

November 30, 2021

To: PRRD Board Directors and staff

From: Director Goodings

TOR: Please read before the PRRD meeting on Thursday Dec. 2, 2021

## History/ background

1. The present PRRD NP Leisure pool has been operational since 1996 and we are all aware that it will need to be replaced sooner rather than later. Most of the issues at the present site are a combination as a result of failed referendums and the location. The four areas were Area B; Area C; City of FSJ and the District of Taylor. Each area would determine, separately, through referendum, whether they wished to participate. When the referendum failed in Taylor, not once, but twice, it was proposed by the administration of the day that there should be a third referendum that would exclude the District of Taylor, keep the original price tag and make changes to bring the cost in line with that original price tag. Big mistake, right down to the change order from stainless steel bolts to ordinary bolts that are rusting. The location issues started with water under the facility (as I recall the facility wasn't even open yet) and it was determined that those issues were caused by not providing adequate drainage for the water that was draining from the roof of the facility and the adjoining arena. Also the location used to be very wet and that many recall this area to be a swamp. 1996 was a very wet year.
2. As the Area B director I was given the task of determining the benefitting area. So, while the bylaw read that all of Area B would be included the Province agreed with me that all residences that were more than 50 km from the facility were exempt while all of the industry in Area B was included. This created a Swiss cheese effect and each year had to be reviewed to make sure that the by-law was being correctly applied. That was when Fair Share was very new and if my memory serves me was increased from \$2,000,000 to \$4,000,000.

3. When the TOR were presented to the board I requested two changes. Those two changes were that 2.2(e) the Area B Director be able to determine the benefitting area and 2.2(f) that the Area B Director determine the assent process for Area B participation.
4. **The City of Fort St. John rejected my request and I want to point out that this would have been exactly the same process as was in place for the original referendum.** The only difference is that industry, who now support the PRA with their dollars,(in 2021 the PRA benefits to the region total \$52,020,000) will not be taxed.
5. It was and still is my belief that when I agree to proceed to referendum it is because it sends the message to Area B residents that I believe the project is vital to the area, is needed and I am supportive. I always appreciated then Chair, Ben Knutson, who insisted that this could not be just a lap pool but would need to be a facility that included a leisure pool that whole families could enjoy.

On Thursday, you will receive and discuss the report from staff with a recommendation to proceed.

I cannot support the TOR as they are presently stated. Please re-consider my request to change 2.2(e) and 2.2(f) so that we can move ahead with the planning needed. The PRRD board has the authority to do so. I look forward to a great discussion.