

TO: SCR D Board; cc MLA, MP, CAO, Shelley Gagnon
DATE: October 11, 2022

SUBJECT: URGENT: FOR OCTOBER 13TH SCR D BOARD MEETING - AGENDA ITEM:
COOPERS GREEN HALL - CONSTRUCTION UPDATE

We, the undersigned, have reviewed the report entitled COOPERS GREEN HALL REPLACEMENT PROJECT - CONSTRUCTION UPDATE, being received at the SCR D Board meeting of October 13, 2022. Our review has been performed very quickly over the Thanksgiving weekend, but we thought our response important enough to present as early as possible and in time for the Board meeting.

We recognize that the Staff are now in a difficult situation, looking to present a way forward that will see the hall built within a reasonable timeframe, retaining the ICIP grant and substantially achieving the original project objectives, all of this in light of a difficult technical challenge to the viability of the original site. However, we believe the original site should not be abandoned without further exploration of the true nature of the technical challenge. It has not been shown that there is an unacceptably high risk of inundation within the lifespan of the building.

Addressing the direction requested in the Report: We are in Agreement with Option A. However, we have numerous observations about the work so far and the work proposed. Notwithstanding our remarks under "Rationale" below, the Halfmoon Bay Community Association (HBCA) will continue to support the SCR D and would welcome a more engaged role in the process. Our primary objective is the continuing improvement of community assets for the benefit of the community.

The **Option A** price tag, up to \$85,000 seems especially high for preparation of a report to better inform an understanding of project and operating costs. This is a high level review to inform the process, not to design the solution. It should be undertaken in a very short period. **Option A** is the option selected through the initial community consultation process. We do not believe the cost and time for community engagement is required now. Furthermore, the community at large is not qualified to comment on the technical outcome of the expert review.

The review of the four sites (**Option A and 3 sites in Option B**) on pages 4 and 5 considers project length, cost estimates, technical and procedural factors. We believe the factors of desirability, public acceptance, anticipated usage levels and perceived value to the community are equally important and should be evaluated with equal emphasis. Whereas some factors may be subjective and difficult to estimate, they are no less important. These factors do not require expert input. The residents of Halfmoon Bay are the experts. The Advantages and Risks analysis in the Report lumps the three alternate sites together. We believe they should be evaluated individually, which will give a much better comparison among the sites.

The proposed steps in the report appear to extend the project, in the best case, to completion in November 2026. This puts the project in jeopardy, since there is not yet any commitment to an

extension of the ICIP deadline for completion to March 2026, let alone November 2026. It is still unclear the circumstances that allowed the architectural design to proceed on the basis of required MBE and setbacks which the consultants were no longer willing to stand by three years earlier. Whereas we are not looking for a scapegoat, a simple explanation may quiet some public skepticism. Aside from the additional cost, the work being entertained by this Report appears to extend the project timeline by at least 12 months.

Proposal

The HBCA proposes the following steps:

- **Undertake Option A** from the staff report right away. Reduce the scope to achieve a recommendation in 2 months, avoiding in-depth measurement and analysis and relying more on expert technical advice.
- Convene a council of interested parties to perform an evaluation of the sites in Option B. Evaluate the options based on a wider set of criteria beginning immediately.
- The HBCA is willing to undertake this review with input from its own membership, suitable members of the SCRD staff, and preferably the Area B Director.
- Add one additional item to the list of options to be evaluated over and above those listed in the Report - see Advantages and Disadvantages below.

Rationale For Preferring the Existing Site

Our preference for the original site is based on the community's desires, expressed through past surveys and supported by the Coopers Green Park Management Plan. Also, from community outreach, donor support and financial viability, we believe that to ensure the hall is an asset and not a liability to owners or those who manage it, the only reliable location is Coopers Green Park.

While an updated Geotechnical Report on Ocean Flooding might suggest that the Floor Construction Level (FCL) of the replacement hall now needs to be significantly higher than the 2017 initial report, further work needs to be done to realistically determine the FCL for a 50 year building life span at the NE location of the inner part of Halfmoon Bay. Here, there is minimal storm surge and wave run up compared to most locations in the Salish Sea, which endure significantly more storm surge and wave run-up from the predominant S/SE winds. Ocean flooding over the period of the building life is not reliably predicted. The Geotechnical consulting firm should be asked for comment on a concept that was briefly discussed in the design task force in 2017/18, namely to enable the building to be raised if and when ocean flooding was deemed to be an issue. Perhaps this could be achieved by a bond that provides monies to raise the building with no risk to the SCRD.

If the SCRD Board chooses to abandon the original site, the alternate location at upper Coopers Green Park is the only alternative that can rely on continued support by the Halfmoon Bay community, the HBCA (for the reasons previously stated), it's donations and those of members

of close to \$400,000 by September 30, 2022. These most likely would not be available if the hall was proposed to be built at a site other than Coopers Green Park as documented in the agreement with the SCRD.

To this end, as representatives of the HBCA Board, we recommend that further geotechnical analysis be done at the current planned location for a 50 year lifespan building as defined by the Customer (SCRD), and then that the components of ocean flooding for this specific location be reconsidered before moving to the secondary location on the upper level at Coopers Green Park if necessary.

These two locations do not need further community input as they were part of the original analysis and supported. From a cost and timeline to get to a decision to ensure less impact on the community and use of the funds from both the ICIP grant and that of the community, this is the most effective and efficient approach.

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF ALL OPTIONS

Coopers Green Original Site

Advantages and disadvantages for the existing site are not listed here. They were analyzed in the original review of site alternatives. They should be reimagined now as part of HBCA's proposed review of sites. Of note, it may become the Board's option to proceed with the existing site, in which case it must consider the following items which we have not been able to consider in the available time, and the implications of which the new Board will need to understand:

- Suggested construction and maintenance of structures to mitigate against wave runup and erosion. This sounds like a massive additional project which would doom the hall construction project .
- Waiver of liability on title.
- Implications of the "save harmless" policy.
- Uncertainty re availability and cost of insurance, possible need to "self-insure".

Connor Park

Adv - ICIP grant can be used.

Adv - Proximity to park, sports field, kids play area, bike park, hiking trails. A natural hub for current and enhanced community activity.

Adv - Parking is easy to provide.

Adv - Site may be usable in many ways, lots of latitude.

Adv - Removes all the uncertainties about timing and cost of the current site, possibly even the archeological analysis.

Risks are as stated in the report.

Dis - Not an iconic destination place like Coopers Green. Whereas some people prefer this location, it is not central like successful venues. Examples - Roberts Creek, Pender Harbour.

Dis - HBCA estimates of usage and income would likely be much lower and hence operating deficit and operating grant much higher.

Dis - Location would attract few weddings and command lower rates, hence the reduction of income.

Dis - HBCA would need to engage a new set of volunteers and we cannot commit to our ability to do this.

Dis - Lacking bus service.

Dis - Presence of HMB school gym that is little used now, and could satisfy some needs of Welcome Woods meeting and event space as it arises.

Lohn Road Park

Adv - ICIP grant can be used.

Adv - Parking is easy to provide.

Adv - Site is usable in many ways, lots of latitude.

Adv - Removes all the uncertainties about timing and cost of current site, even the archeological (?).

Risks are as stated in the report.

Dis - Distributes public amenities instead of consolidating.

Dis - Access is via small unlit residential roads.

Dis - Anticipate strong community resistance; in fact, those who have read the report have vocalized non-support of this option via social media.

Conclusion - We believe this site is a non-starter and **should not be assessed** for technical and planning suitability. It has no advantages over Connor Park and several disadvantages. It would not be desirable even if it was the only location.

Upper Parking Lot at Coopers Green Park

Adv - ICIP grant can be used.

Adv - Same advantages as for the existing site - iconic location, beautiful views, desirable venue for weddings and many events.

Adv - Funding is in place including community donations.

Some risks are as stated in the report. But:

Adv - Public goodwill would be retained and approximately \$400,000 of community donations would be accessible.

Adv - The HBCA interest in being involved in the operations of the hall would remain.

Dis - Parking challenges may be compounded by reducing capacity in the upper parking lot.

Dis - It is possible that a substantial redesign may be needed.

Option X - Coopers Green Performance Space

While we are solid in our belief that the location of the new Hall **must be at Coopers Green Park**, in the unfortunate but possible event that there is no feasible or affordable solution for a hall at Coopers Green, some objectives must be achieved at Coopers Green Park anyway. The HBCA and most residents want Coopers Green to be improved as the “cultural centre” of Halfmoon Bay. This could be partly achieved by constructing a covered performance space, such as some version of the recent constructions at Hackett Park or Brickers Cider. This could also double as a covered picnic space. The HBCA will advocate for this project (with advantages and disadvantages still to be identified and considered) to begin immediately,

should the choice be made to not build the hall at Coopers Green. Also to be considered is that new public washrooms and storage space would be required when the old hall is demolished. While this is a "new" option for this meeting, revitalization of the park is not new in terms of the Park Management Plan.. .

Submitted for your consideration,

Linda McMahon, President HBCA
Andy Jones-Cox, VP HBCA
Don Cunliffe, HBCA Director
Brian Smith, Former HBCA Director