0%	340 100.0%	338 100.0%	678 100.0%
Very important	481 70.0%	236 70.9%	244 69.3%	480 70.1%	44 57.1%	255 69.5%	103 76.9%	77 72.0%	479 69.9%	103 65.6%	151 76.3%	193 66.8%	27 75.0%	474 69.7%	234 68.8%	241 71.3%	475 70.1%
Important	179 26.1%	84 25.2%	95 27.0%	179 26.1%	29 37.7%	100 27.2%	27 20.1%	23 21.5%	179 26.1%	46 29.3%	39 19.7%	87 30.1%	7 19.4%	179 26.3%	88 25.9%	88 26.0%	176 26.0%
Not important	18 2.6%	9 2.7%	8 2.3%	17 2.5%	4 5.2%	10 2.7%	2 1.5%	2 1.9%	18 2.6%	5 3.2%	5 2.5%	7 2.4%	1 2.8%	18 2.6%	12 3.5%	6 1.8%	18 2.7%
No opinion	9 1.3%	4 1.2%	5 1.4%	9 1.3%	0 .0%	2 .5%	2 1.5%	5 4.7%	9 1.3%	3 1.9%	3 1.5%	2 .7%	1 2.8%	9 1.3%	6 1.8%	3 .9%	9 1.3%

Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

Recreation Facilities

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	681 100.0%	327 100.0%	351 100.0%	678 100.0%	77 100.0%	364 100.0%	134 100.0%	104 100.0%	679 100.0%	154 100.0%	196 100.0%	288 100.0%	36 100.0%	674 100.0%	336 100.0%	335 100.0%	671 100.0%
Very important	194 28.5%	100 30.6%	94 26.8%	194 28.6%	25 32.5%	124 34.1%	22 16.4%	22 21.2%	193 28.4%	27 17.5%	47 24.0%	102 35.4%	15 41.7%	191 28.3%	98 29.2%	94 28.1%	192 28.6%
Important	389 57.1%	178 54.4%	209 59.5%	387 57.1%	47 61.0%	207 56.9%	87 64.9%	48 46.2%	389 57.3%	83 53.9%	114 58.2%	169 58.7%	20 55.6%	386 57.3%	194 57.7%	189 56.4%	383 57.1%
Not important	71 10.4%	38 11.6%	32 9.1%	70 10.3%	5 6.5%	28 7.7%	19 14.2%	18 17.3%	70 10.3%	28 18.2%	27 13.8%	14 4.9%	1 2.8%	70 10.4%	28 8.3%	41 12.2%	69 10.3%
No opinion	27 4.0%	11 3.4%	16 4.6%	27 4.0%	0 .0%	5 1.4%	6 4.5%	16 15.4%	27 4.0%	16 10.4%	8 4.1%	3 1.0%	0 .0%	27 4.0%	16 4.8%	11 3.3%	27 4.0%

Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

Public Safety

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	691 100.0%	334 100.0%	352 100.0%	686 100.0%	77 100.0%	366 100.0%	134 100.0%	112 100.0%	689 100.0%	161 100.0%	199 100.0%	288 100.0%	36 100.0%	684 100.0%	342 100.0%	339 100.0%	681 100.0%
Very important	584 84.5%	300 89.8%	281 79.8%	581 84.7%	63 81.8%	317 86.6%	109 81.3%	93 83.0%	582 84.5%	126 78.3%	176 88.4%	241 83.7%	34 94.4%	577 84.4%	283 82.7%	292 86.1%	575 84.4%
Important	98 14.2%	33 9.9%	63 17.9%	96 14.0%	13 16.9%	46 12.6%	23 17.2%	16 14.3%	98 14.2%	30 18.6%	21 10.6%	45 15.6%	2 5.6%	98 14.3%	50 14.6%	47 13.9%	97 14.2%
Not important	4 .6%	1 .3%	3 .9%	4 .6%	1 1.3%	2 .5%	0 .0%	1 .9%	4 .6%	1 .6%	1 .5%	2 .7%	0 .0%	4 .6%	4 1.2%	0 .0%	4 .6%
No opinion	5 .7%	0 .0%	5 1.4%	5 .7%	0 .0%	1 .3%	2 1.5%	2 1.8%	5 .7%	4 2.5%	1 .5%	0 .0%	0 .0%	5 .7%	5 1.5%	0 .0%	5 .7%

Trails / Parks

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	685 100.0%	331 100.0%	351 100.0%	682 100.0%	77 100.0%	366 100.0%	133 100.0%	107 100.0%	683 100.0%	155 100.0%	198 100.0%	289 100.0%	36 100.0%	678 100.0%	339 100.0%	336 100.0%	675 100.0%
Very important	227 33.1%	122 36.9%	105 29.9%	227 33.3%	34 44.2%	133 36.3%	30 22.6%	29 27.1%	226 33.1%	44 28.4%	68 34.3%	99 34.3%	12 33.3%	223 32.9%	117 34.5%	106 31.5%	223 33.0%
Important	373 54.5%	173 52.3%	198 56.4%	371 54.4%	31 40.3%	195 53.3%	87 65.4%	60 56.1%	373 54.6%	85 54.8%	115 58.1%	150 51.9%	21 58.3%	371 54.7%	177 52.2%	191 56.8%	368 54.5%
Not important	68 9.9%	28 8.5%	39 11.1%	67 9.8%	11 14.3%	33 9.0%	14 10.5%	9 8.4%	67 9.8%	16 10.3%	12 6.1%	36 12.5%	3 8.3%	67 9.9%	35 10.3%	32 9.5%	67 9.9%
No opinion	17 2.5%	8 2.4%	9 2.6%	17 2.5%	1 1.3%	5 1.4%	2 1.5%	9 8.4%	17 2.5%	10 6.5%	3 1.5%	4 1.4%	0 .0%	17 2.5%	10 2.9%	7 2.1%	17 2.5%

Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

Other

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	43 100.0%	21 100.0%	22 100.0%	43 100.0%	6 100.0%	23 100.0%	7 100.0%	7 100.0%	43 100.0%	7 100.0%	15 100.0%	18 100.0%	3 100.0%	43 100.0%	20 100.0%	23 100.0%	43 100.0%
Very important	34 79.1%	17 81.0%	17 77.3%	34 79.1%	6 100.0%	16 69.6%	6 85.7%	6 85.7%	34 79.1%	6 85.7%	15 100.0%	13 72.2%	0 .0%	34 79.1%	18 90.0%	16 69.6%	34 79.1%
Important	6 14.0%	2 9.5%	4 18.2%	6 14.0%	0 .0%	5 21.7%	1 14.3%	0 .0%	6 14.0%	0 .0%	0 .0%	4 22.2%	2 66.7%	6 14.0%	1 5.0%	5 21.7%	6 14.0%
No opinion	3 7.0%	2 9.5%	1 4.5%	3 7.0%	0 .0%	2 8.7%	0 .0%	1 14.3%	3 7.0%	1 14.3%	0 .0%	1 5.6%	1 33.3%	3 7.0%	1 5.0%	2 8.7%	3 7.0%

15. What is your gender? (Please circle **one** number)

	Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	703 100.0%	78 100.0%	369 100.0%	137 100.0%	118 100.0%	702 100.0%	165 100.0%	204 100.0%	290 100.0%	36 100.0%	695 100.0%	345 100.0%	349 100.0%	694 100.0%
Female	343 48.8%	51 65.4%	190 51.5%	49 35.8%	52 44.1%	342 48.7%	88 53.3%	89 43.6%	134 46.2%	27 75.0%	338 48.6%	157 45.5%	181 51.9%	338 48.7%
Male	360 51.2%	27 34.6%	179 48.5%	88 64.2%	66 55.9%	360 51.3%	77 46.7%	115 56.4%	156 53.8%	9 25.0%	357 51.4%	188 54.5%	168 48.1%	356 51.3%

16. In which age group are you? (Please circle **one** number)

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Household				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	707 100.0%	342 100.0%	360 100.0%	702 100.0%	165 100.0%	207 100.0%	291 100.0%	36 100.0%	699 100.0%	349 100.0%	348 100.0%	697 100.0%
18 to 34 years	79 11.2%	51 14.9%	27 7.5%	78 11.1%	14 8.5%	20 9.7%	42 14.4%	3 8.3%	79 11.3%	42 12.0%	34 9.8%	76 10.9%
35 to 54 years	370 52.3%	190 55.6%	179 49.7%	369 52.6%	46 27.9%	75 36.2%	218 74.9%	28 77.8%	367 52.5%	174 49.9%	194 55.7%	368 52.8%
55 to 64 years	137 19.4%	49 14.3%	88 24.4%	137 19.5%	50 30.3%	57 27.5%	26 8.9%	4 11.1%	137 19.6%	75 21.5%	61 17.5%	136 19.5%

**Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey**

---

65 or older	121	52	66	118	55	55	5	1	116	58	59	117
	17.1%	15.2%	18.3%	16.8%	33.3%	26.6%	1.7%	2.8%	16.6%	16.6%	17.0%	16.8%

---

Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

17. What best describes the type of household in which you live? (Please circle **one** number)

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Area		Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		North of Lougheed Highway	South of Lougheed Highway	
Total	700 100.0%	338 100.0%	357 100.0%	695 100.0%	79 100.0%	367 100.0%	137 100.0%	116 100.0%	699 100.0%	346 100.0%	345 100.0%	691 100.0%
One or more single adults	166 23.7%	88 26.0%	77 21.6%	165 23.7%	14 17.7%	46 12.5%	50 36.5%	55 47.4%	165 23.6%	89 25.7%	74 21.4%	163 23.6%
Couple with no dependent children	207 29.6%	89 26.3%	115 32.2%	204 29.4%	20 25.3%	75 20.4%	57 41.6%	55 47.4%	207 29.6%	102 29.5%	100 29.0%	202 29.2%
Couple with dependent children	291 41.6%	134 39.6%	156 43.7%	290 41.7%	42 53.2%	218 59.4%	26 19.0%	5 4.3%	291 41.6%	140 40.5%	150 43.5%	290 42.0%
Single parent with dependent children	36 5.1%	27 8.0%	9 2.5%	36 5.2%	3 3.8%	28 7.6%	4 2.9%	1 .9%	36 5.2%	15 4.3%	21 6.1%	36 5.2%

18. Where do you live? (Please circle **one** number)

	Total	Gender		Variable Total	Age				Variable Total	Household				Variable Total
		Female	Male		18 to 34 years	35 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 or older		One or more single adults	Couple with no dependent children	Couple with dependent children	Single parent with dependent children	
Total	698 100.0%	338 100.0%	356 100.0%	694 100.0%	76 100.0%	368 100.0%	136 100.0%	117 100.0%	697 100.0%	163 100.0%	202 100.0%	290 100.0%	36 100.0%	691 100.0%
North of Lougheed Highway	349 50.0%	157 46.4%	188 52.8%	345 49.7%	42 55.3%	174 47.3%	75 55.1%	58 49.6%	349 50.1%	89 54.6%	102 50.5%	140 48.3%	15 41.7%	346 50.1%
South of Lougheed Highway	349 50.0%	181 53.6%	168 47.2%	349 50.3%	34 44.7%	194 52.7%	61 44.9%	59 50.4%	348 49.9%	74 45.4%	100 49.5%	150 51.7%	21 58.3%	345 49.9%

## Qualitative Results

1. How does your family find out about parks, recreation and cultural services and opportunities in Port Coquitlam? (Other responses)
  1. banners/signs (9)
  2. drive by
  3. exploring the city
  4. heritage & cultural society
  5. I like to explore and see what is available
  6. kids playing sports
  7. local baseball / soccer associations
  8. notice boards
  9. notices in park
  10. seasonal employee of the city
  11. soccer
  12. street advertising
  13. Susan Hall
  14. yearly calendar
  
2. Do any of the following limit your household's participation in **recreation and cultural programs and services** provided by the City of Port Coquitlam? (Other responses)
  1. absence of off leash areas for dogs
  2. age groupings
  3. availability - programs fill up too fast
  4. buses don't run often enough on weekends
  5. community could use a rubber track
  6. I am handicapped
  7. lack of cultural programs
  8. lack of instructors
  9. lack of interest (4)
  10. lack of time
  11. more weekend programs for ages 7 -10
  12. most programs not available at Wilson location
  13. not dog friendly
  14. not many programs for ages 15 - 18
  15. pool access for wheelchairs
  16. poor service
  17. shutting down pool on holidays
  18. summer very busy - lack of parking
  19. too old & handicapped

**Port Coquitlam** 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

- 20. traffic
- 21. washrooms needed in Blakeburn Park

*Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey*

3. Do any of the following limit your household's use of Port Coquitlam **parks and trails**? (Other responses)
  22. aggressive cyclists and joggers that don't share the trail
  23. bathrooms being open during day in fall/winter
  24. bears on the dyke
  25. car was vandalized in the parking lot
  26. cold rainy weather
  27. disability due to age
  28. dog accessibility
  29. doggy poop bag dispensers are empty in lots of parks
  30. few off leash area
  31. lack of adequate lighting
  32. lack of parking around some trails
  33. lack of time
  34. my 5 year old found a drug needle (used) in Aggie Park
  35. not enough off leash areas
  36. not stroller friendly
  37. off leash dog areas
  38. off leash dogs (5)
  39. parking spaces
  40. riverbank used by transients, drug & alcohol abusers
  41. the gate on native land blocking access
  42. trails blocked on First Nations land
  43. variety
  44. want access to areas belonging to First Nations
  45. won't use alone by river due to homeless people sleeping in bushes
  46. would like public washrooms to be opened longer than april - oct
  
4. In your opinion, are any new or improved **parks or outdoor recreation facilities** needed in Port Coquitlam? (Other responses)
  47. access to the rivers for kayaks & canoes
  48. another skateboard park in Hyde Creek area
  49. archery field
  50. artificial turf for soccer
  51. baseball diamonds for Port Coquitlam minor
  52. baseball field - not softball
  53. baseball fields
  54. BMX race track
  55. Centennial Pool is 40 yrs old - time to replace it
  56. centre for aerobics, gyms, etc...

*Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey*

57. Citadel playground
  58. fitness centre
  59. girls box lacrosse facilities & funding
  60. golf course - driving range
  61. gym
  62. ice rink
  63. ice rinks
  64. indoor pool
  65. indoor track - outside rubberized track
  66. just moved to area but there seems to be a need for more rec facilities
  67. Memorial Park on Pickton's pig farm
  68. more covered picnic areas for cooking
  69. more sport fields
  70. mountain bike skills park
  71. mountain bike trail network
  72. need a swimming pool or replace Centennial
  73. need more places like Hyde Creek
  74. parks - gardens
  75. playground needs fencing to keep dogs out
  76. playgrounds should be made inaccessible to dogs
  77. public golf course
  78. roller blade paved trails
  79. rubber track
  80. running track
  81. similar to Donald
  82. spray park at Lions Park
  83. the trail by the Red Bridge to be opened again
  84. walking paths
  85. washroom & garbage can on Poco/Traboulay Trail
  86. we are new here so we don't know
  87. wheel thrown pottery
  88. where are the kiddie pools?
  89. within 10 years we will need these facilities to keep up with our focus for better health
5. In your opinion, are **new or improved indoor recreation and cultural facilities** needed in Port Coquitlam? (Other responses)
90. a decent library
  91. art facilities needed
  92. centre for adults to hang out too
  93. curling rink (11)

*Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey*

94. drop in hockey times
  95. fitness centre on south side
  96. increase locker security at Hyde Creek
  97. indoor facilities for children ages 9 - 15
  98. indoor pool on south side
  99. indoor squash
  100. indoor walking/jogging facility
  101. is volleyball offered?
  102. local theatre
  103. more hours for public skating
  104. most of the stuff is on the north side and I don't drive
  105. museum (3)
  106. need something on the south side
  107. need these in the south - update library
  108. north side senior centre
  109. pottery
  110. racquetball / squash
  111. senior centre on the northside
  112. skating rink on north side
  113. table tennis
  114. year round ice time - public skating
6. If you indicated that a new ice surface is needed, please indicate the activities that you or your household would likely participate in at the arena. (Other responses)
115. adult skating
  116. broomball
  117. curling rink (14)
  118. drop in hockey
  119. drop in hockey
7. For the new or improved facilities you identified in #4a and 5a, would you support any tax increases (or rent, if a renter) to help pay for new or improved facilities? (Other responses)
120. as long as it is a fair amount
  121. don't know how much of current taxes go to this
  122. taxes too high now
  123. user pay
  124. whatever it takes
8. Would you support any of the following in order to improve parks, recreation and cultural services in Port Coquitlam? (Other responses)
125. community events - fundraisers
  126. decrease membership fees

*Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey*

127. do not support
  128. find win-win ad revenue ie: billboards in rec centres & road areas
  129. fund raising or casino revenue
  130. I support a user pay system
  131. increase fees for dog owners - maybe they will clean up the mess
  132. local fundraising
  133. make these sponsorships tax deductible
  134. more responsible resource management
  135. Port Coquitlam has no debt as far as I know - put the money towards debt on new facilities
  136. raising prices reduces use.
  137. should be considered in the city budget
  138. user pay method
  139. volunteer services
  140. what needs improvement?
14. Please rank the following in terms of importance to your household. (Please circle **one** number for **each** line: VI (Very Important), I (Important), NI (Not Important), NO (No Opinion)) (Other responses)
141. art facilities, theaters, galleries, etc.
  142. arts & cultural facilities
  143. bike routes connecting neighborhoods
  144. criminal element
  145. cultural facilities
  146. education & libraries
  147. garbage services - which we don't receive & must pay for ourselves - very unfair
  148. keep Port Coquitlam for family style housing
  149. lack of sidewalks at some parks
  150. lawn bowling
  151. less bureaucracy at City Hall
  152. library
  153. light needed at pedestrian crossing
  154. litter & graffiti removal - noise bylaw enforced
  155. more off leash dog parks & trails
  156. more police presence
  157. more shops, super stores, malls and department stores
  158. museum
  159. off leash dog parks (10)
  160. overall cleanliness & bylaw adherence
  161. Port Coquitlam North has gone downhill - quality of owners living in houses & caring for them
  162. Port Coquitlam rivers

**Port Coquitlam** 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

- 163. remove barb wire from PoCo/Traboulay trail
- 164. safety at night
- 165. school
- 166. school funding
- 167. services for the disabled - very important
- 168. street lights
- 169. tar sealing back alleys
- 170. traffic - no thought in planning parking areas
- 171. trans link

*Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey*

19. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about parks, recreation and cultural services in Port Coquitlam? If so, please use the space below.
172. 26 million spent on the Terry Fox School and all we got was a dirt & gravel track!
173. A disc course in Port Coquitlam would be great & the game is getting very popular - we are starting to see more teenagers getting into playing.
174. A lot of great parks in Port Coquitlam. Visual arts, crafts classes are a little too costly. I would like to take some classes but can't afford it.
175. A spray park would be great on the southside. The fields at Minnekada are in terrible condition for soccer. Love the turf at Gates - another would be great. Need another outdoor lacrosse box on the southside.
176. All rec services should be free - if more people exercised, less would be in the hospital. Government should hand over some of the money they get from alcohol & tobacco to communities.
177. All season we had to drive to Pitt Meadows for our hockey team's home games. Clearly more ice surfaces are needed in Port Coquitlam. There are lots of baseball fields, which is great, but they need maintenance so the kids aren't playing in bogs. Generally we love Port Coquitlam and its small community feel even though its a city with lots of amenities.
178. An indoor swimming pool on the southside of Lougheed would be lovely.
179. As a long time resident I have seen population increase immensely but green space is not keeping up. My first impression of Port Coquitlam was "wow" what a lovely little town with incredible parks everywhere - this is not true of today.
180. As a marathon runner I would love to have more areas with trails for long runs.
181. As a resident of our great city for almost 40 years we are satisfied with the present system as it relates to our needs.
182. As an avid mountain biker I am concerned that with the development of Burke Mtn - a lot of the trails that currently exist will, in time, disappear. I realize that this is Coquitlam but I don't see any other areas locally for downhill mountain bikers to enjoy - other than that - Port Coquitlam Rocks!!!
183. As an employee of Burnaby Parks and Rec, I run the food service in the seniors centre and our program is highly successful. I am aware that the senior centre in Port Coquitlam has a food service but not to the degree of service that we offer. I believe that Port Coquitlam parks and rec and the seniors of the tri-cities would benefit a great deal from such a program.
184. As far as fitness centres it would be nice to have something on the south side. Also, there should be more ice time, and a spring hockey league for the kids.
185. As the parent of a disabled child, I want to see more services offered to children/adults with disabilities. There is not enough programs, recreation activities & general awareness for our disabled that live in our community - that needs to change!!!
186. Bad cleaning in the parks.
187. Being much older than 65 it would be nice to have a few parks with a picnic area.
188. Better maintenance on outdoor fields.
189. Builders are allowed to build right to the pavement without insisting on a minimum green space between residences. Properties for children & adults to enjoy the outdoors. In other words, Port Coquitlam is developing ghetto conditions!!!
190. Bus 159 to Braid Station every 15 min. instead of every 30. Shuttles every 15 min. too.
191. Change direction of the slides so they are not facing the sun; they get too hot during summer time at Chelsea Park.
192. Chelsea Park - North Port Coquitlam - Great park and playground. Good location has a baseball field but it is not used. Field needs improvement - it is very wet but it could be made into a great park basketball court, etc. Hyde Creek Trail could use more lights at night.
193. City council & staff do a pretty good job at balancing tax dollars given all of the demands. Would like to see more cultural facilities perhaps. Appreciate the healthy supply of recreation facilities. An important part of a community and particularly important for our youth. Keep up the good work!
194. Considering the amount of property taxes paid every year, I feel program fees are too high. They should be lower to let more people enjoy what the city has to offer.
195. Could not the Trans Canada Trail run just behind the houses on the east side of LaFleur St? There should be enough park property to handle the trail.
196. Crossing Lougheed Highway is the biggest barrier to accessing facilities, from both South and North Port Coquitlam. We are lucky to live in such a beautiful city and we all have to work together to keep it this way.
197. Definite lack of ice surfaces. We have grandchildren in hockey and they get ice time in Pitt Meadows. Unacceptable! Also, minor hockey program is terribly unorganized. Far too much personal politics involved. There is no real motivation passed along to minor hockey players.

*Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey*

198. Designate dog area that's fenced and maintained. Instructors for classes need to be appropriate to classes. Wilson Centre kitchen facilities are not well maintained. Excellent ticket centre at Wilson Centre.
199. Due to the increase in population in Port Coquitlam over the 25 years I lived here, only the sports fields @ Reeves Park have been extended & we must keep up with recreation & nature areas and sports facilities to keep up with the booming population.
200. Enjoy PoCo trail for riding. Better if left natural surface instead of gravel.
201. Ensure safety in the parks.
202. Every time we drive by the skate park, it is full of kids - this has been one of the best ideas / money spent that parks & rec & the city have done. More facilities like this are needed for youths. Also, having the youth involved with the development of that project was awesome.
203. Excellent community!
204. Except for lack of arts & cultural venue, what our community needs is an affordable & reliable transit system. As well as a remedy to the grid lock on Mary Hill bypass and Lougheed Highway.
205. Extend the width of the Coquitlam River Linear Park to include all currently undeveloped land north from Lougheed to the city's northern boundary - west to Hastings Street & east to Shaughnessy Street, this would make for better opportunities to provide off-leash dog areas & would continue to provide habitat for our wildlife. After all they were here first!!
206. Fenced dog park. Upgrade northside lacrosse box or remove - drug hangout. Bike trails through town extended. Roads not safest to ride on. Easy access to new art centre for all.
207. Find that the city is not very open to residents suggestions.
208. Fine dogs off leash and people who don't clean up after them - have no dogs allowed parks and dogs only parks.
209. For the most part I am reasonably satisfied with my life here in Port Coquitlam.
210. For the most part, parks and trails that I have been to have been very well maintained. But, there needs to be a selection of off leash dog parks available. I should not have to go to an adjoining community to enjoy this type of park.
211. Fox St. Park - new playground is awesome, but lights are needed due to teens partying, smashing bottles, throwing needles, etc. Fights happen as well as stabbings. More police needed on this side of Shaughnessy.
212. Generally bike routes throughout Port Coquitlam are good. However, my bike commute to New West has no safe route. Lougheed Hwy is currently the best route although very bad around Riverview Hospital. The other route along the bypass & United Blvd. is scary!
213. Generally even those facilities which I don't often use are very well maintained ie: cleanliness, gardens etc. The city workers with whom I come in contact with are polite and courteous. The staff at Port Coquitlam City Hall are amazing.
214. Good job with trails and playgrounds. Our outdoor pools are ancient and yet still heavily used by both rec users and competitive groups. Centennial Pool is in drastic needs of an upgrade. There is not a single diving board in all of Port Coquitlam. We have an adequate # of fields but they are in bad shape. The soccer field near Minnekhada School are particularly bad - during winter months they are often unusable. Up to 6 soccer teams crowd the gravel fields @ Gates Park during soccer season because so few of the other fields are usable. Castle Park - large empty area would be ideal spot for a new lacrosse box / basketball courts / swimming pool.
215. Great job with the upgrades to Reeves Park. Love the walkways around the park. Love Colony Farms walking paths, but could be "off leash" for people and pets. They are no more a problem than those who ride bikes down the middle or have children running everywhere and throwing things in the duck ponds. Citadel Park could be "off leash" on the lower fields. Too buggy & wet for children but dogs love to run.
216. Green space top priority.
217. Help to re-open the trail on Colony Farms to the Red Bridge.
218. How about a new baseball field? Why is the artificial turf field in Gates Park built on an angle? Would have been room for 2 fields if it was built properly. Could today's playground equipment be any more boring - you have removed all the fun equipment that I used as a child.
219. How about some campsites?
220. How about the odd rockery or plant area. It is a nice area to walk but very boring.
221. Hyde Creek North Centre is not a place I will allow my children to visit. There are groups of teens who intimidate and threaten both youth and adults. Either clean it up or shut it down at night time. Although I live on the north side, a fitness centre is needed in the south. Another ice surface is desperately needed.

*Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey*

222. I am a disabled person and most of these questions don't apply to me as I don't go to parks or go on trails.
223. I am a recreational runner & find it very frustrating when the bathrooms are not open. I realize this is a cost issue but I also know there are a lot of runners using our parks & bathrooms.
224. I am always pleased to see how clean the parks are.
225. I am concerned about people walking their dogs & not picking up after them. I don't go to the Park because of the dog waste. I wish that this would be addressed so kids would not have to walk in it.
226. I am curious about the time line for completion of Blakeburn Park and Lagoon.
227. I believe the area can support a larger theatre. Evergreen is uncomfortable & small. Terry Fox is a good theatre, just not big enough. Terry Fox Library is outstanding!!!
228. I believe we have made progress over the 15 years we have been here to improve sport facilities - fields for soccer & baseball. I would like to see more progress to take advantage of green space along river / dykes. This is a unique opportunity we have. Want to see bike lanes throughout Port Coquitlam like other cities have adopted -- what a great way to get around. Safety - increasing crime issues in Port Coquitlam are very concerning - break-ins & auto theft are almost out of control.
229. I don't feel safe to walk my dog near the Fraser River. If we made a boardwalk with cafés & restaurants or more community gardening in Colony Farms, I believe more people would use these places and more people would mean a safer place to be. I know it is a lot of money but as we grow, with more commercial money along the river we may be able to afford it.
230. I don't make use of facilities generally. I do appreciate that they are necessary and I believe we have good facilities. I review the leisure book which is sent out a couple of times a year and have often thought of taking a class or course but as a 50+ male quite sedentary I haven't found a fitness class I think I would be comfortable in. Keep up the good work!!!
231. I enjoy Port Coquitlam Trails. But, need enforcement to pet owners to leash up their dogs. River Springs Trail is particularly bad -- 90% of dogs are not leashed. More waste bag dispensers & garbage cans would help with lazy dog owners. Need washroom near Marina. Why are 2 of the Port Coquitlam Trail entrances closed at Red bridge?
232. I feel that the July 1st celebration at Castle Park has outgrown the size of the park. During the evening fireworks, the area can not accommodate that large amount of people. Granted the city comes and cleans the park the next day, but the city is not picking up the empty liquor bottles on my property nor washing the vomit off my driveway that people have left. Many districts have done away with the fireworks in the evening. If Port Coquitlam continues with the July 1st a daytime celebration I feel is all that is required and the park should be shut down at 6:00. I pay my fair share in taxes and feel it's time to move this somewhere else or discontinue.
233. I find many of the public washrooms to be in fair to poor condition. Particularly in Lions Park and other outdoor recreation locations. I am very thankful for the skateboard park near Lions Park as it gives our city's youth a constructive place to hang out and be positively active in the community. Looking forward to the arts centre in downtown being completed.
234. I had a wonderful time utilizing the various parks of the city with my child - they are always clean accessible and well-equipped. I would like to see more childcare provided at rec. centres so the parents can take advantage of recreational programs in order for some respite. As a professional person who is raising a young child, I need time to get & stay fit and healthy at a rec centre, but cannot because of a lack of services. More cross-cultural programs would be great too.
235. I have always enjoyed living in Port Coquitlam and especially enjoyed the parks and the many walking trails. For me Port Coquitlam has been "home" for 30 years. I remember fondly the many long walks along the river with my little dog, so now am upset there is a no-pets rule. The many interesting and kind people one meets when out with your pet are a joy.
236. I have been looking for a list of parks/playgrounds designated for young children (3 & under) but have not come across any. In other communities there are special playgrounds designed with the safety & ability of a toddler in mind. If this does not already exist I think it would be beneficial. Something similar in Coquitlam.
237. I have lived here for 57 years and I think Port Coquitlam is a great little city. My major priority is policing & I would be willing to pay more taxes for more police.
238. I have lived in new Chelsea Park since before it was created. In the beginning it was well maintained. Now brambles have been allowed to overgrow the grass play area where kids could ride their bikes up and down small hills. Brambles are also overgrowing the grassed area along Chelsea Ave.
239. I haven't been a resident long enough to Port Coquitlam. I don't feel I can give the proper input.
240. I like the idea of "waste bags" for the dogs, but a lot of time the boxes are empty.
241. I love the nature trail system in Port Coquitlam. It is one of the very key reasons we decided to buy a home here. To date, we have not used any of the other facilities.
242. I never use any facilities other than the library. On behalf of my family however, I think we need more arena access ie: ice surface for hockey & skating lessons.
243. I really enjoy Leah Square and highly approve of its maintenance and the events that are organized there.

*Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey*

244. I see the aggressive building throughout south Port Coquitlam-- I can't see how the current parks and rec services are going to be sufficient. I must admit that it is very nice to have activities of culture and special events available in our own community - not having to go into Vancouver for this kind of entertainment.
245. I should not have to travel to other cities for Port Coquitlam Minor Hockey ice times. I think we really need an indoor pool & gym in south Port Coquitlam. The swimming lessons after school are always hard because we do not have something other than Hyde Creek.
246. I think Castle Park could be better utilized. The playground is not very good - addition of tennis courts or other sports courts would draw more people to this wonderful space. Drainage could be a lot better there too. Port Coquitlam definitely needs another sheet of ice. Minor Hockey deserves better ice times. The efforts of Port Coquitlam Minor Hockey brings in a lot of visitors into our community. I am pleased to hear about the plans for the arts village and I hope this dramatically increases the arts & cultural programming through Parks, Recreation & Culture.
247. I think Port Coquitlam is a very unique place with very unique people from all walks of life. Downtown has a lot to offer potentially but our presentation is poor at best. The store fronts of local businesses are outdated and worn. Downtown should be a source of pride for our city not a rundown mess. Unlike Coquitlam, Port Moody or Maple Ridge downtown could be like Robson Street if we had that vision. People coming, parking, enjoying the walk, having an ice cream, a latte, etc. Secondly the traffic from southside to northside is horrendous. What is the city doing for the future?
248. I think that the cost of the sports facilities are already high in comparison to other municipalities when you look at the quality.
249. I think that whatever is built security against vandalism is very important. Motion activated sprinklers and lights, cameras, roll shutters for after hours as well as lit areas with phones to call for help. This would go a long way to stop young people from gathering and drinking in parks as well as vandalism.
250. I think we are lucky to have what we have. I am just discovering now what we have & enjoying the benefit of it.
251. I think we have a good base but we are growing and our facilities can no longer manage the demands.
252. I walk on the PoCo trail everyday - bike riders should have some way of letting you know that they are behind you. We really like that trail but were very upset that so many trees were destroyed for the construction at McCallister!
253. I wish the skatepark was more accessible by car. It is difficult for parents to pick up children who are at the skatepark. I love the paved trail by the river behind Lions Park but the surface is getting quite cracked.
254. I would hope that all activities were clean, safe & fun (like fireworks at Castle Park). It may be time to renovate some facilities like the outdoor pool rather than build a new one.
255. I would like good quality accessible off leash areas. I would love great bike route connections to all the trails and outdoor recreation areas. I would very much like access to bike ride on the Native Indian reserve areas. I don't know why access was cut off. Tri-city area needs a good sized theatre.
256. I would like to have a water park somewhere in south Port Coquitlam and an indoor pool.
257. I would like to recommend that you do something about the green space behind City Hall. At least paint the concrete and perhaps add something to the seated positions. I know concrete lasts forever and was a cost consideration but it is an eyesore in a great location.
258. I would like to say kudos to the people who developed the idea of free neck passes for grade 5 students. Thanks for making that happen. I think some rec centre programs are too expensive. We use Hyde Creek regularly. We always have to wait in line. I'd like to see a cleaner floor & change room.
259. I would like to see a children's water park at Reeve St or Lions Park (south side), like the one in Coquitlam Blue Mountain (recycled water - turned on and off by users).
260. I would like to see a more adequate museum for the community. We are losing opportunities for artifacts because of lack of display space.
261. I would like to see a spray park near Blakeburn Elementary or Lions Park. Do something with Pickton's land - maybe green space with a spray park. Near Blakeburn Elementary I know there is a small lake where maybe people could walk around. A family bowling centre would be nice.
262. I would like to see an indoor pool who would be fair to the indigent.
263. I would like to see an indoor pool / health centre on the south side.
264. I would like to see another ice rink and indoor pool / rec facility. I would also like to see the area above the ice rink utilized more. Extremely happy with outdoor parks and trails - utilized by family & friends always.
265. I would like to see more accountability for the new Arts Centre in downtown Port Coquitlam. The costs are way over what was projected. If this turns out to be an albatross for the taxpayers, the mayor will be held accountable. It's time that council answered some hard questions on the project and its costs over-runs!
266. I would like to see more cultural events than what is taking place now. In particular multi-cultural events. The local free newspapers are great for advertising events. If there was more reporting and advertising of the PoCo Trans Canada Trail it would be more popular.
267. I would like to see more programs offered at Hyde Creek to be offered at Port Coquitlam rec complex for kids & youth.

*Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey*

268. I would like to see more stringent rules and fines for dogs off-leash on PoCo Trail.
269. I would like to see the PoCo Trail name "Routely" to honor its founder. Mr. Routely was WWI vet. It was his idea to encircle this city with the trail. It should be a priority. Another WWI vet should be remembered by a street or park name for him. His name was H.I. Grandhold a Red Cross man - British Army. Please take time to consider these suggestions.
270. I would like to see weight training equipment at a southside facility. If Port Coquitlam has a water spray / splash park where is it?
271. I would very much like to see a recreational centre with an indoor swimming pool in our beautiful Port Coquitlam instead of all the condo's being built that replace the houses which were torn down.
272. I'd like to see more opportunities for swimming (indoor) etc. closer to the south side of Lougheed Hwy. I guess I should explore more & find out where Hyde Creek is. The trails for walking are fabulous in Port Coquitlam. I would also like to see fewer transients in Shaughnessy downtown. The playground just off Shaughnessy is somewhat hidden & it make me a little nervous about taking my grandchildren.
273. If we can add more parks and trails - great. Hopefully we can at least keep and maintain what we have.
274. I'm sorry to say due to both of us being in poor health I couldn't contribute anything that will help you with your endeavors.
275. Importance of sports and recreation in lives of children and youth should be emphasized. Need more ice surface so Port Coquitlam can compete at higher levels in hockey and lacrosse.
276. Improve the facilities that you do have ie: Lions Park is not a place I would want to take my family for a family event. Given the presence of undesirable individuals & drug related garbage.
277. Improvements to Shaughnessy have added a small town community feel. Terry Fox Library hours expansion for Sunday is much better & should be continued year round. Cultural facilities (long overlooked) will hopefully improve with the centre being built. More facilities, especially indoor pool / fitness centres and rinks are badly needed. While the court house and remand centre have added jobs in the area, the people attracted to this area wander aimlessly around on day passes as they reintegrate into our community and this has increased the feeling of being unsafe as we walk in our neighborhoods.
278. In general I am satisfied. Grade 5 active pass (Great) not so many pools for little kids.
279. Increase senior facilities - baby boomers are on the rise!!!
280. Increasing rates for adult/senior swimming but taking away activities from seniors. Also the fitness room could be enlarged or relocated to a new room & machines are not maintained properly.
281. Industrial and commercial tax rate payers bear an excessive share of the costs for these facilities. The tax burden needs to be shifted to residential taxpayers to more closely reflect the linkage between users and payers of these services. Industrial does not use those services, yet must pay for most of it.
282. It is not safe to have public swim at the same time as lessons.
283. It is time to have a museum in Port Coquitlam to preserve the history for future generations.
284. It is time to stop ignoring the condition of Centennial Pool & its change facilities. Rebuild or vastly renovate.
285. It is vital that we maintain access to the rivers. We must keep the shoreline for the public as it has been along the by-pass between Shaughnessy and the Pub. However the pub & a few other buildings block access & make it so only a few people with money can enjoy the shoreline.
286. It would be nice if there were some more beaches with picnic tables.
287. It would be nice to have a lawn bowling facility in Port Coquitlam.
288. It would be very useful for all ages to have a public computer lab in the area.
289. I've noticed many improvements with playing fields and children's' playgrounds -- some things for us all to be proud of. We'd appreciate washrooms being opened. I've had to leave Lions Park several times because they were shut.
290. Keep our green space safe!
291. Keep Port Coquitlam green.
292. Keep up the good work - enough is never enough for the better living of Port Coquitlam residents.
293. Keep up the good work, and let's try to improve what we have.
294. Keep up the good work.

*Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey*

295. Lack of security at kids parks, wooded trails & skateboard parks. Children are at risk to predators. If a child has no cell phone or change for a pay phone, no one is around to help in crisis situations.
296. Lack of sidewalks or designated shoulder for bikes, walkers, etc. Enforce the off-leash policy.
297. Leave the 2 large ponds at the northwest corner of Carnoustie as is! Any disturbance to the area for trails/paths will destroy the animal life there.
298. Like to see a water park at Lion's Park.
299. Lincoln Park - a beautiful area please keep it that way & monitor neighborhoods. Good Luck!
300. Lions Park and the pathway along the Coquitlam River is full of crackheads and low lifes - get rid of them. That includes the tent cities on the river and the people sleeping under the Kingsway Bridge.
301. Love Hyde Creek Park and the development of the fish hatchery. It's too bad that some people choose to throw trash into the creek.
302. Love Lions Park & Leigh Station & the music events & parades. Great job decorating in the fall and Christmas - love all the flowers in all seasons. Thanks for making Port Coquitlam a blessing to live in.
303. Love Lions Park! Great trails for walking / bike riding. Need off leash area.
304. Love Mayday festivities. Friendly & helpful staff. Hyde Creek facility is great. Love our community. Hate Port Coquitlam traffic - Shaughnessy St. (especially on Saturdays).
305. Love Port Coquitlam Trail!
306. Love the Port Coquitlam trail. Appreciate multitude of parks - after living in Surrey for 28 years this city is heaven.
307. Love the quality of the swimming lessons. I am frustrated by the lack of spots available during summer swim lesson sessions - sometimes we cannot get registered. We request more spots be opened -- swimming is a mandatory skill.
308. Maintain our green space in order to preserve the city's image of a wonderful place to live!
309. Maintenance of parks is as important as new ones. It seems to me that some of the smaller parks in Port Coquitlam are not as well maintained as the larger ones. Those in lower income areas or those that are not quite as busy seem to be missed.
310. Minnekhada Sports Field need to be addressed.
311. More bike and pedestrian routes.
312. More funding to upgrade or build more cultural, arts & craft and rec / fitness facilities for the increasing number of baby boomers who are approaching retirement.
313. More info given ie: support for people with disabilities.
314. More money for police, better roads & sidewalks are needed. Less for extras like parks and recreation. Let "user pay" be the direction for these non essentials and keep our taxes down.
315. More outdoor music events. Rec. facilities should be more user friendly to people with mental health issues. Even half price is expensive on a limited income.
316. More penalties for dogs pooping all over the parks and sidewalks. Increase safety of personal belongings at Hyde Creek Pool.
317. More sports fields needed on the south side. Quality of fields at schools (elementary) is extremely poor.
318. More spray parks with rubber floors.
319. More stop signs or speed bumps and larger speed limit signage for parks, schools and trails on or near busy roads please.
320. More water spray parks on the north side of Port Coquitlam.
321. Most of these questions do not apply to me. I am nearly 80 and don't participate in outdoor activities.
322. Motivate cultural understanding between different cultures. Provide free transport for seniors to rec centres. Promote equal opportunities for all ethnic groups. Celebrate all cultural celebrations at the Recreation Club. Promote juniors to respect seniors. Send newsletters to community and request regular input and feedback.
323. Need better drainage on sport fields - rubberized track - upgrade all playgrounds - better quality of grass - resurface all trails - more urban trails through the city. Ask Engineering Dept. to build more sidewalks to get to the parks.
324. Need lacrosse box on Ulster St on the north side. This parking lot should be paved.
325. Need more programs for people with disabilities.

*Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey*

326. Need to invest in better soccer fields.
327. North side needs a library and Terry Fox needs upgrading in facilities and materials.
328. Not impressed with the fact that a used drug needle was in a children's playground (Aggie Park). Children's play areas should be cleaned up really well and really often so this doesn't happen.
329. Number of spray parks much fewer than other communities. New playground needed at Evergreen Park.
330. One of the greatest assets Port Coquitlam has is the PoCo trail. Please keep Colony Farm as is. Please stand up to the native infraction and blockage of the trail. More basketball courts. Off lease dog areas - Port Moody has a wonderful one at Buntzen Lake - it would be great if Port Coquitlam had something similar. Great concern for all the apartments being built downtown - will the infrastructure support that number of people?
331. Other than the rec centre there are no indoor facilities on the south side. The rec centre needs to be expanded by 2 rinks and have an indoor pool & workout facility, for a complete athletic centre. Gates Park was not built properly- it should be a 4 diamond complex with a central concession & meeting area.
332. Our family has greatly enjoyed the parks & rec for years and really look forward to the positive changes in the coming years that will enhance all the many reasons we call Port Coquitlam home.
333. Our family participates in the local youth soccer association however, we have found it very frustrating with the number of cancelled games due to the city closing the pitches because of water logged fields. Other local communities do not appear to cancel as many. More family changing rooms at Hyde Creek swimming pool. It is not uncommon to wait 15 minutes for a room.
334. Outdoor sport fields could use better upkeep. Include school fields for after hours use and maintain. More pedestrian and bike trails will be needed. Field use for practices could be more organized so that more than one team is not trying to use the field at the same time.
335. Overall - great job.
336. Overall I am very satisfied on with the ongoing improvements to our city. You have made some nice changes to Port Coquitlam. Keep up the good work!!!
337. Overall satisfied with these services. I think it is important to focus on our youth & senior programs. I am a runner and would love to run on trails but feel unsafe to do so. I have always been impressed with the great customer services (friendly employees).
338. Parks and rec facilities - we very much appreciate. Some children's play areas have been improved while other still need care. Overall a big thank you.
339. Parks are good but we can always use more off leash areas. Could use more clean ups on parks, trails and creeks.
340. Parks should be patrolled more. Vandalism is destroying everything.
341. Personal safety on the PoCo trail is of great importance to me and my family.
342. Please address the overgrown "jungle" on the Brown St. Cul-de-sac side of the works yard - it is an eyesore. As well maybe do a little more to prevent the constant drinking and drug use at all hours within the cul-de-sac around the Cat and Fiddle pub expansion. Otherwise Port Coquitlam is a very well run community and a pleasure to be a part of - nice to see our tax dollars at work.
343. Please do not change the ice times for the Monday night Port Coquitlam oldtimers hockey. The league has been there a very long time and remember each of us are taxpayers. If new groups want ice time there is plenty available during weekdays or build more complexes.
344. Please do something about the drug problems in the Pitt River & Shaughnessy area.
345. Please keep the community clean, healthy and balanced.
346. Please keep the trails for horseback riding too. The PoCo trail is wonderful. Keep horses in mind when creating the new Pitt Meadows bridge so everyone can access the awesome trails network we have here in Tri-Cities and Maple Ridge.
347. Please keep up the good work for the next 4 years.
348. Please protect our trees. We need more off leash areas.
349. Please put a dog off leash area at Lions Park or Castle Park. Dogs need to run, play and socialize with one another. I don't feel safe at Lions Park. To many grubbies, etc.
350. Please try at least off leash dog times on the north dyke & Victoria Drive. Then people can choose to have / be around dogs or not.
351. Port Coquitlam continues to be a great place to live and raise a family. The PoCo trail is well maintained and a great benefit to the city. Between the Rec Centre, Hyde Creek Centre and the schools, I think we have enough tracks, courts & fields.

*Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey*

352. Port Coquitlam could partner up with corporations to make some programs other than sports or cultural avenues for kids. I.e: computer centre, technical centre for learning how to do life skills for technical training so they keep out of trouble and excel in life.
353. Port Coquitlam facilities for Port Coquitlam residents. Sports Complex that could attract competitive sports to Port Coquitlam.
354. Port Coquitlam is a fine place to live. Terry Fox Library quality of books is dreadful & the selection of authors is pretty poor. It would be simple to compare with other libraries for the various categories even Port Moody puts us to shame.
355. Port Coquitlam is a great place to live!
356. Port Coquitlam is a great place to live. A little more improvement and we're good to go!
357. Port Coquitlam is great place to live!
358. Port Coquitlam is in desperate need of additional ice surfaces. A state of the art facility would attract additional tournaments, trade shows, etc.
359. Port Coquitlam is in desperate need of off leash dog parks. I drive to Coquitlam and Port Moody to use these facilities. While in these communities we do spend money which I would prefer to spend in Port Coquitlam.
360. Port Coquitlam needs a spray park on the south side.
361. Port Coquitlam should have a water park & basketball courts at the park.
362. Port Coquitlam staff do a good job of keeping Port Coquitlam clean. More garbage cans are needed. Virtually all visible garbage is junk food packages. Tax McDonald's, Burger King, etc. Our local homeless people are doing a service by recycling bottles and cans. Utilize these people to top up welfare.
363. Port Coquitlam has a fantastic trail network - only problem is the links in between them. They need to link the trails better in spots i.e: not have to go off onto Mary Hill bypass to get back onto trail at Kingsway. More ice available so our kids don't have to use Planet Ice or Pitt Meadows for practice times. Better transportation links from south side to the north side.
364. Port Coquitlam has a large number of dogs. If there were more off-leash areas to go to people wouldn't be as inclined to allow their dogs off leash in leashed areas & trails. I have to travel to Port Moody or Coquitlam to properly exercise & socialize my dogs. These off-leash areas make for more responsible owners and better behaved dogs.
365. Port Coquitlam has done a good job planning to make the community a safe and pleasant place. The new Arts Centre is going to be a great asset. The downtown streets need a daily check to keep debris from distracting customers / tourists from otherwise neat & attractive city.
366. Port Coquitlam is getting there but it's a slow process as far as the arts & senior facilities are concerned. Compare Coquitlam or Port Moody. Programs at these facilities indicate that seniors have a mind/brain & don't want only exercise and crafts.
367. Port Coquitlam is one of the most beautiful cities to live in due to its small city environment, community and green space. I feel very fortunate to be a part of it all.
368. Port Coquitlam is very unique community in the lower mainland and we need to maintain status quo, if this means raising taxes to do so, do so. Port Coquitlam is growing with it's park/rec and culture as it is so do not attempt to grow too fast and ruin what space we have left. Please maintain as much green space as possible.
369. Post a specific fine for not picking up doggie litter - in tall grass also. In Castle Park - dog litter bags / dispenser at entrance to park from Mary Hill cross over walk.
370. Price for residents. Collaborate with the school board on shared facilities. Higher price for non-residents.
371. Productivity is very low in existing system. Co-ordination of equipment, too many employees on site (one working - two watching). Some of this work should be contracted out.
372. Rec Services - I think that more toddlers or preschoolers programs are needed and also to extend the time schedule. Indoor Swimming Pool - due to lessons, water is too dirty. I support that you should give some time to clean up and then continue swimming. Ice Lessons - many people do not register due to lack of promotion.
373. Recreation programs should be subject to public input. Make space on your website for comments or suggestions or if new parks and rec buildings develop some form of a suggestion box format. Usage would improve. This includes input on hours - not all people over 50 in senior's programs can go in early afternoon or in morning sessions. If this survey also included heritage, let's keep our focus on arts village as well and heritages' unique needs.
374. Senior Centre for Wilson needs more space for programs. Inadequate storage space for special events.
375. Senior Centre put up all the prices in lunch room. No other senior centre charges .60 for coffee. We are also charge .50 for drop in bridge, every other centre is .25.
376. Senior fees escalating. Community track & field facilities barely exist and are poor quality. Coquitlam has 3 rubber tracks - New West has 1 and same population. The city does not mention track & field in this survey which says volumes about its priority in this area.
377. Seniors have left because of prices of food and bus trips.

*Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey*

378. Settlers Park needs maintenance as the pump in the pond should be working, it needs power washing, benches, etc... Garbage removal is poor -- always overflowing. Lions Park has the potential to be amazing but drug problem and homeless people are an issue. Castle Park has drainage problems.
379. So far we have enough parks but the way housing is going we might need more. Lion's Park should have better access to the river.
380. Soccer fields really need improvements; Aggies and Minnakhada especially. The players are challenged with holes and bad grass patches.
381. Some parks / playgrounds geared towards children need some major upgrades to improve safety. I have witnessed youth completing drug exchanges at these areas. I was with my 3 year old son at the time.
382. Something must be done to increase public safety in the city, particularly Hyde Creek Recreation Centre and the ice rink. Employees need to feel safe at their workplace.
383. Sorry to see fees on public swimming increasing.
384. South Port Coquitlam is lacking rec activity - no theatre - no spray park - no indoor pool. We need more on this side.
385. Sponsor park & trail clean ups - trails are a mess.
386. Sport fields are in poor condition. Too many hands in the cookie jar. Dist. 43, parks & rec, sport organizations. Someone must make choices - too much fighting between all of these guys.
387. Sport registration is already overpriced considering coaches & assistants aren't paid & parents have to fundraise on top of the registration fees.
388. Survey is a good start. Votes should be held before large projects are approved. Council should focus on essentials first.
389. Take advantage of the great recreational draws that Coquitlam and Pitt Rivers are and promote that throughout the area, this will draw in people who will spend money in our community. We must be vigilant when it comes to enforcing our "off-leash" policy. Many people avoid the dyke trail for fear of being confronted by off-leash dogs.
390. Terry Fox library needs to carry more resources/books. I often have to place holds or request books from other libraries to fill my needs.
391. Terry Fox theatre is great but we could use a larger venue - perhaps something like the Evergreen Centre. Additional space for artistic display.
392. Thanks for the good work!
393. The city is well run - the facilities are moderate because population increases. The school district is good. Crime in Port Coquitlam is happening in moderation compared to other places. People in Port Coquitlam are good volunteers because the city appreciates them.
394. The city's website should be kept up to date ie: job postings for the year 2005 are still on the website.
395. The garbage seen on the PoCo Trail between the old red bridge and Gates Park is terrible. Also human excrement is seen frequently in this area.
396. The green space and public parks were a large reason for us to move to Port Coquitlam with our young family over 20 years ago. We still enjoy them a great deal and feel that they should be enhanced & kept safe for future families. Looking forward to the new cultural centre and for an increased cultural/artistic side to our city. It should integrate well with the rejuvenation of the downtown core. I feel that it is important to maintain and keep the rec facilities with programs and upgrades that serve all ages. We need to keep these facilities updated for not just seniors, but everyone.
397. The green space is nice and enjoyable.
398. The Hyde Creek swimming pool is poorly maintained. Changing room doors are broken and not replaced immediately, swimming instructors not always replaced, nobody to take the class. Wilson Centre is too small for the number of memberships. Heating and air conditioning does not work properly.
399. The library needs to expand in regards to size & better selection of books and DVD's.
400. The Lougheed Highway is a real barricade to access in Port Coquitlam. I would like to see an indoor pool on the south side of town by the ice rink & library. Facilities should have easy access by public transit.
401. The new fish seats on McAllister are excellent. We have just moved to Port Coquitlam. One reason for moving here was it's a small town atmosphere. Please don't over build the condos.
402. The old works yard on Kingsway & Kelly should be a site of Terry Fox Memorial Arena - 700 seats w/ walkway to Hawthorne Lodge and arts centre. The city owns the land - never mind any more leaky condos. Let's build an arena facility we can all be proud of. There is plenty of land on the northside for tax base residential.
403. The only area that really needs improvement is the swimming pool but, the staff are great.
404. The only good dog park is up at Bunter Lake there should be more set up in town that are just as good or better.
405. The parks we have should be maintained to a higher standard. More is not better if not maintained.

*Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey*

406. The Port Coquitlam landscaping crew is amazing! Especially James and his crew. We are so lucky to have people like him taking care of the gardens of our city. They make us proud to live here.
407. The present mayor and council are doing a great job. At last I feel that progress is in keeping with the century we are living in.
408. The recreation facility we have at Hyde Creek is great it's just not enough to satisfy the needs of all of our growing Port Coquitlam residents.
409. The school playground and field are in dire need of care. Many children have twisted their ankles because of the field condition. The bark mulch in the playground is not kept up to code - so it seems - because many children have fallen and broken their wrists and arms. The school is Castle Park Elementary. We pay plenty of taxes and I think up keep to the kids field and playground is a must!!!
410. The seat in the Elk's Park needs its approaches seeded to tough grass.
411. The south side is very poorly serviced with facilities. The parks on the south side are barren & boring with nothing for teens to do. I would especially like a weight lifting area close enough for my son to walk to or take a bus. I was unhappy paying for private swim lessons at Hyde Creek Pool for my disabled child as the space set aside was about 2 body lengths and was constantly over-run by others. Charging for this seemed fraudulent.
412. The staff & programs at Hyde Creek are great. The variety & quality of sports & fitness programs in the city are also great.
413. The staff at Hyde Creek are having to deal with registrations & drop in at the same time. Too slow. Nice people though. The playing fields are not kept well.
414. The Terry Fox Library is in desperate need of an upgrade and expansion. Storage and office space is minimal and a larger area is needed for more shelving and programs. If the meeting room space could be turned over to the library then Port Coquitlam could renovate and have the top notch library it deserves. Right now programs have to be registered and limited due to space constraints - at the same time that our population is growing. Let's make this a great place to hang out and support literacy. Why are there no rec facilities in the Citadel area?
415. The tri-cities should be working co-operatively to plan a large centrally located facility/cultural centre including a large theatre that can handle events that currently cannot be held here.
416. There are no upgraded parks where we are - no parks in walking distance except one that is not very safe for young children. (Mary Hill bypass & Pitt River Road)
417. There is not enough for teens to do, and having them hang around in groups makes others uncomfortable when they have to walk through. Don't feel it is safe to walk the paths after 8 pm unless well lit.
418. There should be concession stands at Lions Park.
419. There should be more locker space for storing personal belongings at the indoor swimming pools with the increase in number of people using the pools at the rec centre. Also the broken locks need to be changed. Also need more change rooms with showers - always a long wait for a change room after swimming especially difficult for those with special needs children.
420. Too many condo's & apartments built in Port Coquitlam. We used to have more than enough parks & rec centres, but with fast building going on around us. We fear there will not be enough parks & rec centres for the expansion of housing & population growth.
421. Traffic control will make or break this city.
422. Trail around Hazel Trembath School is very well maintained. However the pond needs to be cleaned more regularly. We need to have a spring clean up day like they have in Coquitlam to get rid of large items once a year. Especially since we are limited with the new garbage system.
423. Trails need to be patrolled to reduce teenagers drinking and vandalism. Also crack addicts have moved from the south side to the north.
424. Very satisfied with all parks & rec services. Only complaint is on holidays when we are all home and available to go to the pool or library they are often closed.
425. Very satisfied with all services provided in Port Coquitlam. I would like to see more activities planned for afternoons at the rec centre.
426. Volleyball nets - I would love to play volleyball here in Port Coquitlam.
427. Washrooms need to be accessible at outdoor facilities. Need to have someone check the condition of the washrooms at least once a day. Need to have Hyde Creek expanded as population of Port Coquitlam has increased. Need to ensure that there are "poop" bags available. Gates Park needs more lighting especially behind the turf field so that runners are not intimidated when it's dark.
428. We are doing lots of really good things in our community but we are growing quickly and we are not keeping up. The north side needs lights at the fields for soccer, field hockey & field lacrosse.
429. We are not using any parks or rec. facilities. No time for that. These are already expensive enough.

*Port Coquitlam 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey*

430. We currently use the Coquitlam Aquatic Centre and Planet Ice as our facilities because of the type of efficiency of the facilities themselves. We also travel to Coquitlam for spray parks as I am not aware of one near me.
431. We don't use half of the sports facilities but we do play golf which we think is very important as all ages can play.
432. We have a 5 year old boy and most activities for his age group are only offered on the north side and the times are usually in the a.m. when he is in kindergarten. More activities offered @ Wilson & more p.m. times would be beneficial for us.
433. We have a concern about parks & recreation vandalism. I think a program to involve the public would be a good idea. Most facilities love homes around them and maybe a "hot-line" could be set up for people to call whenever they see activities that cause damage to the parks or facilities.
434. We have a outstanding system of trails. Is a map of them available for people new to the area?
435. We have enough of them in our city.
436. We have many parks in Port Coquitlam but we need to add more equipment / activities. We have lots of space - kids need more choices ie: slides, hanging tire swings, etc.
437. We have recently moved to this area and are amazed at all of the wonderful trails and greenspace! My family uses the Hyde Creek Centre on a regular basis and we are very pleased with that facility.
438. We have some beautiful trails & parks but many people I know are becoming extremely concerned about feeling safe. Between the homeless, the gangs of youths, drug dealers and users, prostitution and harassment all adding to the picture of fearfulness - something needs to be done.
439. We have to protect the people who are targets ie: seniors & disabled in our parks and facilities.
440. We just moved in and have very little knowledge about this area.
441. We live close to Citadel Park and I notice that it needs improvement. The playground especially - the swing and slide. The park itself is very nice but the playground looks old.
442. We love the dykes & Colony Farm and walking trails and we could use more off leash areas. An outdoor and indoor pool for the south side is needed badly and fitness centre. A complex like Hyde Creek is needed on the south side.
443. We love the PoCo Trail!
444. We need a library update! Terry Fox Library is too small for Port Coquitlam.
445. We need activities and centres to encourage kids to do something more than hang around the 7-11.
446. We need an indoor pool /exercise centre on the south side, Maintenance on lacrosse boxes is lacking. Rowland box is in terrible shape.
447. We need more ice. The fields need maintaining especially in the spring when the grass grows fast.
448. We need more swimming pools.
449. We need off-leash parks. Like to be able to access ball fields for slow-pitch softball leagues.
450. We register our children to play hockey in Port Coquitlam and have to drive them to Pitt Meadows & Coquitlam to get ice time. I would also like to play adult hockey in Port Coquitlam. Our hockey program is very weak due to the lack of ice times we receive compared to other associations. We need hockey rinks not just an ice surface. A private smaller set of rinks for 3 on 3 hockey should also be considered.
451. We would like to see improvements on road between Dominion and Riverside Drive. Improve area close to farm (Pickton), more parks and residents in this area. Arts and music centre for children.
452. Weight room facility - too small and crowded. Road too beat up to roller blade. Other than Mayday no other family activities.
453. When I moved to Port Coquitlam 18 years ago the north side felt like a safe neighborhood. Cooper, Prairie St. area is a real eye sore & way too many drug houses in our area!
454. When it comes to dyke trails, please look at what the city of Richmond has done & what we have in Port Coquitlam.
455. When we moved here 7 years ago we were not expecting the kind of community & caring that has been put into the city of Port Coquitlam. Great job!!!
456. Why do taxpayers have to pay for the buildings, then pay to use the facility, then are nickel and dimed over technicalities like lockers, etc!
457. Why do we have only one indoor swimming pool? Why do we have two ice rinks in the rec centre where there is a seniors centre and no pool? An indoor pool would benefit the seniors in health & fitness and not so much emphasis put on making pottery?

**Port Coquitlam** 2006 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Survey

- 458. Wilson Centre (senior) should have its own direct entrance. Walking around thru rec centre is hard for some seniors with mobility problems. I would like to see a senior swim time at Hyde Creek Centre.
- 459. With the rapid expansion of Port Coquitlam the facilities will become overcrowded and utilization will stress maintenance of all facilities. Library must be expanded for students research for essay & studies - computer renewal program on-going. Expand & diversify youth program.
- 460. Would appreciate knowing what times the washrooms in parks/trails are open. Especially in cooler/wetter months. Could not the times be posted on doors or walls?
- 461. Would be nice to see some money spent on tar sealing in the back alleyways.
- 462. Would like more information available in newspaper or mail in regards to special events, recreational facility prices & hours & parks.
- 463. Would like to see more programs / activities for 3-6 year olds on weekends.
- 464. Would like to see more wheelchair accessible playgrounds.
- 465. Yes, if I'm going to have to pay for it, I don't need it!

# Appendices

**Appendix D**  
**Public Open House Comments**

>

P E R C

# CITY OF PORT COQUITLAM

## PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURE MASTER PLAN

### OPEN HOUSE COMMENTS – JANUARY 24, 2007

---

A Public Open House was scheduled on Wednesday, January 24, 2007 during which City staff and the consultants retained to undertake the preparation of the Parks, Recreation and Culture Master Plan were available to discuss the planning process and the various recommendations included in the draft report.

Open House participants were encouraged to complete a short Comment Form, and submit it to the consultants for consideration prior to the preparation of the final report. (A total of 75 people were estimated to have attended the event.)

The information collected is summarized below under the three headings included in the report: Mission and Vision for Parks and Recreation: Parks, Open Space and Trails: and Delivery of Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services. Participants were also encouraged to make general comments regarding parks, recreation and cultural services.

#### MISSION AND VISION FOR PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURE

- Vision does not go far enough in all aspects of Parks, Recreation and Culture as it doesn't include seniors and heritage wishes.
- Agree with adding culture into the name of the Department. We are rich in culture (heritage, arts). Couldn't find the Mission / Vision statements on the website. I only picked up the Executive Summary at the Open House and it was not included in the package.
- I value the heritage of Port Coquitlam and feel it is being forgotten with all the new construction. We need a museum. Let's keep what's left alive for future generations. Port Coquitlam is rich in history if you look for it.
- I miss the Port Moody Social Recreation Centre, with its many children and adult programs within walking distance. I'd like to see the Port Coquitlam Centre offer more diverse recreation opportunities.
- Managing existing parks and upgrades of existing infrastructure and parks is necessary to maintain interest by local user groups. Additions to existing facilities are necessary in some areas.
- We forgot our old Vision Statements when we allowed the banks of the Coquitlam River to be developed.
- Generally, the Mission and Vision are comprehensive and all-encompassing.

## RECREATION AND CULTURAL FACILITIES

- Please – a museum in the heart of Port Coquitlam.
- Disappointed that there are no plans for new ice in Port Coquitlam. Each year, we turn away numerous youth of Port Coquitlam due to the shortage of ice. It is disappointing that this has not been taken into consideration.
- Please develop the Library! I use it all the time – please look at the Port Moody Library and Pitt Meadows Libraries for inspiration! And ... please improve the trails through the downtown. They are an untapped attraction.
- I wish to express my concern and disappointment with the plan (or lack thereof) for ice rinks. As an active community user with 2 daughters (ages 8 and 9) participating in ringette and a third daughter (5) to join shortly, I can tell you first hand that the current level of allocated ice time is unacceptable. My girls are allocated on average 1 ice time per week. This is not a fixed ice time, but rather contains ice-times of 6-7 am and 5-5:45 pm (for the latter, the ice is not even cleaned) during weekdays. These times for 8 and 9 year olds are understandably only attended by about half the team as it is unreasonable at this age to place ringette or any other sport ahead of school. Compare this to ice-time allocations in Burnaby, Delta, Coquitlam and so on and you will note a large disparity. This disparity manifests itself in lower quality of play for the girls and certainly a lower level of participation due to the ice shortage. Parent groups are frustrated that they cannot have a fixed time practice as other communities are able to provide. This certainly does not promote Port Coquitlam as a healthy community, and I for one am very discouraged that this is not being addressed.

Look at a gym facility as part of the Port Coquitlam Complex. It would be well utilized by youth, adults and the retired seniors population. This multi-purpose facility can also be rented out for large meetings and social functions. People that retire in their 50's should have access to drop-in activities.

The Port Coquitlam complex is not only a facility with arenas, but it is a place where people gather and meet each other. Anything that can be done to encourage and foster this should be considered.

- I support additional amenities to the Port Coquitlam Recreation Complex. I believe it should be a multi-purpose facility. If an additional sheet of ice is being considered it should be full sheet to maximize all different kinds of use. A splash pool on the south side is a very good idea. Robert Hope Pool is a favourite spot for school aged children, as they can walk and ride their bikes. Centennial Pool is good, but it is not within a safe walking distance of the south side. One outdoor pool should be kept open.
- We need more ice. "Yes" to improve the Port Coquitlam Rec Centre. We need more facilities for the youth of the Mary Hill area. Busy, active kids stay out of trouble.
- Very opposed to closing Routley Park pool and Robert Hope pool. They are the only pools that target the area's age groups. Small children are safe and happy at Routley away from rougher big kids. There's nothing like swimming outside in the summer and my kids love having and attending birthday parties, meeting friends in summer. Those pools define Port Coquitlam and access to all financial groups. I can't take my kids to the expensive pool on the north side very often.

- I have just learned of the plans to de-commission Robert Hope pool and replace it with a water park. I am very upset at this plan.

I have lived in the Mary Hill area since 1988. My daughters were born in 1997, used Routley pool when they were very young. We have been using the pool for approximately 8 years. The girls are old enough to stay by themselves at the pool and enjoy it immensely. They have taken swim lessons at Robert Hope pool and learned to swim there. Going there on a summer day is fun for our whole family. Our neighbour also goes to Robert Hope pool on a hot summer day to cool off.

A water spray park would not help a child learn to swim or become a better swimmer. Be fun for a family with kids older than 5 years of age; or help relieve the heat for an older person. Water spray pools have a very limited attraction – only fun for children under 6 years old. Routley pool also has a very limited attraction and I can completely understand closing Routley.

I have seen teenagers of all ages having fun together playing/swimming in Robert Hope pool. It is a place for the local Mary Hill/Citadel/Central school families to meet up and chat. It is a vital asset to our South Side community for recreation in the summer.

Where will we go to swim in the summer? Centennial pool is too far way for my children, and I don't think I will feel like driving that far for a swim to cool off after dinner. Centennial Pool is also a bit deep for younger children to enjoy. Robert Hope pool is liked by all ages and adults.

Why should the North Side have 2 pools, even with the closure of Sun Valley pool? We, on the South Side need a summer time pool too. Please do not close Robert Hope pool. Bad idea. Save

- Please accept this letter as an expression of our objection to the City Council's high priority plan to close Routley and Robert Hope pools.

As a member of this community, we strongly disagree with this proposal. As a resident of south Port Coquitlam we are concerned about the negative impact the pool closures will have on the children and families in our community who regularly enjoy the benefits of these recreational facilities. In the summer, this is a wonderful gathering place for the families of Mary Hill. Our three boys are able to walk to Robert Hope pool with a sense of independence and safety in their neighbourhood. They meet up with friends and spend hours swimming and having fun. It would be a shame if other children were deprived of this same opportunity. Also noted, we would find it unlikely that children 8-13 would find the same appeal in a spray park. When we were young we also used Robert Hope pool.

In addition, it would be a shame to lose youth lifeguards, for summer employment, that these pools create. Promoting jobs, as well as choosing healthy activities for our youth, I would hope would be considered when making these kinds of long term decisions.

- I am writing to emphasize the importance of this small pool to folks on Mary Hill. The pool has been here for many years and no doubt will need some upgrading or repairs. However, this is normal for any park project and to talk about deleting the pool and putting in a water parks just doesn't make sense. Children cannot learn to swim in a water park. We regularly utilize the services provided in this park, but most especially the small pool, for our grandson. I cannot emphasize strongly enough the importance of retaining Routley Pool for many years to come. I trust Port Coquitlam will be able to find a way to utilize the service of the pool for many years to come.

- I would like to comment on some things that pertain to the Wilson Senior Centre and that we would like to be included in the Master Plan. Some of these problems are unacceptable. The facility is long overdue for some basic maintenance and an ongoing plan for the future growth of the community.
  - Lack of signage on the building that designates the centre as separate from the recreation centre.
  - Our area is fast becoming too small as the population of Port Coquitlam is getting older.
  - We need more room. Expansion could be made available by adding another floor or by adding on to the west side of the building into the parking lot. Another route would be to add a second floor to the library and move the Senior Centre there, and build a larger library (also needed). However it can be done, we need more room.
  - Water leakage from the roof needs repair.
  - Holes in the hallway and cafeteria.
  - Our kitchen is too small for the volume of work put out by our cook and volunteers.
  - The island counter in the kitchen needs to be moved which will entail putting down a new floor. The floor is the original and needs replacing.
  - Our dishwasher has been there since the kitchen was built and will need to be replaced in the near future.
  - Slide-out drawers for the cupboards are needed as it is hard for the seniors to get anything out of the bottom shelves.
  - Our kitchen sinks have been out of commission for over a month waiting for repairs.
- Though the draft report refers to the "Wilson Recreation Complex" it does not state or refer to the "Wilson Seniors Centre" and its needs, which are urgent and long overdue. The "Wilson Seniors Centre" is an integral part of the well being, cultural, and participation of all citizens fifty years of age and over. Those important citizens look to the "Wilson Seniors Centre" as a life line in their retiring years.

Page # 1, Section # 6.1.4, item # 5 of the report states to develop new fitness, youth, and multi-purpose space at the "PoCo Recreation Complex" – when are we going to discuss the long overdue specifics for the "Wilson Seniors Centre"? There are no signs indicating that this "complex" is also a "Wilson Seniors Centre".

I realize that the overall "complex" is housed in one structure, but there are two separate components, both to a large extent separate entities, independent from each other. For example, there is no mention of the area allocated to the "Wilson Centre Seniors Advisory Association" Executive and Board meetings. But as we meet in the Green Room the noise from those using the area above, the acoustics, and reverberation of the room is not conducive when discussing matters of importance to the "Wilson Seniors Centre" and its members. When the area is brought up to standard there should be a room suitable for such meetings. It would appear that further dialogue is necessary before final judgment is approved.

Where are the millions of dollars coming from and at what cost to the City, and the taxpayers? Will there be a debt overrun? What impact will this have on current and future tax bases? Will Port Coquitlam no longer be debt free? These questions require an answer. At what time and place will there be a public forum before Council approves this 2015 Plan?

- I find it disturbing that our history is not included in the Plan. I personally would like Port Coquitlam to save a 50s or 60s house from destruction - move it closer to the downtown core and let the Heritage Cultural Society use it for a museum that would be unique in the Tri Cities or BC.

- I am so excited about Leigh Square and the “Granvillesque” feel it will have. I hope it is a highly public outreach as it’s been described. I hope it attracts Commercial Drive-type talent.
- Update recreation facilities at the Port Coquitlam Recreation Centre with sports/athletic related facilities (fitness centre, small ice rink – ½ size for 3 on 3 hockey).
- Minor lacrosse would support a third sheet of ice at the arena. A recreational pond will not address turning children away from hockey, ringette and lacrosse. An additional sheet will make Port Coquitlam a tournament destination which will ultimately draw money to the entire community.
- Proceed with Phase Two renovations to the Terry Fox Library. There is a great need for a library on the north side – more development = more people. Also, more facilities for seniors.
- Washroom facility not in close proximity to tennis courts and no indication that these facilities exist. Often under lock-up.
- Upgrade tennis courts at Gates Park, particularly the large crack across three courts (may require more than re-surfacing since crack was there prior to last re-surfacing).
- Recreation facilities seem to outweigh cultural services.
- Seniors centre on the north side of town would be nice – maybe tucked in with Hyde Creek.
- There seems to be no mention of seniors in the discussion of facilities.
- Extremely disappointed in the low level of priority given to a new ice surface. The Mayor has been quoted on several occasions stating that we will have a new sheet in 2009. I will remember this come the next election.
- Providing a more open seniors facility that residents can see from the street. It is rather hidden. In 2015, adults that are filling out these forms will be seniors, and they will come with more expectations around what is, and can be different to the 50+ population.
- The Open House was in a very inappropriate area. People were coming with other business within City Hall, as well as people trying to obtain information and data on the draft report of the Parks, Recreation and Culture Plan. It ended up being very crowded; it is a small circular area and not really conducive to an information meeting.

Not one word for seniors. Very disappointing. With schools closing and apartments/condos being built, it seems that this would point to a demographic of more population of 50 years of age or older. The Wilson Centre is badly in need of upgrades and expansion. There is a demand for more of the courses that are currently offered, and new and diverse courses to for seniors.

Heritage is another topic I didn’t see addressed. Heritage should be a basic pride for the City. I think that this topic should be given space within the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Plan.

## **PARKS, OPEN SPACE AND TRAILS**

- Nice to see upgrades at Lions Park. It's been doing a good job for the citizens for many years. It's such an open and inviting park for everyone.
- Security is a concern in regards to the homeless and derelict people in parks and on trails.
- Think of an all-season softball diamond. Some fields are well utilized but cannot be used in the rain. All ages use the parks at all times of the day.
- Provide an off-leash dog area in the Citadel Heights area. Many owners and their dogs are currently using the lower portion of Castle Park. This park is well used by the neighbourhood. If you are going to create a picnic area in Castle Park, consider a bandshell or seating area that can be used for events like Canada Day or performances in the park.
- With the loss of single family housing and green space, and the apparent ease that developers have in reducing already too narrow riparian set-backs, it is even more important that green spaces be protected. A city is not known for its buildings or high density but for its parks. We should develop active parks, but even more important, we must set aside natural areas with connecting corridors. A healthy and prosperous community depends on a healthy and sustainable natural environment. Once again, natural areas are given a low priority whereas they should be at the top. Port Coquitlam should not just talk about protection, but must act.
- The need for youth baseball is to significantly upgrade old City and School baseball diamonds. With no new space available, a commitment to significant upgrades is mandatory. The School District must be involved with maintaining and upgrading baseball fields. Currently, the City does some, and other fields are not maintained at all.
- Finish off the Pitt River Road project. Complete the sidewalk on the east side of Pitt River Road, all the way to the Mary Hill By-Pass. The kids need a safe walking and cycling space (a sidewalk) to get to and from their schools – to bus stops – and a safe, complete sidewalk so the residents of the Mary Hill area can walk without fear for their children and pets.

Lions Park has the river. "No" to the water park being located there.

"Yes" to a water park located at Robert Hope Pool, up Mary Hill. Robert Hope Pool has been sadly neglected for many, many years. There is a big chunk of land beside the pool that is not being utilized. Let's try and keep the car traffic out of the downtown core. We need to locate recreation in areas where people live, so they can leave their cars at home.

Castle Park needs more trees. We have this big, big park that's not kid friendly. There is no shade. Every year on Canada Day we have many families coming out to enjoy the day – only to bake in the sun. The large field can't be used for organized sport because of the grade of the slope. Why not a non-profit, organized Memorial Garden and a Community Garden that encourages seniors and local schools to participate in various activities. As we all know, water restrictions are a fact of life in this area so let's educate and participate.

Please try to consider Mary Hill in your plans for the future. I feel this “old” established neighbourhood has been over-shadowed by the Downtown Core Revitalization and the Northside Area/Recreation. We don’t begrudge these other facilities, but I believe it’s our turn to get some tax money spent in our neighbourhood.

- Off leash dog areas are long overdue. Trails are beautiful and well utilized. A motorized boat ramp would fill a large need abdicated by Port Moody, but of course that would be a different group since it would be Pitt Lake more than the ocean.
- I have young children, and we’ve been coming to Port Coquitlam and the Bowling Lanes for years, along with other Tri City families. Can we have a water park, stairs down to the river area, hot dog vendors along the trail? Provide a small play area at Gates Park. Will the splash park improve safety and not disturb the mature trees?
- Continued development of existing trails/facilities and parks. More water parks (Castle Park?). Improvement in outdoor athletic facilities such as Thompson Park (baseball) and fields across from Hyde Creek Park (for track and field or soccer).
- In addition to repairs at the athletic field, Minor Lacrosse would like the City to consider the following: existing fields at Pitt River require fairly inexpensive fending and “lining” to make this a viable sports field for the community.

#### **DELIVERY OF PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURE SERVICES**

- A single-use museum demonstrates a certain maturity in a City. It is a tourism draw. Right now tourists come here and ask to see the Pickton Farm. It’s nice to be able to point out the Terry Fox display to counter our “fame”.
- Fully support a community development approach as a city cannot provide all services. By building community capacity everyone gains. Satellite youth programs in the neighbourhoods that could feed into the youth centre. Youth walk the streets in their neighbourhoods – provide a destination place. Quite often they don’t have transportation to get to the youth centre. You can work with the local schools to offer drop-ins, councils and gym activities.
- I like Port Coquitlam’s call in the paper to involve the public in its cultural development (I’ve applied to be a member of the “Friends of Leigh Square”). Please continue to be an “inclusive” regulating body.
- Services must be acceptable and easy to obtain. Expense increase in order to provide better service is anticipated and required (user fees/fees).

#### **OTHER COMMENTS**

- The nature of Port Coquitlam is totally changing from small-town to bedroom community. Destruction of all the old single family heritage buildings to make way for apartment buildings changes us forever. The inhabitants of apartments do not look on them as their permanent home. They think of it as a temporary stepping stone to somewhere else. The community suffers as a result.

- Where does the City provide free parking for longer than two hours? To park near City Hall today was a challenge, and it was an average day.
- Everything had been going along beautifully until Port Coquitlam allowed inappropriate development next to the Coquitlam River – too bad!
- The City should be looking at curbing, reducing or eliminating user fees for youth. Coquitlam has done this already.

## **LETTERS OF CONCERN REGARDING ROUTLEY AND ROBERT HOPE POOLS**

A number of letters were received from residents in response to the following request regarding Routley and Robert Hope pools.

As a concerned parent of the community, I would like to inform the parents and children of south Port Coquitlam of the proposed plan to close both Routley and Robert Hope pools. If anyone is interested in objecting to this proposal or finding out more information I have attached a form letter. In order to get your objections heard promptly this letter can be returned to your school or be gathered and hand delivered to City Hall to help save our pools. If you are interested in filling out the form letter provided please return it as soon as possible as I would like to deliver them on Monday, February 19<sup>th</sup>, 2007.

### **Response Letters**

This letter is meant to express my objection at City Council's high priority to close Routley and Robert Hope pools. As a member of the community, I strongly object to this proposal. As a resident of south Port Coquitlam I am concerned about the negative impact the pool closures will have on the children and families in our community who regularly enjoy the benefits of these recreational facilities. **(256 copies of the letter were received by Friday, February 25<sup>th</sup>, 2007)**