Agenda:

1. Inter River Park: South Sports Field Feasibility & Conceptual Design
2. Kirkstone Park ATF Conversion
3. District Wide Sports Field Strategy
In addition:
4. Lynn Valley Trail Loop Proposal

Presented by:

Susan Rogers, Parks Manager
Catherine Eiswerth, Project Manager, Binnie & Associates
ATF/Sportsfield Demand

- Increasing demand for more playing fields in the District
- District limited to accommodate full sized tournament sportsfields
- ATF’s provide 3-4 times more playable hours than grass sportsfields
- Playable in wet weather and no recovery time from use

Stakeholder Process to date:

- Sportsfield User Group Meeting - October 2015
- Sports Advisory Presentation - November 2015
- District Council Workshop - January 2016
- Parks Advisory Committee - January 2016
- Sportsfield User Meeting - July 2016
- Sport Council - September 2016
- PNEAC - September 2016
- Council Workshop – October 24, 2016
Project Background

Site History

- Waste Landfill - 1956 to 1988
- Field 1 Opened 1988
- Soil Disposal 1990 Present
- Fields 2, 3 Opened mid 1990’s
- Master Plan approved 1995
- Fields 4, 5, 6 - Opened 2005
- Fields 7, 8 - Opened 2009

8 = Field Number
Why is upgrading being considered?

- Existing field is uneven with poor drainage
- Total rebuild required

Why an artificial turf field?

- One multi-use ATF is equal to 4 to 6 grass fields
- Strengthen Inter River Park’s role as a tournament center
- Pressure taken off District’s other grass fields
- Potential increase in bookable hours from 147 hrs. (2015) to 2600 hrs.
Artificial Turf Field Concepts

1 Field + Warm-up Option

1) Existing parking
2) Proposed parking areas (79) (74 ninety degree, 5 parallel)
3) Existing bike skills facility
4) Proposed drop-off area
5) Proposed field lights
6) Existing field building / washrooms
7) Existing sedimentation pond
8) Existing trail entrance
9) Existing trees preserved
10) Spectator area
11) Bus parking stalls (2)
12) Service vehicle access
13) Bike skills park drop-off area
14) Parking and event staging area
15) Future sport court (by others)
16) Emergency access
17) Future park operations area
Artificial Turf Field Concepts

2 Field Option

1) Existing parking
2) Proposed parking areas (ninety degree)
3) Existing trail entrance
4) Existing sedimentation pond
5) Service vehicle access
6) Existing trees preserved
7) Parking and event staging area
Environmental Overview

- Existing disturbed portion of riparian setback
- 30m Lynn Creek Riparian Setback Line
- New sports field location
- Boundary of existing grass field
- Lower treed area (some wetland with stormwater and habitat enhancement potential)
- Boundary of forested area
Natural Grass Field Concept

1) Existing parking
2) Proposed parking areas (ninety degree)
3) Existing bike skills facility
4) Existing field building/washrooms
5) Future sport court (by others)
6) Existing sedimentation pond
7) Existing trail entrance
8) Existing trees preserved
9) Service vehicle access
10) Bike skills park drop-off area
11) Parking and event staging area
# Implications of ATF Options

## Relative Implication of Design Options – 2 ATF Fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>No Impact (or Benefit)</th>
<th>Some Impact</th>
<th>High Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tree/Habitat Loss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian Encroachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preload Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. Utility Relocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraordinary Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Maintenance Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Demand Met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Field Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Relative Implication of Design Options – 1 Field + Warm-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>No Impact (or Benefit)</th>
<th>Some Impact</th>
<th>High Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tree/Habitat Loss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian Encroachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preload Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. Utility Relocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraordinary Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Maintenance Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Demand Met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Implications of ATF vs Grass Options

### Relative Implication of Design Options – Natural Grass Field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>No Impact (or Benefit)</th>
<th>Some Impact</th>
<th>High Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tree/Habitat Loss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian Encroachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preload Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. Utility Relocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraordinary Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Maintenance Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Demand Met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Relative Implication of Design Options – 1 Field + Warm-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>No Impact (or Benefit)</th>
<th>Some Impact</th>
<th>High Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tree/Habitat Loss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian Encroachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preload Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. Utility Relocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraordinary Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Maintenance Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Demand Met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Class D” Cost Estimates

Site development costs (ATF Field plus associated infrastructure upgrades)

- One field plus warm-up area option:
  $5.0 - 5.9 million

- Two field option:
  $9.5 - 10.5 million

- Grass field option:
  $1.9 million
What is the environmental concern about artificial turf?

- Public/media concerns over ATF crumb rubber infill ('soil' portion)
- Ground car/truck tires used for ATF infill
- ATF fibres ('grass' portion) do not pose an elevated risk to health or environment
- Infill safety being studied by United States' EPA - report pending
- City of Vancouver no longer using crumb rubber - TPE, organic or EPDM infill

Are there options to crumb rubber?

- A number of infill options - TPE, EPDM, Organic, 100% Sand, etc.
- Other infills more costly than crumb rubber (+$150K to $300K per field)
Public Feedback

Main Comments Summarized

- Baseball prefers natural grass option due to impact of ATF on higher level ball
- More people support closing Premier Street than do not
- Concerns about increased traffic, noise, safety, speeding
- 1 field option preferred over 2 ATF option
- Concerns about deforestation/impact on environment
- Dog walkers are a major user group and hope project won’t impact them
Timeline

1. Feasibility Review and Concept Design
2. Public Information Session
3. Public Feedback Period
4. We are here
   - Sports Council Council Workshop Parks Committee
   - Go or No Go
5. Spring 2017
   - Implementation (if Go) Detailed Design
6. Summer 2017
   - Tendering/Construction Site Preparation
7. 2018 and beyond
   - Field/Parking Construction
Recommendation

That Council direct staff to proceed with a 2017 Capital Budget request for site preparation for a 1 ATF field plus warm-up option at South Inter River Park.
Inter River Park - slope expansion project
Inter River Park
South Sports Field Feasibility and Conceptual Design

Comments and Questions
Thank You!
In 2016 DNV retained van der Zalm + Associates for feasibility review to convert DNV all-weather field to community-level ATF

DNV has shortage of soccer practice facilities for year round use.

All weather fields are generally underutilized.

Kirkstone AW Field has infrastructure required by an ATF. This reduces construction cost without affecting playability

- Existing field lighting
- Existing drainage

The all-weather field at Kirkstone has key infrastructure:

- Existing parking
- Existing washroom building
- Located on a bus route
- Next to Lynn Valley Growth Center
Gravel Field ATF Conversion: Kirkstone Park

- Increasing demand for more playing fields
- Low demand (bookings) for existing gravel fields
- Potential increase of bookable hrs from 700 - 2600 hrs. per year
- Limited park areas to expand with new field inventory
- Sites are dedicated, flat and have existing field lights
- Gravel conversions cost less than typical ATF fields as lighting exists; drainage is less costly and less fill is required.

Stakeholder Process:

- Sportsfield User Group Meeting - October 2015
- Sports Advisory Presentation - November 2015
- District Council Workshop - January 2016
- Parks Advisory Committee - January 2016
- Sportsfield User Meeting - July 2016
- Council Workshop - October 2016
Recommendation:

• Develop field 47M x 105M - marked for Super 8 and full-length field

• Field meet FIFA standard for play

• Field halved for simultaneous games in U6 - U10 leagues or broken down for youth practice games.

Cost Estimate:

Estimated Grand Total - $1,200,000.00

Preliminary Concept (VDZ & Associates May 2016)
Argyle Secondary School ATF

55m x 110m
**District Wide Strategy**

- **Inter River** (2017-2019)
- **Kirkstone** (2017)
- **Argyle** (2019-2020)
- **William Griffin**
- **Delbrook**
- **Myrtle**
- **Kilmer**
- **Fen Burdett-CNV** (2017)
- **Lynn Valley**
- **Kirkstone** (2017)
- **Inter River** (2017-2019)
- **Windsor**

Legend:
- 🌟 In planning or design phase
- ⭐ Existing or under construction
- 🌟 Future potential sites
Inter River Fieldhouse
## Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter River Park South Field (Option 1)</td>
<td>Detailed design &amp; site prep &amp; preloading 5 m – 5.9 m (Phase 1 – 1.5m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explore partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter River Fieldhouse (north)</td>
<td>Detailed design &amp; construction</td>
<td>1.6 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter River Fieldhouse (south)</td>
<td>Conceptual planning</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkstone ATF Field</td>
<td>Detailed design &amp; construction</td>
<td>1.2 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyle School</td>
<td>Continue exploration school with school/community</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All weather field conversion to ATF</td>
<td>Continue feasibility reviews</td>
<td>TBD Range 1.2 m per field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtle, Kilmer &amp; Delbrook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>