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<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Approval of the agenda.</td>
</tr>
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<td>2.</td>
<td>Disclosure of pecuniary interest and the general nature thereof.</td>
</tr>
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ANNEX A
3. A memorandum regarding whether to adopt for information the Trail Enhancement and Connectivity Strategy report as prepared by Dillon Consulting and to consider funding for the extension of the McMahon Frame Lake Trail extension in 2019 – 2021 budget deliberations.

ANNEX B

ANNEX C
5. (For Information Only – Previously considered at GPC October 22, 2018) A memorandum regarding whether to adopt for information the Aquatic Centre Pre-Design Plan as prepared for the Aquatic Centre Advisory Committee by Stantec Architecture Ltd. and to consider funding for the project in the 2019-2021 budget.
MEMORANDUM TO COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE: Governance and Priorities

DATE: November 26, 2018

DEPARTMENT: Community Services

ISSUE: Whether to adopt for information the Trail Enhancement and Connectivity Strategy report as prepared by Dillon Consulting and to consider funding for the extension of the McMahon Frame Lake Trail during the 2019-2021 budget deliberations.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. Adopts for information the Trail Enhancement and Connectivity Strategy report as prepared by Dillon Consulting, and

2. Considers funding in the amount of $450,000 for the extension of the McMahon Frame Lake Trail during the 2019-2021 budget deliberations.

3. Directs Administration to continue discussions with the Department of Health and Social Services and with the stakeholders, including the Arctic Indigenous Wellness Foundation, and present alternative options to Council for the location of the McMahon Frame Lake Trail extension.

BACKGROUND:

During the 2018 Capital Budget deliberations, $25,000 was committed for the completion of a trail enhancement and connectivity study. Specifically, the study was to complete an audit of the various trails within the City and consider the requirements for a connectivity strategy, the development of an implementation schedule with projected costs, and the development of an enhancement strategy for the McMahon Frame Lake Trail upgrade and expansion. This latter aspect was the result of a presentation heard by Council during the preparations of the 2018 – 2020 budget. The use of the McMahon Frame Lake Trail by commuters from the Frame Lake, Range Lake and Northlands areas has been discussed in many forums and the expansion of the trail behind the hospital connecting to the underpass was presented as a project for consideration. Finally, the work also entailed a review of the City of Yellowknife’s Cycling Guide to ensure it is current and relevant.
Through a competitive Request for Proposal process, Dillon Consulting was selected to carry out the work. The consulting team carried out a full consultative process that included meeting with several of the key users and developers of trails with the City including the Great Slave Snowmobile Association, the Yellowknife Mountain Bike Club and the Ecology North Transportation Issues Committee. A public open house process was included in the consultation process as was an on-line public survey.

**COUNCIL POLICY / RESOLUTION OR GOAL:**

| Council Goal #1 – Better Engagement with Stakeholders |
| Council Goal #4 - Community Sustainability |

**APPLICABLE LEGISLATION, BY-LAWS, STUDIES, PLANS:**

Public Parks and Recreation Facilities By-law No. 4564

**CONSIDERATIONS:**

**Financial Considerations**

The 2018 - 2020 budget identified the funding required to complete the Trail Enhancement and Connectivity Strategy as well as identifying funding in 2019 to carry out a portion of the anticipated work, specifically the continuation of the McMahon Frame Lake Trail in behind the hospital.

The initial estimated cost for the work on the trail behind the hospital was $300,000, however after closer consideration the estimated cost has been adjusted to $450,000.

The Strategy identifies several outside funding opportunities that will be explored in detailed. Specifically, funding has been identified through the NWT Recreation and Parks Association funding through The Great Trail (Trans Canada Trail), the Federation of Canadian Municipalities Green Municipal Fund, and the GNWT Recreation and Sport Contribution, as well as the Community Tourism Infrastructure Contribution Program.

**Accessibility**

Although not specifically addressed in the recently adopted Accessibility Audit, the completion of this trail to an asphalt surface supports the continuation of the trail to a high level of accessibility for all.

**Economic Development/Tourism**

The continued expansion and improvements to the trail systems within the community including clearly identifiable linkages and added amenities and surfacing will provide another opportunity for visitors to explore and discover Yellowknife.

**Public Consultation**

The consulting team carried out public consultation to solicit information from key interest groups as well as the general public. One on one meetings were held with the various stakeholder groups such as the Transportation Issues Committee of Ecology North, the Yellowknife Mountain Bike Club, and the Great Slave Snowmobile Association, the Arctic Indigenous Wellness Foundation (AIWF) etc. In addition there was a Place Speak online engagement that occurred as well as public open houses. Each of these opportunities was successful in obtaining key feedback to various issues identified in the plan.
Throughout the engagement process, there was general overall support for the continued development of the connectivity and the extension of the McMahon Frame Lake Trail. The AIWF has expressed concern regarding the alignment of the trail indicating that intrusive measures such as blasting would disrupt their use of the area. In discussions with the consulting team the AIWF suggested an alignment of the trail that would best suit their use of the area.

The attached sketch indicates three potential trail alignments linking the current trail to the underpass at the Co-op corner. The trail indicated in yellow is the alignment favoured by the AIWF. The sketch also details the various active transportation alternatives in that portion of the city available for commuter use to and from the downtown.

**Staffing**
The extension of the McMahon Frame Lake Trail will require attention by the Community Services staff, particularly in the winter months. It is anticipated that the commuter use of this trail to and from the downtown will be quite extensive. There will be a need to ensure that its extension is maintained to the same high standard of care as the existing trail. This will require an adjustment to the current maintenance program to ensure that the trail meets the same standard for accessibility and safety. Installing the necessary signage as indicated in the Strategy will be carried out with existing resources.

**Land**
Subject to final trail corridor design and location, Planning and Development will work to confirm any zoning and land requirements.

**ALTERNATIVES TO RECOMMENDATION:**
That Council not adopt for information the Trail Enhancement and Connectivity Strategy report as prepared by Dillon Consulting, and direct Administration to continue discussions with stakeholders to resolve the McMahon Frame Lake Trail alignment.

**RATIONALE:**
The continued development and enhancement of the trail systems within the City will ensure that these amenities continue to evolve to meet the needs of the community, specifically the increasing demands for active transportation opportunities and clearly identifiable linkages.

The Strategy identifies these needs and provides for an implementation strategy for consideration that includes a time line from 2019 to 2023 and approximate costs. This will assist Council with moving forward on a clearly identified plan including budget guidance for the next several years.

The feedback from the public and the various interest groups has indicated broad support for the Strategy and the various initiatives contained within. The Arctic Indigenous Wellness Foundation (AIWF) has provided specific feedback regarding their issues concerning the development of the area close to their program site. The continued discussions with the AIWF and a report back to Council prior to commencing with the development of the trail extension will assist in building strong community support for the project.
The adoption of the Strategy will provide Council with means to evaluate and assess the demands of the public regarding the continued development of the existing and new trails in the future. Past Councils have been presented with various initiatives from interest groups such as the Ecology North Transportation Issues Committee, Yellowknife Mountain Bike Club, Yellowknife Rotary Club and the general public.

ATTACHMENTS:

McMahon Frame Lake Trail Extension Concept Map DM#538247

Prepared: November 9, 2018 GW/dh
Revised: November 21, 2018 GW
CITY OF YELLOWKNIFE
Trail Enhancement and Connectivity Strategy

November 2018 – 18-8474
November 19th, 2018

City of Yellowknife
4807 52nd Street
Yellowknife, NT
X1A 2N4

Attention: Dave Hurley
Facilities Manager, Community Services Department

RE: Trail Enhancement and Connectivity Strategy

We are pleased to submit this Trail Enhancement and Connectivity Strategy for the City of Yellowknife. This work is the collection of historical reports, current public feedback and best practice standards on trails with specific consideration for Yellowknife.

Dillon has worked in Yellowknife since 1975 and continues to value the relationship established with the City and this region. This report serves to verify the importance of trails to the residents of Yellowknife, and provide recommendations for how to move forward through continued maintenance, signage and trail expansion.

Sincerely,

DILLON CONSULTING LIMITED

Gary Strong, P.Eng.
Partner

Our file: 18-8474
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Acronyms, Abbreviations, Definitions

– A –

Active Transportation, movement by a mode that is human-powered, such as walking, cycling, skateboarding, rollerblading, or similar forms of transportation

– B –

Bike Route, road identified with signs as a shared route for bikes and cars
Bike Lane, portion of roadway demarcated with a painted strip for bike use only
Bike Path, separate paved pathway for bike use

– G –

GNWT, Government of the Northwest Territories (various departments including Lands, Industry Tourism and Investment, and Municipal And Community Affairs)

– M –

Multi-use Path, separate paved pathway for multiple active transportation activities
Executive Summary

The Trail Enhancement and Connectivity Strategy Report was initiated by the City of Yellowknife to gather past report learnings, confirm ideas with current public engagement, and prepare a plan for how trails and trail infrastructure should be supported in moving forward. This process has been undertaken before in Yellowknife, and will continue to be necessary in the future. Involving the public in the creation of their infrastructure and supporting their interests, clubs and activities is the mandate of staff and council, creating an inclusive City, where residents have an opportunity to take part in a variety of pursuits. Supporting outdoor active lifestyles provides social, environmental, economic, and cultural benefits for residents that all cities should strive to provide.

The City of Yellowknife is fortunate in the trail network that it already provides its residents, and respondents to surveys and through open house discussions were aware of the great resources they already enjoy. However, opportunities and ideas for improvement were enthusiastically shared through public engagement processes, with maps redrawn to dream of the possibilities that remain unwalked. This strategy looks to past reports, and blends historical ideas with current interest to demonstrate what is most important to residents. Defining elements for how a trails system should be supported.

These elements of the Trails Enhancement and Connectivity Strategy provide the general themes under which the City of Yellowknife should proceed with trail development. The elements are then built upon to provide direct actionable projects that form priorities for the next years of municipal trail development.

The City is currently considering a significant cost commitment within the 2019 Budget, related to the McMahon-Frame Lake Trail. This request is about seeking a commitment from council to complete the foundational piece of the commuting, tourism and active recreational trail system in the City. This commitment acknowledges that there are land use partners who have interests in the area, primarily the Arctic Indigenous Wellness Foundation (AIWF) which must take precedence over any trail work. The commitment however will allow City staff to continue to work with these partners, in exploring all options for trail completion and re-routing to preserve time and space for the AIWF, while seeking to serve the residents of the Borden and Range Lake neighbourhoods, and businesses along Old Airport Road. This commitment to active transportation and not a specific route allows for outside funding to be obtained, while allowing for the AIWF to engage with the City once they are prepared to move forward in a timeline and location that suits their project needs.

Trail infrastructure does not typically require grand budget decisions, and can be incrementally improved through trailhead signage and wayfinding markers, more frequent by-law enforcement patrols, and improved maintenance of trails and bike lanes. Coordinating these smaller actions should be a trails representative within the City, with a dedicated budget toward the maintenance and incremental improvements necessary to enhance the existing trail network.
1.0 Introduction

The Trail Enhancement and Connectivity Strategy is another phase in the planning process for active transportation infrastructure and programs. In 2005, the City of Yellowknife supported the completion of an Integrated Parks, Trails and Open Space Development Study, and 13 years later we continue this work. Components of this past vision remain unaddressed, and the City still has a great deal of work to undertake in realizing the 2005 mission statement.

To create an environmentally friendly park system that beautifies our City, meets the needs of residents, visitors and tourists and encourages people to be active in the outdoors year round.

Dillon Consulting Limited was retained in August of 2018, to undertake a review of the City’s existing trail network, engage with residents and prepare a Trail Strategy that would inform the budget process and new City Council.

The City of Yellowknife is fortunate in its geography, density, climate and past infrastructure investments which have provided for a trail network that allows for a great number of residents to consider Active Transportation, human-powered travel in their daily activities.

This Trail Enhancement and Connectivity Strategy centres around the concept of Active Transportation, most commonly represented with walking and cycling but could also include the use of a wheelchair, skiing or canoeing. Active Transportation is used interchangeably with trail use, however this report recognizes that additional motorized uses form part of the trail network user group and social fabric. The City of Yellowknife, through the delivery of trails, parks and open spaces seeks to encourage residents to pursue active, healthy lifestyles, and these include a wide variety of transportation options on trails, roads, and waterways.

This report involves three distinct components in the preparation of a Trail Strategy. Each component serves to further gather information, inform the process and establish final priorities for action.

The first component involves review of past reports, current and planned city infrastructure, and an assessment of each trail based upon this existing knowledge and current public interests. This component summarized the findings of 7 past reports, and compared these with the results of public engagement occurring through two public open houses and an online survey. Each trail is then assessed based upon past recommendations for action, and current public use and interest.

The second component of this report includes an identification of the elements of a Trails Strategy with the McMahon-Frame Lake Trail highlighted as a foundational feature where action is called for by the public, however consideration of additional land uses must be a included.

The final component directs action on how the priorities and identified trail elements will be achieved, prioritizing individual components based upon the past reports, public feedback and best practices. Additionally, a monitoring plan is included at the end of this report, which follows best practices where monitoring and evaluation should be completed in all projects to ensure the actions remains on schedule and aligned with public interests.
2.0 Purpose

The Trail Enhancement and Connectivity Strategy was initiated by the City as part of creating an inclusive community, where all residents have the opportunity to take part in the social, economic and cultural life of Yellowknife. It is understood that trails offer mobility options for residents, providing a choice and allowing for greater resident participation in community events and activities.

This Trail Strategy provides a snapshot of the current trail system within Yellowknife, and guides how and why the City should move forward with infrastructure investment and a staff commitment to further this transportation option. The prioritization of action is developed from resident ideas and feedback, confirming the recommendations of past reports and best practices. Community ideas have been summarized which will allow council and city staff to prioritize their actions now and in the future.

Trail systems around the world are recognized for their benefits to social equality, health, economy and the environment (CAPE, 2017; Transport Canada, 2011). Further, users should not be regarded as an isolated or fringe community, and instead recognized for their numbers and importance within Yellowknife. Representing a quarter of daily commutes, active transportation users already make use of the current trail system, road network and informal connections. Serving this sizable portion of the community through a coordinated and connected trail network will serve to improve upon the benefits to current and future residents and the growing tourism industry.
3.0 Where are we now? - Trails Audit

What does active transportation look like in Yellowknife?

Trails are municipal infrastructure, maintained by the Community Services Department, with support from other City staff and departments. It is recognized however that there are a number of informal trails throughout the City that originate through the interest of private individuals and organizations. Trails serve both a similar function to roadways: connecting families, neighbourhoods, and the needs of residents; in addition to linear parks, creating playgrounds for all residents. For this trails audit, a systematic review of the current network has been undertaken, summarizing past reports on Yellowknife’s trails, and walking, biking and using trails, while engaging with trail users.

3.1 Review of Past Reports

The City of Yellowknife has commissioned and received a number of reports relating to trails and active transportation in recent years. Further, Council has endorsed the use of Smart Growth Principles in development, and follows trails specific principles of:

- **Community Collaboration** – Require effective community involvement and openness to development opportunities in the ongoing long-range planning and development of the city to find unique solutions that fit with the community’s vision of how and where it wants to grow.
- **Placemaking** – Create lively, safe and attractive urban live/work/play neighbourhood environments with adequate amenities that respect the existing community character, landscape, and cultural heritage.
- **Open space and natural areas** – Improve quality of life by protecting natural features, minimizing environmental impacts and making natural areas easily accessible.
- **Transportation** – Increase active transportation options to private automobiles by providing infrastructure for walking, bicycling, carpooling, car sharing, and public transit to help to improve air quality and reduce vehicle related land use.
- **Promote clean energy** – Reduce greenhouse gases and consumption of fossil fuels by maximizing energy efficiency through conservation, local renewable energy opportunities, green building design and innovative industries.
- **Regional Awareness** – Support local and regional community-based planning and land-use decisions through communication and capacity building and communication that fosters cooperation on matters relating to the environment, infrastructure and the economy.

(Adapted from Smart Growth Development Plan, 2010)

These Smart Growth principles commit the City of Yellowknife to a set of actions on Trails and Active Transportation, and are reaffirmed through the 2011 General Plan. By following the above principles, Council and staff should be placing a greater emphasis on transportation alternatives and creating a
linear public parks system that connects to the regional area. These principles established in 2009-2010 build off of a variety of reports undertaken on transportation in Yellowknife.

- Dillon Consulting Limited – Integrated Parks, Trails and Open Space Development Study (2006)
- FSC Architects and Engineers – Bicycle Routing for the City of Yellowknife (2008)
- Ecology North – Yellowknife Bike Route (2009)
- HDR/iTrans - Smart Growth Development Plan Transportation Improvement Study (2010)
- Ipsos Reid – Parking Improvement Study (2012)
- IBI Group – Downtown Yellowknife Parking Assessment (2013)
- City of Yellowknife – Franklin Avenue Bike Consultation (2016)

The recommendations of the above reports were supported by extensive community engagement, seeking to improve upon trails and active transportation infrastructure in Yellowknife. Consistent and unresolved priority action items from these reports are identified as:

1. Trail use and active transportation can be increased through **creating and maintaining a trail network accessible to all residents.**
   - The existing system is noted as having gaps which should be addressed to improve safety and use. These **gaps** were repeatedly noted as being:
     - Co-op connection to **Frame Lake trail** behind Stanton Hospital
     - **Kam Lake** and **Grace Lake** connections
     - Access **across Highway 3** and along **Highway 4**
     - Cycling improvements along **Franklin and Old Airport Roads**
     - Safety review of the intersection of Franklin and Old Airport with improved access to the **Multiplex and Field House**

2. Create simplified and consistent **signage** for active transportation routes and remove historical signs which can create confusion.

3. Establish a protocol for **trail maintenance** which allows for year-round use of primary routes which may include additional sidewalk or partial road clearing.

4. Provide **authority and responsibility** for active transportation to one individual or department which can coordinate city-wide efforts on improving trail use and experiences.

5. Create an asset management database or improve the tools within the existing **CityExplorer mapping** program to allow for individual trails to be highlighted, bike parking, public washrooms and informal items including skiing trails, and winter crossings to be included.

These recommendations are part of broader discussions on the topic of trails and this report does not intend to replace or gloss over the merits of each individual report. It is important that the future work on trails in Yellowknife make use of past reports and continue to reference the ideas and recommendations they offer the City.
3.2 Current City Infrastructure

The City of Yellowknife maintains an extensive and varied network of interconnected active transportation routes. These routes incorporate passive walking and biking, intensive hiking and mountain or seasonal ‘fat’ biking, and seasonal cross-country skiing and snowshoeing. From these trails which the City maintains, extend informal trails which meet the varied interests and needs of resident groups. These informal networks are not recorded or maintained due to a variety of reasons, however rely upon and are built from the City’s public trail network.

Current trail data is available through the CityExplorer on-line mapping tool where residents can learn of what resources are found throughout the City. This infrastructure is reported as:

- 25 km of City maintained trails
  - 3 km of bike lanes (separate and raised or painted bike infrastructure)
  - 9 km of accessible trails (McMahon-Frame Lake, Niven Lake, part of Range Lake)
- 85 bike racks
- 139 benches
- 8 designated public washrooms

The City of Yellowknife maintains this infrastructure through a portion of the annual Community Services Department budget, and further spends portions of allocated budgets from the Public Works and Engineering Department or other capital amounts on the creation of new trails and related infrastructure, generally through road construction and reconstruction projects.

This infrastructure is supported by City policies which define best practices and use requirements including the City of Yellowknife Cycling Guide (Figure 1), in addition to use by-laws. These include the Highway Traffic By-law (4063) which direct where bicycles and pedestrian traffic may move, and the Helmet By-law (4795) which requires youth to wear helmets on roads.

Confusion over these by-laws results in bicycles riding on sidewalks, and pedestrians crossing streets inappropriately, which can result in conflicts and injuries. Limited signage and a lack of education programs may be contributing to these infractions and increasing user conflicts.
3.3 Planned Infrastructure

The long-term planning for trail and active transportation infrastructure is determined through actions within individual departments. The Public Works and Engineering Services Department in the past has prepared a five-year bike lane development schedule (Figure 2). This infrastructure is planned for as part of other road network upgrades being undertaken, with the most recent schedule planning for the years 2014 through 2019.

Recent upgrades have occurred to Franklin Avenue, extending the 3m wide multi-use roadside paths from Tommy Forrest Ball Park and 57th Street to the intersection with Old Airport Road. Improvements to the McMahon-Frame Lake Trail also occurred recently with the repaving of this multi-purpose trail.

Annual upgrades to trails, as part of the implementation of roadway standards will continue to occur and should reference the interests of local residents toward fulfilling a comprehensive and cohesive trail system. The Trail Enhancement and Connectivity Strategy recognizes the importance of this future planning and by considering the trail network gaps provides a path forward for trail network build-out. This planned repaving work must make use of road and trail standards being developed in concert with the City Community Services Department. These trail standards currently being developed should follow best practice standards from other jurisdictions with knowledge of the unique ‘winter city’ circumstances of Yellowknife. Future paving schedules should be further discussed with trail groups including Ecology North’s TIC prior to final road design.
### Trails Assessment – Review of what is known

An audit of the City of Yellowknife’s trail system requires analysis of what has been learned through past reports, whether these issues remain relevant in current community engagement and that these ideas be compared to national and international best practices.

The project team has assessed each of the trails maintained by the City based upon the above knowledge and support against best practice criteria that results in additional use and improved user experiences. These criteria include:

- Connectivity
- Consistency
- Safety
- Land ownership/availability
- Potential costs

A review of these factors for each trail is completed below in Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified in Past Reports</th>
<th>Identified in Current Feedback</th>
<th>Connectivity</th>
<th>Consistency (signage/trail type)</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Land Ownership/Availability</th>
<th>Potential Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McMahon-Frame Lake Trails (south side)</td>
<td>Hospital extension identified as a significant gap in multiple reports. Improved maintenance and snow clearing needed.</td>
<td>Extension supported, with interest in leaving existing trail intact for Mtn Bike use. Painted strip may address user conflicts</td>
<td>Strong support for extension, with limited blasting, painted strip may reduce conflicts, work with hospital and Staples plaza to improve Borden traffic</td>
<td>100% use</td>
<td>The 'backbone' of Yellowknife's trail network, connections to this system could be improved.</td>
<td>Signage present, some requires replacement and additional information signs could support tourism and use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niven Lake</td>
<td>Niven Crossing hotspot has been addressed, trail connections good and well used.</td>
<td>48th St Crossing remains dangerous, used considerably by commuters</td>
<td>Excellent trail, safety issues with limited lighting, residents still use 48th St &amp; use 48th St</td>
<td>83.1% use</td>
<td>Loose gravel sidewalks around Nova limit bike use</td>
<td>Strong connections to surrounding community and trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deh Cho Boulevard</td>
<td>Support connecting residents with business</td>
<td>Orphan section of trail</td>
<td>Traffic limited, however widened shoulders may improve safety</td>
<td>32.5% use</td>
<td>Not connected to other trails apart from road network and will require further work</td>
<td>Well marked lanes, abrupt start and end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Avenue</td>
<td>Intersection with Old Airport Rd. remains a problem, traffic and space within Downtown should factor in cyclists.</td>
<td>Bike lanes from Old Town appropriate, need painted area through downtown, multiuse trail an improvement</td>
<td>New multi-use trails a good route, although they dead end at park, traffic in downtown a deterrent to use</td>
<td>42.9% use</td>
<td>Three components, with no smooth transitions. Need to consider how this route can become continuous</td>
<td>Lane painting on hill, nothing through downtown, multi-use trail unfinished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52nd Avenue</td>
<td>Led to unsafe interactions between cars and cyclists, the city should learn from this work</td>
<td>An inappropriate blend of trail and road. Should not be repeated and should be removed in future roadwork</td>
<td>Unsafe for users, should not be repeated</td>
<td>36.4% use</td>
<td>Painted bike lane at start and end, good connections, dead ends at 56th St and discontinuous with puddy before Franklin Ave.</td>
<td>Well painted and marked variety of trail types creates confusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Lake Trail</td>
<td>Need for connections to all areas of the City, prior to development</td>
<td>Connect with other portions of City</td>
<td>Need connections to this area, not yet known</td>
<td>15.6% use</td>
<td>Not connected to other trails apart from road network</td>
<td>No signage present, some faded paint and flagging tape</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Identified in Past Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Public Consultation</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Connectivity</th>
<th>Consistency (signage/trail type)</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Land Ownership/ Availability</th>
<th>Potential Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>McMahon-Frame Lake (north side)</strong></td>
<td>Support a variety of trail types and protected spaces</td>
<td>Remain recreational trail, improved signage, bike access</td>
<td>Remain recreational trail</td>
<td>67.5% use</td>
<td>Limited and inconsistent signage and markers</td>
<td>Frequently used, safety highlighted as a problem</td>
<td>Commissioner’s Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Range Lake Trail</strong></td>
<td>Need for connections between all areas of the city</td>
<td>Improved signage needed</td>
<td>One way trail, would be much more valuable with connections to Borden or Dehcho Blvd.</td>
<td>33.8% use Interest in connecting with Rivett Cr.</td>
<td>Connected to Parker Park and Range Lake. Does not connect neighbourhood or residents to broader area</td>
<td>Lake of signage on Range Lake Rd., other entrances limits awareness and use</td>
<td>Safety not highlighted as an issue, vegetation clearing may improve safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tin Can Hill Trails</strong></td>
<td>Should be protected from Twin Pine development, part of waterfront trail</td>
<td>Allow for continued mtn bike trail use, protect from other development</td>
<td>Boardwalk along Rat Lake, restrict development and motorized traffic, improve connectivity to Con Mine area</td>
<td>70.1% use Informal connections to neighbouring streets and neighbourhoods</td>
<td>No signage present, recreational trail</td>
<td>Considerable human and animal activity, some safety concerns noted</td>
<td>Commissioner’s and Municipal Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Twin Pine Hill Trails</strong></td>
<td>Connect to broader system and allow public access to remain prior to development, new trails have supported this</td>
<td>Waste of money, should have remained a recreational trail</td>
<td>New trail, limited awareness</td>
<td>31.2% use Odd staircases and trail connections to neighbouring roads and residents</td>
<td>No signage, flagging tape inconsistent</td>
<td>Some safety concerns noted</td>
<td>Municipal Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rotary Waterfront Boardwalk</strong></td>
<td>Should create a Mine (Giant) to Mine (Negus) waterfront trail system</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7.3% use An isolated boardwalk servicing houseboats, would benefit from connection to Lundquist or Brock</td>
<td>Boardwalk, no signage or map available</td>
<td>Frequently used and open, reflectors should be maintained for snowmobile traffic</td>
<td>Commissioner’s Land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional trails were noted within the survey as being present within the City of Yellowknife municipal boundary, however are either not maintained by City staff (Territorial ownership and maintenance or informal trails managed by individuals or private organizations) or were not consider for this review as an established trail system (Taylor Road, School Draw Avenue).
3.5 Lessons Learned

From the above table it is identified that the more accessible, signed, and known trails are those that report greater use. The McMahon-Frame Lake, Niven Lake and Tin Can Hill routes reporting the highest percentage of survey respondents use. However, lower use trails provide alternative recreational options (including mountain biking or natural interpretation) which should be supported by the City.

Of the trails present in the City, a number are isolated from any broader network, relying on informal pathways and the road network to provide connections. These trails serve residents and neighbourhoods, however do not provide an active transportation option due to limited connectivity.

Installing or improving signage, including direction, destination and distance information are consistent issues across trail types. This information would service tourism, and improve user experiences for residents. Safety is commonly highlighted as a significant issue for survey respondents, with the need for improved lighting, vegetation clearing and more active municipal enforcement patrols requested. Safety includes avoiding user conflicts, and reducing accidents and criminal activity on trails.

The results of the completed public survey are included within Appendix A. Further notes from the public engagement sessions are provided in Appendix B. Biking and active transportation users were over-represented in the survey however provided considerable insight and direction on their priorities. Seasonal variation was noted by users, who also noted trails were used slightly more frequently for recreational reasons than commuting. Survey respondents noted that limitations in current city infrastructure were more of a deterrent to use than personal reasons, although there are a variety of factors which result in residents not using active transportation alternatives.

Respondents strongly supported extending the paved, accessible, all-season McMahon-Frame Lake to the Coop corner in the survey and public open houses. Improving signage, safety and maintenance were consistent themes through further questions that sought insight on how to improve other areas of the City’s trails and how to prioritize action.
4.0 Where do we want to go?

What matters most?

The Trail Enhancement and Connectivity Strategy involves considering the work and knowledge gained through past reports, corroborated with current public engagement, best practices and consideration of feasibility to provide direction on moving forward with active transportation. The second component of this report draws from the preceding Trails Analysis and public engagement to create an image of what a trail system should appear as in the City of Yellowknife.

4.1 Preparing the Strategy

A Trail’s Strategy should not have a pre-existing agenda, should look at broad best approaches for connecting a variety of residents and user groups, and should consider what approach(s) are the most beneficial toward realizing the goal of greater active transportation options and use.

In preparation of this process it was found that the City of Yellowknife had already undertaken some Strategic Planning for what elements such a process would include. These basic factors (Figure 3) are supported by the historical reports reviewed, current public feedback and best practices as found in active transportation strategies across Canada and the north.

![Figure 4: Elements of an Active Transportation Study; City of Yellowknife](image-url)
**Well Connected and Designed Network**

A Well Connected Network includes a variety of choices, which make use of local circumstances, neighbourhoods and geography to provide an efficient alternative to automobile use. This network will require thoughtful consideration for how individual components can be integrated within a broader system. Seamless transitions between varying trail types, and consideration for destinations and parking are all part of Well-designed Facilities. This element includes designing routes with the users in mind, making them feel safe and motivated to make use of alternative transportation options. This design will take into consideration the City of Yellowknife Accessibility Audit review which occurred in 2017, and other best practice examples for design standards.

**Responsive and Sustainable Operations**

Responsive and Sustainable Operations are important factors to consider within a Winter City, improving existing maintenance programs and re-approaching how roadways are cleared, to encourage active transportation. Census data on commuter use of active transportation shows declining interest in walking and biking to work. In order to reverse this trend, the trail network must provide an improved user experience, if it intends to increase active transportation mode share.

**Effective Signage and Communication**

Well Designed Signage is recognized as the most cost effective approach to improving user experience, and can result in a unified and seamless trail network with greater use, efficiency and motivation to consider alternative modes of travel. Signage serves as the most Effective Communication tool to inform direct users and encourage additional users to consider trail options.

The City of Yellowknife’s Trails Strategy will go beyond these factors however to include other strategic elements as identified through the public consultation process. Defining what must be undertaken to meet the vision for an alternative transportation network.

**Other Elements considered through this process include:**

**Coordinated and Accountable**

Coordinated and Accountable action are elements of what residents are seeking from their civic employees. Feedback from a resident in the public engagement session stated that they know multi-jurisdictional issues create barriers and delays in action, but they did not care, they expected the City to find a way to get problems fixed. It is also clear, that while multiple reports have been prepared on the trail network system, only some issues have been addressed while new problems have emerged. Monitoring these reports and coordinating City staff to address these trail issues will be an important component of building out the trail system.

**Youth Focused**

Youth Focused actions are recognized as instilling life-long interest and skills which build into future generations. Physical activity is noted as being a pillar upon which active transportation should be established, addressing the chronic problems of low child and youth and later adult daily physical activity. By establishing skills and interest at a young age the City will create new and continuing users and advocates for active transportation.
A Holistic Approach to Civic Building is what must be undertaken when integrating trails within existing road corridors, right of ways, and public or private lands. Trails are one component of the transportation options available to Yellowknife residents, representing approximately a quarter of all daily commuting (Census, 2016). Recognizing the limits and importance of active transportation to limiting traffic congestion, providing continued independence to growing numbers of seniors, and providing action on Greenhouse Gas Emissions, demonstrates how Trails are part of much larger issues Yellowknife is facing.

### 4.2 Strategy Highlight: Looking specifically at the McMahon-Frame Trail

The McMahon-Frame Lake Trail surrounds Frame Lake and connects a variety of features throughout Yellowknife. The trail provides the primary connection between Old Airport Road and the downtown area. The southern and eastern portions are a paved 3 metre wide, lit and accessible recreational trail, while the northern and western portion is a rough recreational hiking trail.

The Arctic Indigenous Wellness Foundation (AIWF), a traditional, land based healing initiative has been proceeding toward the construction of a wellness centre along Frame Lake in the area of the proposed trail. In consultation with the AIWF, it is the recommendation of this report that the City of Yellowknife in following its past adoption of parts of the Truth and Reconciliation Report, and in supporting the invaluable work of the AIWF await their direction and completion of the wellness centre project prior to proceeding with trail design and completion.

#### 4.2.1 Why focus on McMahon-Frame Lake?

As a key connecting feature of the Yellowknife trail system, the McMahon-Frame Lake Trail serves the entire community, connecting major employers, businesses and many residential neighbourhoods. Survey respondents reported extensive and frequent use of this system between the new Stanton Hospital and Samba K’e Park. The trail beyond the hospital is present, however for a 500 metre stretch is a recreational trail over rough rocky terrain. It then becomes a gravel 3 metre wide (although overgrown) section that passes an underpass to the Coop Grocery Store before ending after 100 metres at a public parking area. From this point onward, the bike lanes continue on Old Airport Road, or the trail becomes a rough recreational route around the northwest side of Frame Lake, until reaching the Territorial Legislative Building.

![Figure 5: Ecology North - Way to Go Bike Routes Report, 2007 (Hot Spot A)](image-url)
The portion of the trail behind the Stanton Hospital has been identified in past reports as a ‘hot spot’ requiring action to grow the Yellowknife trails network (FSC 2008; Ecology North, 2007). These reports highlighted five (5) ‘hot spots’ where priority action was needed. One of the ‘hot spot’ issues was generally addressed with the installation of a crosswalk from the Niven subdivision, others include intersection improvements at Old Airport Road and Franklin Avenue, and 43rd Street and 51st Avenue in uptown. Two of the remaining concerns relate to the Coop grocery store corner. These concerns involve integrating the residential areas of Borden and Range Lake into the Frame Lake trail system in a safe and convenient manner. This integration was reported as relying on the completion of the McMahon-Frame Lake Trail in a continuous condition, separate from confusion of the hospital and Old Airport Road.

The City of Yellowknife proposed action on the completion of the trail segment within the 2018 Capital Budget, however a decision was deferred to the 2019 Budget process. Through this deliberation in 2018, wide ranging support was provided by a number of community groups and businesses.

Once again, strong support has been received for the improvement of the McMahon-Frame Lake Trail to the Coop Corner in survey and public engagement in 2019. All parties agree that there are clear benefits and it is in the general interests of all to complete a trail through this area. However at this time, the City should await direction from the AIWF prior to proceeding with any design or on-the-ground trail work.

4.2.2 How should it be built?

As noted above, it is not the recommendation of this report to proceed with any trail design prior to receiving direction from the AIWF, and allowing for their centre to be established. In moving forward in a future period however it is recommended that some consideration be provided for accessibility as defined in the City’s accessibility standards reports of 2017 (Dillon Consulting, 2017), and continuing the trail characteristics of the existing south Frame Lake route.
Applying the concept of universal design to trails considers that:
- Trails can be created to be enjoyed by a broad spectrum of people;
- All users have different abilities which should be accommodated for in a variety of trail types, however not all trail users should be accommodated for in each trail;
- Universal design strives to minimize as much as possible the barriers to users accessing trails.

Adapted from City of Yellowknife Outdoor Recreation Facilities Accessibility Audit

The findings of the audit report encouraged:
- Establishing multiple trailheads with parking
- Improving signage to identify trail conditions, length, and amenities (benches, washrooms)
- Lighting, particularly in winter conditions

Through the potential completion of the McMahon-Frame Lake Trail, the network will be better connected to accessible public parking, have more direct access to public washrooms at the Coop Grocer, and follow the example of the existing trail network with lighting and benches which extend the accessible trail to additional retail locations and residential areas of the city. Consideration for emergency call boxes, towers, or stations was suggested as part of improving the security and sense of safety on the trail.

4.2.3 Additional funding opportunities

As in all City infrastructure projects, municipal staff are encouraged to engage with community groups and organizations as part of developing a fundraising program to offset the capital costs of trail development. Such visible and regularly used features are ideal opportunities to involve community groups as part of upfront cost savings and long-term community interest and maintenance. In the past community groups have supported the city in the creation of public boardwalks and trails and outreach to all community groups should once again be undertaken.

Formal funding may also be sought through the:
- NWTRPA for work on and an extension to The Great Trail (formerly Trans-Canada Trail)
- Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) Green Municipal Fund - Transportation and Fuel Efficiency Funding
- Government of the Northwest Territories – Recreation and Sport Contributions, and Community Tourism Infrastructure Contribution Program

The City has identified that outreach to the above funding programs has already been initiated, and will be continued as part of off-setting municipal costs.
How can we get there?

How should we organize and prioritize active transportation options and actions to integrate and coordinate with other Yellowknife planning projects?

This section defines clear recommendations and timelines for each of the previously identified elements of a Yellowknife Trails Strategy. The recommendations make use of past reports, current resident feedback and best practices to direct action on the trails network.

“Picking the low hanging fruit”
Strategic planning and city building can take time. In order to initiate momentum and maintain interest through bigger changes, the City of Yellowknife should get visible results by finding the ‘low hanging fruit’, projects that are easy and quick, often because they are also simple to implement and cost-effective actions. Examples of this may be cutting curbs at trail intersections with roads to make for smoother routes, fixing potholes or replacing boards on segments of stairs or boardwalks, or replacing or installing better signage.

Adapted from Active Transportation in Canada: a resource and planning guide, 2011

5.1 City of Yellowknife Trail Elements

Well Connected and Designed Network

Review and work toward Implementing Past Recommendations including addressing ‘hot spots’ and integrating Smart Growth principles.

Review existing trails based upon resident feedback, addressing dead ends, stops and starts, and improving signage to Adapt Existing Trails to improve user comfort and interest.

Responsive and Sustainable Operations

Safety from weather and other trail users are two factors commonly cited by the public, which can be addressed through surface maintenance, vegetation clearing, and improved lighting. Following the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) best practices.

User Experiences are affected by commonly minor issues which detract from smooth and clear pathways. Curb cuts, routes around stairs for bikers and simple signage allow for users to enjoy their commute or recreational pursuit.
An open and welcoming kiosk or other signage at trailheads and intersections establishes rules and informs users of what options are available. Wayfinding or additional route markers along trails and bike routes can motivate and inform users of directions, distances, changing conditions and features or amenities.

Formalizing a City trails representative to serve as the primary contact for the public and to coordinate the various departments involved was a consistent issue for stakeholders. This additional responsibility will be formalized within an existing position ensuring that projects are tracked and public concerns addressed. This role may also assist in organizing local associations to coordinate volunteer activities, events and fundraising. The Community Services Department currently takes on the role of trail maintenance, however does not have a defined city-wide authority or capacity to address broad issues affecting trails.

Priorities for future trail development should focus first on improving routes to schools, involving school boards to increase options for student commuting and use of trail systems.

Education on safe biking practices, and the alternatives to vehicle use should start with youth, instilling ideas in future generations who also share with their families and the broader community.

Developing programming around trails through the library, and recreation programs building upon Pumpkin Lane and Easter Story-telling programs

With general City development, trails should be incorporated into planning and design in the same way that roads and other infrastructure are required. When constructing new roads, or permitting development, there should be provisions for trail development, bicycle parking, and smooth and signed connections to existing trail routes.

The City is currently developing transportation (road and trail) standards which will incorporate trails into all future planning. This is supported by the results of the strategy.

When considering the above elements of a trail strategy it is important that the city establish timelines for each element, in order to ensure actions occur in the appropriate sequence and to provide transparency to municipal staff and the public.
The City previously considered the McMahon-Frame Lake Trail Extension within its 2018 budget and deferred action to 2019. This trail as previously identified is the foundation of the City’s broader trail network and requires action to better realize its potential role. It is not recommended that action occur until the AIWF has been established, however a commitment by the City is required in order to leverage funding and support a future trail that works with the AIWF project.

Further action for 2019 includes the integration of trail priorities within the Community Plan Update and working with schools. Integrating the role of a trail representative within the Community Services Department will support improved signage efforts, maintenance and address simple user experience concerns.

Moving forward over the next five years these immediate actions will continue, along with more supportive school and maintenance programs.

Cost Assumptions:
- McMahon-Frame Lake Trail potential costs were developed with City staff.
- Trailhead and signage costs were determined based upon the 2017 Accessibility Audit Report.
- Asphalt and paving costs based upon past budgets and industry estimates.

### Timeline Considerations

### Table 2: Implementation Plan - Time and Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>Potential Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Well Connected and Designed Network</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMahon-Frame Lake Trail – Yellowknife’s Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Work with land use partners to complete a strong trail connection to the Coop Corner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Potential Cost: $450,000 Require commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation: continuously review and consider options for priority areas, consulting with user groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On-going process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsive and Sustainable Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve maintenance programs and activity (safety) along Frame Lake Trail and along primary road corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allocated from existing budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To be incorporated within existing budgets and through coordination with other City departments (Public Works and Engineering, Public Safety and Policy, Communications and Economic Development)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clearing and sanding the paved Frame Lk trail, clearing snow (winter) and gravel (spring) from bike lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address ‘low hanging fruit’ user experience issues, including curb cuts and asphalt cracking/repair and boardwalk and stair repairs (to be contracted out)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Curb cuts: $10,000 Asphalt Repair: $15,000 Boardwalk and stair repair: $5,000 Total Cost: $30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care for existing sidewalks, curbs, and other elements as required (face/repair, maintenance, and program for safety)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective Signage and Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve signage and wayfinding in the existing network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Install trailhead signage at Range, Frame, Jackfish, Niven, Grace, and Rat Lakes, Backbay, Rotary Park, and Tin Can Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trailhead Signage: $15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Update and replace trail wayfinding along Frame, Jackfish, Range, Grace Lakes, and Tin Can Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wayfinding sign/footprints: $7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Install painted lines on McMahon-Frame Lake Trail to avoid confrontation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Painted Bike Lanes: $2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Paint bike lanes along Kam Lk to Dehcho Blvd and to Grace Lk, and along Old Airport Rd and Bristol Ave to the airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost: $25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordinated and Accountable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalize a trail representative/contact role within the City (part-time allocation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth Focused</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritize school zones for trail development in Community Plan updates and road construction plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with schools to create education and outreach events with municipal by-law, library and recreation staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinated through trail representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with schools to create walking and biking programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holistic Approach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update the Yellowknife Community Plan and By-laws to reference active transportation and support trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Occurring and funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grow the network to serve increasing trail users and to provide additional trail opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown, to be determined with future funding or support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Expansion as funding and community support is available, connecting Grace Lk with Dehcho Blvd, Range Lk to Borden, Frame, Niven, and Jackfish with the Ski Club and Back Bay, circling Kam Lk, Rat Lk boardwalk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is the Strategy being implemented?

How should we monitor and evaluate our active transportation actions?

The implementation of any strategy requires participants to revisit initial goals and targets on an annual or regular basis, in order to ensure efforts remain appropriate and effective. This evaluation is not intended to be a burden on the delivery of programs, and does not assign blame or fault, however is a proactive management tool for the delivery of an improved trail system.

6.1 Monitoring Plan

The City of Yellowknife has in the past undertaken trail projects that residents have not supported in design, use or maintenance. The Trail Enhancement and Connectivity Strategy seeks to ensure that current and new trails, and their users are monitored and evaluated to ensure goals for improved trail connectivity and enhanced user experiences are being met. These evaluation processes are continuous and supportive, creating baseline information on current users and their experiences on trail networks.

Municipal staff can initiate a monitoring and evaluation process through regular communication with outside partners including the Ecology North Transportation Issues Committee, Mountain Bike Club, Territorial Department of Lands, Ski Club, YK Multi-Sport, Great Slave Snowmobile Club and the YKDFN. Further, businesses in the community which make use of the trails network for recreational pursuits or tourism should also be regularly engaged.

Indicators will also be necessary to show continued improvement or changes in the trail system. Examples of such indicators are provided in Table 3. Collection of public input on trail use, may follow the process undertaken within this report (Appendix A, and B), or any number of simple surveying tools. Trail systems within Yellowknife are highly valued for their commuting and recreational opportunities, and strong interest and support from the community was noted throughout the strategy’s survey process. Seeking resident responses to supplement stakeholder group opinions on an annual or biannual basis would not be overly burdensome for City staff.

Such information connects Council decisions and City actions to the resident users, fulfilling mandates for improved transparency and accountability. The result is a system of infrastructure that resident’s desire, businesses can make use of and the broader City benefits from.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>METRIC</th>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
<th>BASELINE</th>
<th>TARGET (2023)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KM OF CITY TRAILS</td>
<td>Total km of trails</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>2018 CityExplorer</td>
<td>27.5km (10% growth in 5 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- BIKE RACKS</td>
<td>Total # of bike racks</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>2018 CityExplorer</td>
<td>(85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- BENCHES</td>
<td>Total # of benches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PUBLIC WASHROOMS</td>
<td>Total # of public washrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODE SHARE</td>
<td>% who use AT to commute</td>
<td>Every 5 Years</td>
<td>Canada Census 2016</td>
<td>An increase (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIKE FRIENDLY TRANSIT</td>
<td>Bicycles permitted on buses</td>
<td>Annual until instituted</td>
<td>Not currently used</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A

Summary Report from Yellowknife Trail Enhancement and Connectivity Strategy Survey
A public survey was prepared in conjunction with open house consultation amongst Yellowknife residents, seeking feedback on use and priorities for improving the City's trails system. 101 responses were received over 11 days from October 11th through 21st, 2018. The responses received are noted below:

Responses are supportive of active transportation options with 66.2 and 53.8% of 100 noting active transportation rates of commuting to work by walking and bicycle respectively. These rates of response, demonstrate that active transportation modes of travel were over-represented in the survey, in comparison to 2016 census data which reported nearly 23% of residents walking or biking to work.

Seasonal variation in commuting options is expected for Yellowknife, given extreme variation in climate and light. Once again results demonstrate that active transportation is over-reported in comparison to the community average with responses suggesting walking rates of 72% and biking or any other vehicle commuting averaging 20 to 22% in the survey responses received. While no Statistics Canada Census information is provided on seasonal variation in commuting, it is expected that modes of commuting would not vary significantly from census reports which suggest active transportation rates of approximately 23% walking and biking combined.
Respondents generally reported that trails were used for slightly more recreational reasons (77.4%) than simply commuting (74.2%), and other social uses, clubs or private organization use was limited (16.1%).

Respondents reported a range of trails used, with additional trails outside of the scope of this review also reporting use. The most frequently used trails are McMahon-Frame Lake Trail (100%), Niven Lake Trail (83.1%), Tin Can Hill Trails (71.1%).
Respondents generally reported very high accessibility to work and shopping through active transportation, although as noted in earlier questions, respondents do not represent the census area averages as reported in the 2016 census.

Reasons for why active transportation could not be used for commuting to work, shopping or other services are a collection of varying responses. Answers vary due to the personal circumstances (children, distance, time available) and infrastructure (no trails, no lighting, too dangerous), along with respondents residential location. It is of note that equipment availability and presence of trails are the least frequently noted concerns and limitation on active transportation use.

Responses to this qualitative survey question noted that perceived limitations to trail use in Yellowknife are more a function of City infrastructure limitations (100) than personal limitations (0). The survey respondent demographic is more likely to already be using the trail network, than the broader average and these rates may therefore be affected by existing interest.
Part 2

Subsequent questions relate to specific infrastructure gaps that are noted in Yellowknife. These include the completion of the McMahon-Frame Lake Trail and connections through the intersection of Old Airport Road, Franklin Avenue, Kam Lake Road and Taylor Road.

![Graph showing responses to the McMahon-Frame Lake Trail extension question]

Respondents were very supportive of the completion of the McMahon-Frame Lake Trail between the new Stanton Hospital and the Co-op Corner. Providing paving and lighting to the same standard as the existing trail were the most common responses (68.4%) with options for a gravel extension (24.1%) and opposition (13.9%) being considerably less. Comments to this question note an interest in allowing for the existing recreational trail to remain (4), that the cost of improvements is too high and the trail should remain as is (3), and the importance of improving connections to Borden Drive and Byrne Road (2).

![Graph showing responses to the McMahon-Frame Lake Trail improvement question]

Approximately half of respondents (52.1%) noted that no other changes are necessary on the McMahon-Frame Lake Trail, while the other half of respondents noted that signage (10), safety/lighting/bylaw enforcement (8), improved maintenance (9), and general route improvements are needed to make the system easier to navigate.
Responses to the question of how the Old Airport Road, Taylor Road, Kam Lake Road and Franklin Avenue intersection could be improved were extremely varied, however it was noted that there is a high interest in making changes to this intersection, as noted by 63% of respondents.

Individual suggestions included the installation of a round-about (3), tunnels or overpasses for bikes and pedestrians (5), improved bike lanes, paint markings through the intersection (14), improved pedestrian lighting, scramble crossings and alternative routes to the multiplex and fieldhouse (12). Some respondents (5) noted that with recent construction on the intersection in the summer of 2018, further improvements are unnecessary and will need to wait until future construction occurs.

Part 3

The remaining 3 questions relate to the general trail network and offer an opportunity for residents to provide general feedback on what trail system they would like to see in Yellowknife.

Responses noted that Multi-use pathways (3m wide paved routes) are the preferred model of bike trails and bike lanes (painted on road routes) also receiving higher support. Additional comments were varied but noted that recreational trails (ex. Tin Can Hill) are cheaper and beneficial than expensive options, and that bicycles should be better integrated with vehicles in a safe and visible way, allowing pedestrians to use the other trails.
This general question sought answers on how residents would like to improve the Yellowknife trail network. Responses varied from specific requests for ice skating on Frame Lake, trail connections from Parker Park to Lovell Court to more general ideas of recognizing Yellowknife as a Winter City, extending ski trails to the ski club, supporting snowmobile commuting and providing improved trail connections to the airport and Fred Henne Park.

What should be the priority for Active Transportation improvements?

The final question requested identification of trail priorities. Responses were very general and varied slightly from the responses to previous questions:

- Safety
- Safe intersections and bike lanes
- Supporting bike rental programs
- Driver education
- Safe access to schools
- Waterfront trail extensions
- Trail connectivity and signage
- Access around the Hospital
Appendix B

Summary Report from Yellowknife Trail Enhancement and Connectivity Strategy Public Consultation
Summary Report from Yellowknife Trail Enhancement and Connectivity Strategy
Public Consultation

The preparation of the Trail Enhancement and Connectivity Strategy required public support and direction in order to ensure that the resultant trail infrastructure is desired by the community. The City of Yellowknife therefore made Community Engagement a priority for the preparation of a Trails Strategy, incorporating a variety of methods for connecting with community groups, interested residents and involved businesses. A record of this engagement is included below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Chambers, City Hall</td>
<td>October 11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, 2018; 11am – 1pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplex Arena</td>
<td>October 11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, 2018; 7 – 9pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PlaceSpeak - Survey</td>
<td>October 10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; – October 21&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of Yellowknife Staff aided in the preparation of materials and survey questions and attended the events. Additional support was provided by the Government of the Northwest Territories, Department of Lands at public open houses.

Figure 1: Existing Yellowknife Trail Network

Figure 2: Publically Amended Trail Network
Materials provided in Open House Sessions One and Two, directed participants to consider the current trails, and propose amendments to this system, identifying gaps and opportunities throughout the city. Further, the McMahon-Frame Lake Trail was showcased as a priority route that requires attention where specific feedback on a new potential accessible trail route was sought. Participants were encouraged to mark-up a provided trail network map, with ideas and dreams for the cities trail system. Additional post-it notes were provided for participants to explain ideas and speak to specific concerns.

Attendance in the Open House Session’s was approximately 10 and 20 at the Council Chambers and Multiplex respectively. Residents were noted as being vocal and engaged in the topic, taking time to review material and think through their use of the existing trail network. Average times for participants engaging with the consultation team was approximately 20 minutes, with significant and informed discussions.

Comments provided in the Amended Trail Network Image (Fig. 2) include:

- Signage needed on Jackfish Lake Trails
- Wayfinding signage needed around Frame Lake Trail
- Kam Lake Road Multi-use Path signage needed acknowledging that this is a shared bike and pedestrian route
- Better skiing (trail) connections are needed on Tin Can Hill to access Con Mine and Great Slave Lake
- Need a boardwalk along Rate Lake (3)
- Restrict motorized access to Tin Can Hill
- Restrict development at Tin Can Hill (no Twin Pine development)
- Improve connections through Con Mine

Figure 3: Proposed McMahon-Frame Lake Trail Extension Public Comments
- The bike path on 52nd Street is dangerous and a waste of money – a painted line would have been fine
- Install proper trails on both sides of Franklin between School Draw Avenue and William McDonald High School.
- Franklin/Old Airport Road intersection is hard to get across for kids, consider a crossing that makes it easier for kids to cross to the multiplex
- Need dirt bike trails
- Need winter trails, skiing, fat biking, skateways
- Groomed ski trails on Frame Lake open to skiing to all neighbourhoods, keep it up!
- Groom the Fred Henne Campground for skiing (would be dog friendly)
- Niven Lake Townhomes require trail improvements to Back Bay
- Fairly impassable trail on north side of Frame Lake
- Make trails more mountain bike friendly (with ramps)
- Improve access to Range Lake Trail – it’s beautiful but no one knows about it
- More trails on Grace Lake
- Construct new recreational trail around Kam Lake
- Connect Taylor Road to Frame Lake Trail (wider sidewalk/cycling lanes along Forrest Drive)
- Narrow the crossing and install traffic calming at Niven Crossing
- Install traffic calming and street-scaping of 50A Avenue to support biking
- Freshen up signs and trail around Back Bay Cemetary
- Could install signposts and improve trail between Dehcho Boulevard, Parker Park and North Borden subdivision with signage needed.
- Connect Fred Henne with Jackfish Lake trails
- Connect and encircle the Ski Club with summer/winter trails
- Fix Old Airport/Franklin Intersection

Additional comments specific to the McMahon-Frame Lake Trail extension were generally supportive and understanding of the need for accessibility considerations. Environmental Impacts were encouraged to be minimized and other connections (to Borden and Byrne) were encouraged to occur at the same time.

- Better bike route from Borden
- Work with GNWT to improve the wooden boardwalk between the hospital and Staples
- Check curbs for bike access (create smooth curb ramps at the end of Byrne Road)
- Pave the route to coop corner as it is a key commuter route
  - Don’t blast
    - But ensure trail is accessible... (minimal blasting)
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MEMORANDUM TO COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE: Governance and Priorities
DATE: November 26, 2018
DEPARTMENT: Community Services

RECOMMENDATION:

BACKGROUND:
In 2017 the Federal government announced the second national Homelessness Partnering Strategy (HPS) Point-in-time (PiT) Count. Along with the announcement, funding was provided to assist communities in carrying out the PiT Count events as well as for training of the organizers and the staff or volunteers that will be carrying out the work.

The funding included some strict parameters such as carrying out the PiT Count during a specified range of time (March to April 2018) the use of specified questions as provided by the Federal government and the sharing of results nationally. The Yellowknife Community Advisory Board on Homelessness (CAB) reviewed the opportunity to participate in the PiT Count and supported the necessary endorsement.

A PiT Count Steering Committee was established and included representatives from the CAB, Department of Justice, NWT Housing Corporation, Safe Harbour Day Shelter and the Bureau of Statistics. The Steering Committee was instrumental in moving the project forward by recommending, to the CAB, the methodology to be utilized for the PiT Count, reviewing the questions provided by the Federal government and altering within the stated limits, as well as identifying the training required for volunteers and staff.

The purpose of the PiT Count is to obtain a snapshot of sheltered and unsheltered individuals and families in a community at a particular point-in-time. The City, through the CAB participated in the first
PiT Count in 2015, however due to the time of year that was specified by the Federal government (February) the dates in Yellowknife were altered to May. For the 2018 PiT Count, the Federal government took this into account and moved the timing to a time where the weather would be more cooperative for the northern communities. Over time, the various counts will allow for the development of a better understanding of homelessness issues as well as an evaluation tool to measure the progress in reducing homelessness.

The various communities that have chosen to participate in the National PiT Count were required to submit the completed reports to the Federal government which will assist in identifying the magnitude of the homelessness issue on a national scale.

**COUNCIL POLICY / RESOLUTION OR GOAL:**

Council Goal # 1. Better Engagement with Stakeholders

**APPLICABLE LEGISLATION, BY-LAWS, STUDIES, PLANS:**

N/A

**CONSIDERATIONS:**

Financial Considerations
Funding from the Federal government in the amount of $23,181.30 was provided to cover all the costs associated with carrying out a PiT Count including training of staff and volunteers; materials and supply costs for the day of the Count; the provision of properly trained on-site counselors; and, the administrative time required for the planning, implementation and evaluation of the event.

At a recent Federal and Territorial government announcement held in Yellowknife regarding the Federal funding of homelessness, it was announced that funding under the Federal Homelessness funding program will be linked to the recently completed PiT Count.

Comparative Information
The 2015 PiT Count was carried out in May and included three magnet events around the community. A magnet event is one that is designed to attract those that are sheltered and unsheltered by providing them a particular opportunity. The Steering Committee for 2018 reviewed the report from 2015 and recommended the same methodology for this most recent Count along with some improvements.

There were three events in 2015 which included a barbeque during a weekday at three locations including downtown, the Co-op corner and at the YWCA. The recommendations from 2015 were considered by the Steering Committee and for the 2018 Count it was determined magnet events were the preferred methodology with some changes. Specifically, the locations selected were specific to where the homeless individuals and families would congregate and not be interfered with by those not experiencing homelessness. It was also determined that the shelter staff would offer a more familiar face rather than the use of a large number of volunteers when conducting the PiT Count survey.

The 2018 magnet events were held at the Safe Harbour Day Shelter, Side Door Youth Centre and the Salvation Army on Sunday, April 22, 2018, the YWCA conducted the family magnet event on Monday April 23, 2018. This alteration to the locations and day proved to be successful as it allowed for a more
thorough and meaningful PiT Count to unfold. During the event participants were provided with a lunch and grocery store gift cards. There were other services provided at the Side Door Youth Centre specific to needs of the youth. There were some key findings to be considered that came out of the 2015 report recommendations which included: mandatory comprehensive training, there were two three-hour training sessions for all volunteers and staff, in addition the methodology was expanded to include working with the outreach workers and counting families in transitional housing. This resulted in more families being counted in 2015 where there was 132 enumerated and in 2018 there was 338 enumerated.

In 2015 the PiT Count report was presented to the CAB where it was reviewed and then presented to Council for approval. The 2018 PiT Count report was presented to the CAB in September 2018 however due to issues with quorum, the CAB has not officially endorsed the Report. Since first distributing the Report in September, there have been no comments received from CAB members regarding the content or the results indicated in the Report. The Report will remain on the CAB agenda until such time that CAB has had the opportunity to discuss it in a formal meeting.

Indigenous Relations
The training that was provided to staff indicated that with the nature of questions and the subject matter being addressed through the interview process, there is a high probability that many individuals may be triggered by past traumatic events in their lives. This was highlighted through the indigenous lens of reconciliation and residential school survivors and it was suggested that proper measures be in place to address these issues as they may arise.

The Steering Committee took the steps to address this issue by ensuring that Indigenous Counselors were on hand at the Safe Harbour Day Shelter and the Salvation Army during the Count. The Side Door Youth Centre and the YWCA specifically indicated that due to the nature of the relationship between the staff and their clients, no additional care would be required.

**ALTERNATIVES TO RECOMMENDATION:**
That Council refers the 2018 Yellowknife Point-in-Time Count Technical Report to the Yellowknife Community Advisory Board on Homelessness for approval.

**RATIONALE:**
The PiT Count Report was due to be submitted to the Federal government in September of this year. At this point, the Report has not been submitted due to issues with the CAB not being able to achieve quorum since August of this year. The report has not been officially adopted and presented to Council by CAB, however the members have had the Report in-hand since August and no comments have been received. The adoption of the Report will remain on the CAB agenda until the opportunity to deliberate the issue has been met.

At a recent Federal and Territorial government announcement held in Yellowknife regarding the Federal funding of homelessness, it was announced that funding under the Federal Homelessness funding program will be linked to the recently completed PiT Count. This lends to the urgency to have the Report submitted to the Federal government in a timely manner as the current funding program expires March 31, 2019.
ATTACHMENTS:

2018 Yellowknife Point-in-Time Homeless Count Technical Report and Summary (DM# 531698)
Prepared: November 19, 2018; GW
KEY FINDINGS

THE PIT COUNT SERVES AS CRITICAL PART OF YELLOWKNIFE'S RESPONSE TO HOMELESSNESS. CONDUCTING PIT COUNTS ENABLES THE COMMUNITY TO MEASURE PROGRESS IN REDUCING HOMELESSNESS, PARTICULARLY AS MORE HOUSING FIRST PROGRAMS ARE IMPLEMENTED.

338 people counted as experiencing homelessness during the 2018 Yellowknife Point-in-Time (PIT) Homeless Count.

NOTABLE FINDINGS

HIGH NUMBERS OF CHILDREN AND YOUTH.
There were 42% of those enumerated who were youth (up to 24 years old). Of these, 104 were children under 18.

INDIGENOUS PEOPLE ARE SIGNIFICANTLY OVERREPRESENTED.
With 90% reporting Indigenous identity in the survey data, this is a significant over-representation compared to the overall Yellowknife population at 23%.

PEOPLE WANT TO BE HOUSED.
Of those enumerated, 95% said they want permanent housing.

MIGRATION FROM OTHER N.W.T. COMMUNITIES IS A MAJOR DRIVER.
The majority of people arriving (68%) are from other communities within N.W.T. The top three communities from which the highest frequency of people migrated from are Behchoko, Hay River and Fort Smith. Many respondents arrive from smaller settlements throughout the N.W.T. The remainder (32%) of people arrive from other provinces in Canada particularly Kugluktuk and Edmonton.

UNAFFORDABLE HOUSING AND LOW INCOMES PLAY KEY ROLES. The most common reasons reported for becoming homeless were inability to pay rent/mortgage, addiction or substance use, conflict with spouse/partner, and job loss. Low income and high rent are the top two challenges with seeking housing.

MOST WERE CHRONICALLY HOMELESS.
In fact, 75% of those enumerated were experiencing chronic homelessness according to the federal definition.

MOST ARE MIGRANTS TO YELLOWKNIFE.
Only 16% reported being from Yellowknife; about a third (36%) of survey participants had arrived in the past 5 years. The top reasons people reported for migrating is connecting with families and employment.
**KEY DEMOGRAPHICS**

**GENDER**
- Females were slightly more prevalent (50%) in the homeless population than males (48%), as a result of under 18s being included in the dataset.

**AGE (survey data)**
- 90% of individuals in total self-reported as having served in the Canadian military and/or the RCMP.

**METHODS REFINEMENT**

In comparison to 2015, the 2018 count showed a significantly higher total enumerated (19 vs 338). Note that the cause of this increase is a change in methodology that better accounts for dependents and children (under 18 years), and additional facilities in the data set, which caused undercounting in 2015.

Because of these changes in methods, it is not possible to accurately compare 2015 to 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsheltered</td>
<td>Unsheltered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure (multiple response)</td>
<td>Respondent Unsure (likely Homeless)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency shelter</td>
<td>Emergency Shelter, Domestic Violence Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couchsurfing</td>
<td>Provisionally Accommodated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported Living</td>
<td>No answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Motel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 2018 Children/dependents inherited Family Head responses for this survey question. Percentages rounded, thus may not add to 100%.

Nationally, there were methods implemented through the Homelessness Partnering Strategy and the Canadian Observatory on Homelessness that had not been adopted in previous provincial counts (i.e. conducting a tally of observed homelessness or using honoraria for count participants). Advancements in the core questions that we also introduced nationally differed from previous counts.
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KEY FINDINGS

How Many:

There were 338 people counted as experiencing homelessness during the 2018 Yellowknife Point-in-Time (PiT) Homeless Count. The PiT Count serves as critical part of Yellowknife’s response to homelessness. Conducting PiT Counts enables the community to measure progress as a response to homelessness and to target housing and support programs.

Notable Findings

- **High numbers of children and youth.** There were 42% of those enumerated who were youth (up to 24 years old). Of these, 104 were children under 18.
- **Unaffordable housing and low incomes play key roles.** The most common reasons reported for becoming homeless were inability to pay rent/mortgage, addiction or substance use, conflict with spouse/partner, and job loss. Low income and high rent are the top two challenges with seeking housing.
- **People want to be housed.** Of those enumerated, 95% said they want permanent housing.
- **Most were chronically homeless.** In fact, 75% of those enumerated were experiencing chronic homelessness according to the federal definition.
- **Indigenous people are significantly overrepresented.** With 90% reporting Indigenous identity in the survey data, this is a significant over-representation compared to the overall Yellowknife population at 23%.
- **Most are migrants to Yellowknife.** Only 16% reported being from Yellowknife; about a third (36%) of survey participants had arrived in the past five years. The top reasons people reported for migrating is connecting with families, and employment.
- **Migration from other NWT communities is a major driver.** The majority of people arriving (68%) are from other communities within NWT: the top three communities from which the highest frequency of people migrated from are Behchoko, Hay River, and Inuvik. Many respondents arrive from smaller settlements throughout the NWT. The remainder (32%) of people arrive from other provinces and territories in Canada particularly Kugluktuk, Edmonton, and Montreal.

Key Demographics

- Females were slightly more prevalent (50%) in the homeless population than males (48%), as a result of dependent children record addition.
- 42% fall into the “youth” age category: children (under 18) and young adults (18-24).\(^1\)
- Two individuals in total self-reported as having served in the Canadian military and/or the RCMP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Survey Data(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\(^1\) See limitations section for dependent children deduplication process.
Methods Refinement

In comparison to 2015, the 2018 count showed a significantly higher total enumerated (139 vs 338). Note that the cause of this increase is a change in methodology that better accounts for dependents and children (under 18 years), and additional facilities in the data set, which caused undercounting in 2015.

In 2018, the count was hosted at four different facilities that service homeless individuals, the YWCA, the Salvation Army, the Day Shelter, and the Side Door. The hours and date of each count were catered to when people would be most likely to access the services. This year participants also received a $20 gift card.

In 2015, there was a public BBQ in the downtown core, which attracted a lot of non-homeless people and detracted from the count.

Because of these changes in methods, it is not possible to accurately compare 2015 to 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsheltered</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Unsheltered</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure (multiple responses)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Respondent Doesn't Know [Likely Homeless]</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency shelter</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Emergency Shelter, Domestic Violence Shelter</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couchsurfing</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Provisionally Accommodated</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported Living</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Motel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 2018 Children/dependents inherited Family Head responses for this survey question. Percentages rounded, thus may not add to 100%.

Nationally, there were methods implemented through the Homelessness Partnering Strategy and the Canadian Observatory on Homelessness that had not been adopted in previous provincial counts (i.e. conducting a tally of observed homelessness, or using honoraria for Count participants). Advancements in the core questions that were also introduced nationally differed from previous counts.

2 NOTE: Percentages calculated by removing nulls - unclear/blank responses only from survey data totals. ‘Don’t Know’ and ‘Decline to Answer’ responses have been retained. As data was rounded, it may not add to 100%.
INTRODUCTION

In February 2017, the Government of Canada announced Everyone Counts 2018, the second HPS Coordinated Point-in-Time (PiT) Count, to be held between March and April 2018. The Yellowknife Community Advisory Board (CAB) coordinated their count of homeless people as part of this 2018 National Count, and along with other participating communities nationwide, used a common set of survey questions which will contribute to an improved understanding of homelessness not just in Yellowknife, but across Canada. There were additional questions added to the survey from consultation with the PiT Committee.

This year, the Yellowknife PiT Count was conducted via youth event and adult events on April 22, 2018 and a family event on April 23, 2018.

The PiT Count in the Context of Yellowknife’s 10 Year Plan to End Homelessness

In 2017, the community launched “Everyone is Home: Yellowknife’s 10 Year Plan to End Homelessness”. Through the development of this Plan, it became evident that there are some key knowledge gaps impacting Yellowknife’s capacity to respond to homelessness. There is limited access to local data on trends, making it challenging to understand the scope of the issue and how to respond. Thus, a priority of the Plan is to improve information and knowledge about homelessness. As such, this standardized Point-in-Time Count can be leveraged to help address some of these basic knowledge gaps around homelessness in the community, evaluate progress in reducing homelessness, track demographic changes, and monitor evolving service needs in Yellowknife. The PiT Count is a critical part of Yellowknife's response to homelessness and will be held biannually moving forward.

Benefits of PiT Counts

The PiT Count provides a snapshot of sheltered and unsheltered homeless people in Yellowknife, an opportunity to educate a broad range of stakeholders regarding homelessness, and consistent data to help guide programs and services in our efforts to end homelessness. Homeless counts are one of the ways that we can determine the overall scope of homelessness and the sub-populations of people who are experiencing homelessness or who may be at risk of homelessness. This includes individuals or families who may be temporarily sheltered in various institutions like hospitals, jails, or emergency shelters.3

Improvements from 2015 PiT Count

Yellowknife held its first PiT Count in 2015, and the learnings from 2015 informed the 2018 Count.4 PiT Counts are not mandatory, but are done voluntarily by communities hoping to understand and effectively address homelessness and related issues. The PiT Count provides a vital benchmark particularly valuable in the implementation of Housing First. It enables us to speak to trends over time with confidence, and gives us a common language and information to compare successes and teachings in order to support our community in our collective efforts to end homelessness.5

---

On April 22\textsuperscript{nd}, 2018 a minimum of 338 individuals were experiencing homelessness during the Count. The City of Yellowknife recognizes that this only represents a fraction of those experiencing homelessness in Yellowknife; however, the survey data provides useful insights into the experiences of those counted.

The following data analysis allows the community to identify needs, trends, and key issues related to homelessness in Yellowknife. Policy makers, service providers, and funders will use the data to enhance planning for programs, services, and housing to end homelessness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Valid Surveys</th>
<th>Records Generated for Children/Dependents</th>
<th>Total Records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yellowknife</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**METHODOLOGY**

The methodology was determined to be three different magnet events. One for youth (ages 15-24) at the Side Door Resource Centre, one for families at the YWCA Transition Housing Program, and a third for adults in general which was held at the Safe Harbour Day Shelter. It was also decided to visit the Salvation Army the evening of April 22\textsuperscript{nd} to get any of the adults who may have been missed from the Day Shelter.

The PiT Committee consisted of three CAB members which included two sheltering agencies, a local sheltering agency the NWT Housing Corporation Homelessness Manager, GNWT Integrated Case Management Manager (Justice), a manager from the NWT Bureau of Statistics, the PiT Count Administrator, and the Community Entity’s Homelessness Coordinator/Specialist.

The 2018 PiT Count was hosted at the three venues with a magnet event which supplied food and drinks for people who attended the magnet events and a $20 grocery gift card for those who participated in the survey. This resulted in more of the hidden homeless showing up to the Safe Harbour Day shelter.

The Side Door Resource Centre also partnered with local resources such as a hair dresser who provided free hair cuts, and a tax specialist who assisted youth with filing taxes.

The hours were:

- **Side Door Resource Center** – Sunday April 22\textsuperscript{nd} from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. conducted by two staff members and food volunteers.
- **Safe Harbour Day Shelter** – Sunday April 22\textsuperscript{nd} from 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m., and 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. conducted by three staff members and three volunteers (there were two shifts of three volunteers, totalling six volunteers). There was a councillor onsite during all of the adult surveys in case there was any trauma that arose from participating in the survey, which proved helpful at the day shelter.
- **YWCA Transition Housing Program** – Monday April 23\textsuperscript{rd} between 10:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., conducted by five staff members.
- The Shelter count took place at the Salvation Army between 8:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. with four volunteer surveyors, as well as the PiT Coordinator and Councillors.
By having staff members at each of the survey sights it helped to eliminate the number of “double” surveys. Most of the staff at each location were familiar with the majority of the participants, and would let other staff or the PiT Coordinator know if the same person was attempting to take the survey twice.

2017 Canadian Definition of Homelessness

The Canadian Homelessness Research Network has released a new definition of homelessness that is based on a typology providing definitions and a range of housing situations along a homelessness continuum.

Homelessness describes the situation of someone who is without stable, permanent, and appropriate housing. Along the continuum there are four main categories of homeless: unsheltered, emergency sheltered, provisionally accommodated, and at risk of homelessness.

Please refer to Appendix A for the full definition.

The definition also identifies eight situations which could lead someone to be homeless, such as being precariously employed (part-time, temporary, low-pay) or having a serious and persistent mental illness. The goal of ending homelessness includes ensuring housing stability that includes the supports (such as supportive housing or income supports) that are required to remain permanently housed.

Based on this definition, screening questions were used to determine eligibility.

Eligibility Criteria

1. The participant had not yet completed a PiT Count Survey.
2. The participant indicated that they were without a permanent residence.
3. The participant was defined as homeless, as per the Canadian Definition of Homelessness.

In total, individuals completed the screening questions. During the data analysis anyone who failed to meet all three criteria were removed. For example, individuals who indicated they had previously completed the PiT Count Survey, or declined to answer the first question were removed:

“Where are you staying tonight?”

Additionally, individuals who indicated a history of homelessness but were currently staying in a permanent residence were also removed.

Limitations

1. The dataset contained a number of records that were double counted children (i.e. both parents recorded as a family head with children and thus the dependent child(ren) may have been added to the final dataset twice). Efforts to de-duplicate these focused on cross-referencing age and gender of children. Some duplicates may remain.
2. Dependents records inherited the typology question only: “Where are you staying tonight?”

---

DATA ANALYSIS

Descriptive statistics were used to describe the basic features of the data in the Count. They provide simple summaries and, together with simple graphics analysis, they present the data in a manageable form.

- Frequency distributions were used summarize and compress data by grouping it into classes (answer categories) and record how many data points fall into each class. Converting these raw numbers into percentages provides an even more useful description of the data. Percentages were calculated upon removing the null (blank/unclear) responses. ‘Don’t Know’ and ‘Decline to Answer’ responses were retained.
- Cross tabulations were used to examine the relationship between two categorical variables. For example, using the Age category as a row variable and Gender as a column variable, a two-dimensional cross tabulation is generated that shows the number of males and females in each age category. Again, converting these raw numbers into percentages provides an even more useful description of the data.

Web mapping was also implemented this year: using an online template with a base map, additional data content (i.e. web services, shapefiles, and the Microsoft Excel spreadsheet of the survey data) were combined to create an interactive map.

Click to access:

2018 Yellowknife PIT Count Mapping Application
2018 COUNT RESULTS

338 individuals were enumerated during Yellowknife’s 2018 Point-in-Time Homeless Count. Looking at the data per capita, Yellowknife has a rate of 17 individuals experiencing homelessness per 1,000. The most recent available population data was obtained from the Statistics Canada 2016 Census.

Table 2: Individuals Experiencing Homelessness Per 1,000 Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>2018 Survey, Facility, System Data</th>
<th>2016 Census Population</th>
<th>2018 ate per 1,000 People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yellowknife</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>19,569</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than half of the population counted as experiencing homelessness in Yellowknife were provisionally accommodated (63%), followed by those staying at an emergency shelter (28%). People reporting to be unsheltered (5%) and also not knowing where they would stay that night (4%) make up the remaining percentages.

Table 3: Survey - Sheltered Status of Homeless Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yellowknife</th>
<th>Unsheltered</th>
<th>Unknown (respondent likely homeless)</th>
<th>Emergency Sheltered</th>
<th>Provisionally Accommodated (Couch Surfing and Transitional Housing)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Children/dependents inherited family head of household records.

Contextualizing the Findings

While there were advancements in the methodology between the 2015 and 2018 counts, proportional differences in demographics can be observed.

Table 4: PIT Count Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yellowknife PIT Count</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2018^</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18*</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2018 dependent children demographic records added to database based on family head of household response.

^ ‘Declined to Answer’ and ‘Don't Know’ retained; and Nulls (blanks/unclear) removed from total for percentage calculations.
Population
NWT's population has remained stable through the 2011 and 2016 population census, with a growth rate dropping to near zero (0.8%). Statistics Canada reported 41,786 residents in 2016, up from 41,462 in 2011.\(^7\)

Yellowknife, the territory's capital, saw a net increase of 335 new residents over the five-year period.

The land area of Yellowknife is 105.47 square kilometres, and the population density was 185.5 people per square kilometre. In 2016, there were 7,131 private dwellings occupied in Yellowknife, which represent a change of 2.8% from 2011.\(^8\)

Migration between communities may explain the territory's stable population overall.\(^9\)

Housing Affordability
Affordability issues continued to rise across the territory in 2018, and Yellowknife observed an increase in Core Housing Need from 10.1% in 2011 to 10.7% in 2016.

Further context is provided in the CMHC 2018 Northern Housing Report\(^10\)

- Average rent (2BR): $1,699
- Vacancy rate: 3.5%
- Total title transfers: 454
- Total starts: 65

Housing Policy
The Northwest Territories Housing Corporation (NWTHC) provides assistance both to renters and homeowners. NWTHC assistance comes in several forms; the most supportive being significantly reduced rents in social housing, while the most modest is the Transitional Rent Supplement Program (TRSP). Under this program, households that earn under $70,000 and pay over 30% of their income in rent are eligible to have their rent subsidized by up to $500 a month.

Previously, the program only provided a subsidy for two years, but the NWTHC decided to extend the program in 2017 due to ongoing affordability problems. The NWTHC hopes this program will provide better support for eligible households in core housing need. Increased uptake could lower vacancy rates in larger-sized units as renters move into accommodations that are of an appropriate size that have become financially available to them.

Rental Market
Despite weaker employment conditions, the overall vacancy rate increased since the last count to 3.5%.

New Home Markets
New construction in Yellowknife was weak overall in 2017, trailing a strong 2016. There were 49% fewer units started in 2017 compared to 2016.

Figure 1: Housing Trends since 2015 (Previous Pit Count)\(^11\)

---


## Yellowknife Forecast Summary 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018(F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Home Market</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Starts (units)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Detached Starts</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Starts</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Real Estate Transactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential sales</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average price ($)</td>
<td>417,000</td>
<td>395,500</td>
<td>408,290</td>
<td>384,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rental Market (October Survey)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment Vacancy Rate (%)</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Two-Bedroom Apartment Rent ($)</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>1,699</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CMHC, CMHC Forecast

*It is possible that the low and the high end of forecast ranges for housing starts for singles and multiples jointly may not add up to the total. This is caused by rounding as well as the volatility of the data.*

2018 KEY DEMOGRAPHICS AND CHARACTERISTICS

The following section presents the 2018 findings on key demographics and characteristics. Records categorized as Unknown (Do Not Know and Decline to Answer) and Null values have been removed to calculate percentages.

Gender and Sexual Orientation

This year’s survey included two new questions regarding sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI). In Yellowknife, females (50%) were slightly more prevalent than males (48%), and transgender individuals accounted for 0.3% of the homeless population in Yellowknife.

Figure 2: Survey – Gender Identity

During the Count, 4% of individuals identified as LGBTQ2S+ in Yellowknife. This may have been a challenging question to administer, given the 4% declining to answer.

Table 5: Survey – Sexual Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yellowknife</th>
<th>Straight/ Heterosexual</th>
<th>Bisexual</th>
<th>Not Listed</th>
<th>Decline to Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age

Not including dependent children, the average age of the survey respondents was 39 years old with a minimum age of 16 years, and a maximum age of 78 years.

These individuals also indicated their age when they had their first homelessness experience: 27 years old was the average for this group.

Looking at the entire population, including dependent children enumerated that night, 10% of the sample were young adults aged 18-24 years, and 23% were 45 years or older.

Combining the number of children under 18 and young adults results in 42% of those enumerated falling into the “youth” age category.
Looking at respondents who reported their age, across age groups, males emerge as slightly more prevalent, as some women declined to divulge their age.

**Figure 4: Survey - Gender and Age**

Indigenous Peoples

In 2016, there were 4,460 Indigenous people in Yellowknife, making up 23% of the population. With 90% reporting Indigenous identity in the survey data, this is a significant over-representation compared to the overall Yellowknife population.

**Figure 5: Survey – Indigenous Groups**

Participants who identified as Indigenous were asked what community they were from. The top 10 communities were all in the NWT and Nunavut.

**Figure 6: Survey – Top 10 Indigenous Communities**
Education

More than 60% have not completed their high school education. Research indicates that individuals with lower educational attainment are at higher risk of unemployment, underemployment, and poverty.\(^\text{12}\)

Figure 7: Survey – Education

For many homeless youth and children, homelessness can disrupt their efforts to stay in school and often leads to dropping out despite their desires to remain in school.

Table 6: Survey - Highest Level of Education and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Primary School</th>
<th>Some High School</th>
<th>High School Graduate / GED</th>
<th>Some Post-Secondary</th>
<th>Post-Secondary Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 to 17</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 24</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 44</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 64</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Foster Care

34% stated they had been in foster care or a group home.

---

Immigration and Migration

Approximately one third (36%) of survey participants had arrived in the past five years.

Figure 8: Survey – Length of time in Yellowknife

A very small number (six) indicated that they had come to Canada as an immigrant or refugee, representing just 2% of the total responses to this question.

Figure 9: Survey – Immigrants and Refugees as a percent of the valid responses in 2018

Migration is defined as individuals who moved to their respective city in the past year. Forty-three people had moved to Yellowknife within the past year.

Figure 10 shows where people arrived from regardless of timeframe. The majority of people arriving (68%) are from communities within NWT (intraprovincial/territorial migration). The top three communities from which the highest frequency of people migrated from are Behchoko, Hay River, and Fort Smith. Many respondents arrived from smaller settlements throughout the NWT.

The remainder (32%) of people arrived from other provinces/ cities in Canada (interprovincial/territorial migration), e.g. Kugluktuk, Edmonton, and Montreal were the main towns from which people arrived.

Figure 10: Survey – Intraprovincial and Interprovincial Arrivals
What is the main reason you came to Yellowknife?

This was an optional question suggested by the Canadian Observatory on Homelessness in order to capture reasons for migration into various communities. As noted in the figure below, the top reasons concern connecting with families and employment.

Figure 11: Survey – Reasons for Coming to Yellowknife

Chronic Homelessness

For Yellowknife, 75% are experiencing chronic homelessness according to the federal definition; 3% are episodic, and 16% are transitional. This is similar to the 2015 results.
Over half of the population (64%) counted as experiencing homelessness were reported to have stayed at an emergency shelter in the last 12 months. For those who chose not stay in a shelter, their main reason for doing so was that they preferred to stay with family or friends.

Service in the Canadian Forces and RCMP

In 2018, the survey asked if an individual had served in the Canadian military or the RCMP. Two individuals out of the 224 completed responses to this question (less than 1%) self-reported as having served in the Canadian military and/or the RCMP.

Children and Families

Those who participated in the surveys administered were asked additional questions about accompanying family members and dependents. Seventy Yellowknife YWCA respondents, and two respondents at other locations reported at least one child living with them at the time of the PiT Count. Upon further investigation, some of the 70 YWCA individuals were two parents in one family, and children were added twice to the dataset. De-duplication efforts focused on reviewing the dependents for the same gender, age, and ethnicity reported by heterosexual parents. Parent records were joined resulting in 54 families. Duplicate dependents were removed (33 records in total).

Table 7: Dataset - Families and Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Children Under 18</th>
<th>Number of Dependents Over 18</th>
<th>Total Dependents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54 families</td>
<td>YWCA</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 families</td>
<td>SideDoor, Safe Harbour Day, Salvation Army</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the uncertainty with the de-duplication and the higher-than-expected number of children reported this year in the 2018 PiT Count, further analysis is problematic.

Reasons for Loss of Housing

The 2018 survey asked individuals about the cause(s) of their most recent loss of housing. In many cases, there are multiple reasons, and thus this was a multiple-response question, and percentages will not
The most common reasons were inability to pay rent/mortgage, addiction or substance use, conflict with spouse/partner, and job loss.

**Figure 13: Survey – Reasons for Housing Loss**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unable to Pay Rent / Mortgage</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addiction or Substance Abuse</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict with: Spouse / Partner</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Loss</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe Housing Conditions</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Abuse by: Spouse / Partner</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness or Medical Condition</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict with: Parent / Guardian</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evicted</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Had Housing</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Passed Away</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarcerated (Jail or Prison)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Abuse by: Parent / Guardian</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Obstacles to Finding Housing**

Low income and high rent are the top two challenges with seeking housing. Ninety-five percent want permanent housing.

**Figure 14: Survey – Housing Challenges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacle</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Too High</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addiction</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Income Assistance</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Breakdown / Conflict</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal History</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/ Disability Issues</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Housing Conditions</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Issues</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pets</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 15: Survey – Permanent Housing Desired**
What resources do you need to get a place of your own?

The word cloud gives greater prominence to words that appear more frequently among the respondents’ detailed answers to this question.

*Figure 16: Survey – Resources Required*
**Income Sources**

The 2018 survey asked individuals about their main source or sources of income. As there can be multiple income sources for individuals, this was a multiple-response question, and percentages will not total 100. In Yellowknife, the most common sources were welfare or social assistance, GST Refunds, formal employment, and Child and Family tax benefits.

*Figure 17: Survey – Income Sources*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welfare / Social Assistance</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GST Refund</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child and Family Tax Benefits</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal / Self-Employment (e.g., Bottle...)</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money from Family / Friends</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Benefit</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Insurance</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors Benefits (e.g., CPP/OAS/GIS)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Health and Justice Contact**

Forty-six percent of respondents reported health system contact. These individuals visited the ER three times on average, and some have been hospitalized four times on average. No full days in hospital were recorded.

Thirty-three percent of respondents reported justice system contact. These individuals interacted with police 10 times on average, and some have been to prison or jail two times on average. No full days in prison were recorded.
KEY LEARNINGS

The 2018 PiT Count was based on learning from the 2015 PiT Count. In 2015 the count was held at a large downtown BBQ during noon hour that attracted a lot of the downtown working population. It was determined that there many homeless who did not attend the BBQ and actually sat across the street at the post office and watched the BBQ take place. This also caused some issues, as there were many volunteers that could have possibly double counted observed homeless. There were also issues with volunteers all administering the survey in different manners, and many of the completed surveys being unusable as they were not completed properly.

In 2018 the PiT Committee met several times and discussed each question with the PiT Coordinator. It was determined that there would be a qualified trainer hired to train survey volunteers, walk through the whole survey, and ensure that all volunteers have a good understanding of the survey and why it is important. This took place through two, separate three-hour training sessions.

The 2015 PiT Count utilized 38 volunteers for the survey and BBQ, while the 2018 Count Utilized 10 volunteer surveyors as well as sheltering staff members and five food volunteers. In 2018 there were also counsellors who were available at both the Day Shelter and the Salvation Army for any people who needed help after the survey.

Moving towards the HPS methods (aligning with national definitions and data collection) resulted in ...

- Larger sample of those experiencing homelessness is Yellowknife;
- Understating the age ranges and genders of those experiencing homelessness;
- More closely estimate the total size of the homeless population living in Yellowknife;
- Track changes in the demographics of those experiencing homelessness in Yellowknife;
- Begin to measure our progress towards ending homelessness;
- Get an understanding of shelter use from those who use it; and
- Understanding how participants are supporting themselves (income sources).

For 2020:

1. Interview the family and record children under the Family Head; record once; do not assign the second parent as Family Head.
2. Administrative data – HIFIS. To work with HIFIS 4.0 and work from tablets to instantly record results
3. Work with service providers to ensure that we are not “doubling” the people we count
4. Ensure the next PiT Count is culturally appropriate
CONCLUSION

This 2018 Point-in-Time Count was a collaborative effort undertaken by members of the City of Yellowknife’s CAB on Homelessness and the City of Yellowknife over the course of several months. Efforts to align Count methods with the National Point-in-Time Count resulted in methodologic advancements from 2015.

A total of 338 individuals were identified as experiencing homelessness. Breakdowns in proportions of women, Indigenous persons, veterans, and immigrants were similar to those seen in 2015.

The number of youth recorded this year warrants further investigation.

Coordinating a Point-in-Time Count is a significant undertaking requiring considerable investments of time, research, and discussion from all involved. Within Yellowknife there is significant engagement around planning and the execution of the Count, which is informed by past methodology and local circumstances.
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# GLOSSARY

## Table 8: List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Organization or Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAB</td>
<td>City of Yellowknife Community Advisory Board on Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COH</td>
<td>Canadian Observatory on Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCMP</td>
<td>Royal Canadian Mounted Police</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table 9: Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>An individual 18 years of age or older (where noted, this may include youth between the ages of 18-24).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependents/Children</td>
<td>Individuals who a caregiver indicated would be staying with them on the night of the Count.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelters</td>
<td>Overnight accommodation for individuals who have no permanent address.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Count</td>
<td>The total number of individuals approached who reported not having a permanent place to stay on the night of Count day plus the total number of individuals staying at a shelter on the previous night. Both figures also include the number of children staying with an adult caregiver on the night of the Count.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>A respondent was classified as “Indigenous” if they identified as First Nations, Métis, Inuit, non-status, or as having Indigenous ancestry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Homeless</td>
<td>Homeless individuals counted at a shelter or in a hotel (funded by the province) on an emergency basis on the night prior to Count day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>Temporary housing with support to assist client movement into permanent housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsheltered Homeless</td>
<td>Homeless individuals counted in the Street Count (at an agency or service, on a walking route, at a bottle depot, or by outreach teams and mobile vans). Individuals enumerated in this category may be staying in motels/hotels on their own, or sleeping in a car, a tent or outside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>An individual who has previously served with the Canadian military or the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>An individual 18-24 years of age.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A: 2017 Canadian Definition of Homelessness

TYPOLOGY

The typology describes the range of accommodations that people without appropriate, stable, and permanent housing may experience. Those without acceptable housing experience a range of different types of homelessness, from being unsheltered to having housing that is insecure or inappropriate. As homelessness is not one single event or state of being, it is important to recognize that at different points in time people may find themselves experiencing different types of homelessness.

1) Unsheltered

This includes people who lack housing and are not accessing emergency shelters or accommodation, except during extreme weather conditions. In most cases, people are staying in places that are not designed for or fit for human habitation.

1.1 PEOPLE LIVING IN PUBLIC OR PRIVATE SPACES WITHOUT CONSENT OR CONTRACT

- Public space, such as sidewalks, squares, parks, forests, etc.
- Private space and vacant buildings (squatting)

1.2 PEOPLE LIVING IN PLACES NOT INTENDED FOR PERMANENT HUMAN HABITATION

- Living in cars or other vehicles
- Living in garages, attics, closets, or buildings not designed for habitation
- People in makeshift shelters, shacks, or tents

2) Emergency Sheltered

This refers to people who, because they cannot secure permanent housing, are accessing emergency shelter and system supports, generally provided at no cost or minimal cost to the user. Such accommodation represents a stop-gap institutional response to homelessness provided by government, non-profit, faith-based organizations, and/or volunteers.

2.1 EMERGENCY OVERNIGHT SHELTERS FOR PEOPLE WHO ARE HOMELESS

These facilities are designed to meet the immediate needs of people who are homeless. Such short-term emergency shelters may target specific sub-populations, including women, families, youth, or Indigenous persons for instance. These shelters typically have minimal eligibility criteria, offer shared sleeping facilities and amenities, and often expect clients to leave in the morning. They may or may not offer food, clothing, or other services. Some emergency shelters allow people to stay on an ongoing basis while others are short term and are set up to respond to special circumstances, such as extreme weather.

2.2 SHELTERS FOR INDIVIDUALS/FAMILIES IMPACTED BY FAMILY VIOLENCE

These shelters provide basic emergency and crisis services including safe accommodation, meals, information, and referral. They provide a high security environment for women (and sometimes men) and children fleeing family violence or other crisis situations. Residents are not required to leave during the day. These facilities offer private rooms for families and a range of supports to help residents rebuild their lives.
2.3 EMERGENCY SHELTER FOR PEOPLE FLEEING A NATURAL DISASTER OR DESTRUCTION OF ACCOMMODATION DUE TO FIRES, FLOODS, ETC.

3) Provisionally Accommodated

This describes situations in which people, who are technically homeless and without permanent shelter, access accommodation that offers no prospect of permanence. Those who are provisionally accommodated may be accessing temporary housing provided by government or the non-profit sector, or may have independently made arrangements for short-term accommodation.

3.1 INTERIM HOUSING FOR PEOPLE WHO ARE HOMELESS

Interim housing is a systems-supported form of housing that is meant to bridge the gap between unsheltered homelessness or emergency accommodation and permanent housing. In some cases referred to as ‘transitional housing’, this form of accommodation typically provides services beyond basic needs, offers residents more privacy, and places greater emphasis on participation and social engagement. Interim housing targets those who would benefit from structure, support, and skill building prior to moving to long-term housing stability with the ultimate goal of preventing a return to homelessness. In the case of second-stage housing for those impacted by family violence, the key characteristics of this housing are the safety and security it provides, trauma recovery supports, along with the ultimate goal of preventing re-victimization. Interim housing has time limitations on residency, but generally allows for a longer stay (in some cases up to three years) compared to emergency shelters.

3.2 PEOPLE LIVING TEMPORARILY WITH OTHERS, BUT WITHOUT GUARANTEE OF CONTINUED RESIDENCY OR IMMEDIATE PROSPECTS FOR ACCESSING PERMANENT HOUSING

Often referred to as ‘couch surfers’ or the ‘hidden homeless’, this describes people who stay with friends, family, or even strangers. They are typically not paying rent, their duration of stay is unsustainable in the long term, and they do not have the means to secure their own permanent housing in the future. They differ from those who are staying with friends or family out of choice in anticipation of prearranged accommodation, whether in their current hometown or an altogether new community. This living situation is understood by both parties to be temporary, and the assumption is that it will not become permanent.

3.3 PEOPLE ACCESSING SHORT TERM, TEMPORARY RENTAL ACCOMMODATIONS WITHOUT SECURITY OF TENURE

In some cases, people who are homeless make temporary rental arrangements, such as staying in motels, hostels, rooming houses, etc. Although occupants pay rent, the accommodation does not offer the possibility of permanency. People living in these situations are often considered to be part of the ‘hidden homeless’ population.

3.4 PEOPLE IN INSTITUTIONAL CARE WHO LACK PERMANENT HOUSING ARRANGEMENTS

Individuals are considered to be provisionally accommodated and ‘at risk’ of homelessness if there are no arrangements in place to ensure they move into safe, permanent housing upon release from institutional care. This includes individuals who:

a) were homeless prior to admittance (where their stay may be short-term or long-term) and who have no plan for permanent accommodation after release; or
b) had housing prior to admittance, but lost their housing while in institutional care; or

c) had housing prior to admittance, but cannot go back due to changes in their needs.
In either case, without adequate discharge planning and support – which includes arrangements for safe and reliable housing (and necessary aftercare or community-based services) – there is a likelihood that
these individuals may transition into homelessness following their release. Institutional care includes:

- Penal institutions
- Medical/mental health institutions
- Residential treatment programs or withdrawal management centers
- Children’s institutions/group homes

3.5 ACCOMMODATION/RECEPTION CENTERS FOR RECENTLY ARRIVED IMMIGRANTS AND REFUGEES

Prior to securing their own housing, recently arrived immigrants and refugees may be temporarily housed while receiving settlement support and orientation to life in Canada. They are considered to be homeless if they have no means or prospects of securing permanent housing.
APPENDIX B: Survey Tools

UNSHELTERED SURVEY [OVERNIGHT]

Location: ____________________________ Time: ________________ AM/PM
Interviewer: __________________________ Contact #: __________________

C. [Surveyor: Indicate overnight location]

- DECLINE TO ANSWER
- OWN APARTMENT/ HOUSE
- SOMEONE ELSE’S PLACE
- MOTEL/HOTEL
- HOSPITAL, JAIL, PRISON, REMAND CENTRE
- EMERGENCY SHELTER, DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SHELTER
- TRANSITIONAL SHELTER/HOUSING
- PUBLIC SPACE (E.G., SIDEWALK, PARK, FOREST, BUS SHELTER)
- VEHICLE (CAR, VAN, RV, TRUCK)
- MAKESHIFT SHELTER, TENT OR SHACK
- ABANDONED/VACANT BUILDING
- OTHER UNSHELTERED LOCATION
- RESPONDENT DOESN’T KNOW [LIKELY HOMELESS]

BEGIN SURVEY

1. What family members are staying with you tonight? [Indicate survey numbers for adults. Check all that apply]

- NONE
- PARTNER - Survey #: _______ _______ _______ _______
- DECLINE TO ANSWER
- CHILD(REN)/DEPENDENT(S)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How old are you? [OR] What year were you born? [If unsure, ask for best estimate]

- AGE __________ OR YEAR BORN ____________
- DON’T KNOW
- DECLINE TO ANSWER

For the next questions, “homelessness” means any time when you have been without a secure place to live, including sleeping in shelters, on the streets, or living temporarily with others.

3. How old were you the first time you experienced homelessness?

- AGE __________
- DON’T KNOW
- DECLINE TO ANSWER

4. In total, how much time have you been homeless over the PAST YEAR? [Best estimate.]

- LENGTH ____________ DAYS | WEEKS | MONTHS
- DON’T KNOW
- DECLINE TO ANSWER
5. **In total, how many different times** have you experienced homelessness over the PAST YEAR? [Best estimate.]

| NUMBER OF TIMES ________ | INCLUDES THIS TIME | DON'T KNOW | DECLINE TO ANSWER |

6. **Have you stayed in an emergency shelter in the past year?** [Give local examples of homeless shelters]

| YES | NO | DON'T KNOW | DECLINE TO ANSWER |

06b. **If not, what are the main reasons?** [Do not read categories; select all that apply]

| TURNED AWAY (SHELTERS ARE FULL) | PREFER TO STAY WITH FRIENDS/FAMILY |
| TURNED AWAY (BANNED) | PET(S) |
| LACK OF TRANSPORTATION | OTHER: ______________________ |
| FEAR FOR SAFETY | DON'T KNOW |
| BED BUGS & OTHER PESTS | DECLINE TO ANSWER |

7. **How long have you been in (community name)?**

| LENGTH _______ DAYS / WEEKS / MONTHS / YEARS | WHERE DID YOU LIVE BEFORE YOU CAME HERE? |
| ALWAYS BEEN HERE | COMMUNITY ____________________ PROVINCE ______ |
| DON'T KNOW | OR COUNTRY ________________________ |
| DECLINE TO ANSWER | DECLINE TO ANSWER |

8. **Did you come to Canada as an immigrant, refugee or refugee claimant?**

| YES, IMMIGRANT ↓ | YES, REFUGEE↓ | YES, REFUGEE CLAIMANT↓ |
| YES, IMMIGRANT | YES, REFUGEE | YES, REFUGEE CLAIMANT |
| NO | DON'T KNOW | DECLINE TO ANSWER |
| IF YES: How long have you been in Canada? | IF YES: How long have you been in Canada? |

8. **Did you come to Canada as an immigrant, refugee or refugee claimant?**

| YES, IMMIGRANT | YES, REFUGEE | YES, REFUGEE CLAIMANT |
| YES, IMMIGRANT | YES, REFUGEE | YES, REFUGEE CLAIMANT |
| NO | DON’T KNOW | DECLINE TO ANSWER |

9. **Do you identify as Indigenous or do you have Indigenous ancestry?** This includes First Nations with or without status, Métis, and Inuit. [If yes, please follow-up to specify.]

| YES | NO | DON'T KNOW | DECLINE TO ANSWER |

| YES | NO | DON’T KNOW | DECLINE TO ANSWER |

| FIRST NATIONS (with or without status) | INUIT |
| METIS | HAVE INDIGENOUS ANCESTRY |
10. Have you ever had any service in the Canadian Military or RCMP?
[Military includes Canadian Navy, Army, or Air Force]

○ YES, MILITARY ○ NO ○ DON’T KNOW ○ DECLINE TO ANSWER

○ YES, RCMP

11. What gender do you identify with? [Show list.]

○ MALE / MAN ○ TRANS FEMALE / TRANS WOMAN ○ NOT LISTED: ______________________

○ FEMALE / WOMAN ○ TRANS MALE / TRANS MAN ○ DON’T KNOW

○ TWO-SPirit ○ GENDERQUEER/GENDER NON-CONFORMING ○ DECLINE TO ANSWER

12. How do you describe your sexual orientation, for example straight, gay, lesbian? [Show list.]

○ STRAIGHT/HETEROSEXUAL ○ BISEXUAL ○ QUEER ○ DON’T KNOW

○ GAY ○ TWO-SPirit ○ NOT LISTED: ______________________

○ LESBIAN ○ QUESTIONING

13. What happened that caused you to lose your housing most recently? [Do not read the options. Check all that apply. “Housing” does not include temporary arrangements (e.g., couch surfing) or shelter stays.]

□ ILLNESS OR MEDICAL CONDITION □ CONFLICT WITH: PARENT / GUARDIAN

□ ADDICTION OR SUBSTANCE USE □ CONFLICT WITH: SPOUSE / PARTNER

□ JOB LOSS □ INCARCERATED (JAIL OR PRISON)

□ UNABLE TO PAY RENT OR MORTGAGE □ HOSPITALIZATION OR TREATMENT PROGRAM

□ UNSAFE HOUSING CONDITIONS □ OTHER REASON: ______________________

□ EXPERIENCED ABUSE BY: PARENT / GUARDIAN □ DON’T KNOW

□ EXPERIENCED ABUSE BY: SPOUSE / PARTNER □ DECLINE TO ANSWER

14. What are your sources of income? [Read list and check all that apply]

□ EMPLOYMENT □ DISABILITY BENEFIT □ OTHER SOURCE: ______________________

□ INFORMAL/SELF-EMPLOYMENT (E.G., BOTTLE RETURNS, PANHANDLING) □ SENIORS BENEFITS (E.G., CPP/OAS/GIS)

□ EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE □ GST REFUND □ NO INCOME

□ WELFARE/SOCIAL ASSISTANCE □ CHILD AND FAMILY TAX BENEFITS □ DECLINE TO ANSWER

□ MONEY FROM FAMILY/FRIENDS

C01 What is the highest level of education you completed?

□ PRIMARY SCHOOL □ SOME POST SECONDARY □ DON’T KNOW

□ SOME HIGH SCHOOL □ POST SECONDARY GRADUATE □ DECLINE TO ANSWER

□ HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE/GED □ GRADUATE DEGREE (E.G., MASTERS, Ph.D.)

C02 Have you ever been in foster care and/or group home?

○ YES ○ NO ○ DON’T KNOW ○ DECLINE TO ANSWER

⇒ C02b Approximately how long after leaving foster care/group home did you become homeless?

○ LENGTH _____ DAYS / WEEKS / MONTHS / YEARS ○ DON’T KNOW ○ DECLINE TO ANSWER
C03 In the past year (12 months) have you: [Ask respondents to give their best estimate]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Times</th>
<th>Days Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEEN TO AN EMERGENCY ROOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEEN HOSPITALIZED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAYS YOU HAVE SPENT HOSPITALIZED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERACTED WITH POLICE (Tickets, arrests, searches)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEEN TO PRISON/JAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAYS YOU HAVE SPENT IN PRISON/JAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C04 Do you want permanent housing?

- YES
- NO
- DON'T KNOW
- DECLINE TO ANSWER

C05 What resources do you need to get a place of your own?

- ________________________________
- DON'T KNOW
- DECLINE TO ANSWER

C06 What challenges or problems have you experienced when trying to find housing?
[Select all that apply]

- LOW INCOME
- NO INCOME ASSISTANCE
- RENTS TOO HIGH
- POOR HOUSING CONDITIONS
- DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
- HEALTH/DISABILITY ISSUES
- MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES
- ADDICTION
- FAMILY BREAKDOWN/CONFLICT
- CRIMINAL HISTORY
- PETS
- CHILDREN
- CRIMINAL HISTORY
- DON'T WANT HOUSING
- OTHER: ______________
- NO BARRIERS TO HOUSING
- NONE OF THE ABOVE
- DECLINE TO ANSWER
# SHELTERED SURVEY

**Facility/Program Name:** _____________________________  **Time:** ____________  
______ AM/PM  

**Interviewer:** _____________________________  **Contact #:** _____________________________  

C. **[Surveyor: Indicate overnight location]**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f.</th>
<th>EMERGENCY SHELTER, DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SHELTER</th>
<th>g.</th>
<th>TRANSITIONAL SHELTER</th>
<th>Other location:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## BEGIN SURVEY

1. **What family members are staying with you tonight?** [Indicate survey numbers for adults. Check all that apply]

| □ NONE | □ PARTNER - Survey #: ____________ | □ OTHER ADULT - Survey #: ____________ | □ DECLINE TO ANSWER |  
| □ CHILD(REN)/DEPENDENT(S) | [indicate gender and age for each] |  | |  
| GENDER | AGE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|________|________|________|________|________|________|________|________|________|________|

2. **How old are you?** [OR] **What year were you born?** [If unsure, ask for best estimate]

| ○ AGE __________ OR YEAR BORN __________ | ○ DON’T KNOW | ○ DECLINE TO ANSWER |  

➤ **For the next questions, “homelessness” means any time when you have been without a secure place to live, including sleeping in shelters, on the streets, or living temporarily with others.**

3. **How old were you the first time you experienced homelessness?**

| ○ AGE __________ | ○ DON’T KNOW | ○ DECLINE TO ANSWER |  

4. **In total, how much time have you been homeless over the PAST YEAR?** [Best estimate.]

| ○ LENGTH ___________ DAYS | WEEKS | MONTHS | ○ DON’T KNOW | ○ DECLINE TO ANSWER |  

5. **In total, how many different times have you experienced homelessness over the PAST YEAR?** [Best estimate.]

| ○ NUMBER OF TIMES ___________ [Includes this time] | ○ DON’T KNOW | ○ DECLINE TO ANSWER |  

6. **Have you stayed in an emergency shelter in the past year?** [Give local examples of homeless shelters]

| ○ YES | ○ NO | ○ DON’T KNOW | ○ DECLINE TO ANSWER |  

---

---
06b If not, what are the main reasons? [Do not read categories; select all that apply]

- TURNED AWAY (SHELTERS ARE FULL)
- TURNED AWAY (BANNED)
- LACK OF TRANSPORTATION
- FEAR FOR SAFETY
- BED BUGS & OTHER PESTS
- PREFER TO STAY WITH FRIENDS/FAMILY
- PET(S)
- OTHER: ______________________
- DON'T KNOW
- DECLINE TO ANSWER

7. How long have you been in (community name)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Where did you live before you came here?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LENGTH _____ DAYS / WEEKS / MONTHS / YEARS</td>
<td>COMMUNITY________________________ PROVINCE____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALWAYS BEEN HERE</td>
<td>OR COUNTRY______________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON'T KNOW</td>
<td>DECLINE TO ANSWER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7c What is the main reason you came to (community name)? [Do not read categories; select one]

- TO ACCESS EMERGENCY SHELTER(S)
- TO ACCESS SERVICES AND SUPPORTS
- FAMILY MOVED HERE
- TO VISIT FRIENDS/FAMILY
- TO FIND HOUSING
- EMPLOYMENT (SEEKING)
- EMPLOYMENT (SECURED)
- TO ATTEND SCHOOL
- FEAR FOR SAFETY
- RECREATION/SHOPPING
- OTHER: ______________________
- DON'T KNOW
- DECLINE TO ANSWER

8. Did you come to Canada as an immigrant, refugee or refugee claimant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>How long have you been in Canada?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES, IMMIGRANT</td>
<td>LENGTH: ___________ DAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES, REFUGEE</td>
<td>OR DATE: __<strong><strong>/</strong>_<strong><strong>/</strong></strong></strong> DAY / MONTH / YEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES, REFUGEE CLAIMANT</td>
<td>DON'T KNOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>DECLINE TO ANSWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON'T KNOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECLINE TO ANSWER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Do you identify as Indigenous or do you have Indigenous ancestry? This includes First Nations with or without status, Métis, and Inuit. [If yes, please follow-up to specify.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>If YES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>FIRST NATIONS (with or without status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>INUIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON'T KNOW</td>
<td>METIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECLINE TO ANSWER</td>
<td>HAVE INDIGENOUS ANCESTRY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Have you ever had any service in the Canadian Military or RCMP?

[Military includes Canadian Navy, Army, or Air Force]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>If YES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES, MILITARY</td>
<td>FIRST NATIONS (with or without status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES, RCMP</td>
<td>INUIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>METIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON'T KNOW</td>
<td>HAVE INDIGENOUS ANCESTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECLINE TO ANSWER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What gender do you identify with? [Show list.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>If YES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE / MAN</td>
<td>TRANS FEMALE / TRANS WOMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE / WOMAN</td>
<td>TRANSGENDER / TRANSGENDER NON-CONFORMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO-SPIRIT</td>
<td>MALE / MAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT LISTED: _______________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON'T KNOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECLINE TO ANSWER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. How do you describe your sexual orientation, for example straight, gay, lesbian? [Show list.]

- STRAIGHT/HETEROSEXUAL
- GAY
- LESBIAN
- BISEXUAL
- TWO-SPRIT
- QUESTIONING
- QUEER
- NOT LISTED: ____________________
- DON'T KNOW
- DECLINE TO ANSWER

13. What happened that caused you to lose your housing most recently? [Do not read the options. Check all that apply. “Housing” does not include temporary arrangements (e.g., couch surfing) or shelter stays.]

- ILLNESS OR MEDICAL CONDITION
- ADDICTION OR SUBSTANCE USE
- JOB LOSS
- UNABLE TO PAY RENT OR MORTGAGE
- UNSAFE HOUSING CONDITIONS
- EXPERIENCED ABUSE BY: PARENT / GUARDIAN
- EXPERIENCED ABUSE BY: SPOUSE / PARTNER
- DON'T KNOW
- DECLINE TO ANSWER

14. What are your sources of income? [Read list and check all that apply]

- EMPLOYMENT
- INFORMAL/SELF-EMPLOYMENT (E.G., BOTTLE RETURNS, PANHANDLING)
- EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE
- WELFARE/SOCIAL ASSISTANCE
- DISABILITY BENEFIT
- SENIORS BENEFITS (E.G., CPP/OAS/GIS)
- GST REFUND
- CHILD AND FAMILY TAX BENEFITS
- MONEY FROM FAMILY/FRIENDS
- NO INCOME
- DECLINE TO ANSWER

C01 What is the highest level of education you completed?

- PRIMARY SCHOOL
- SOME HIGH SCHOOL
- HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE/GED
- SOME POST SECONDARY
- POST SECONDARY GRADUATE
- GRADUATE DEGREE (E.G., MASTERS, PH.D.)
- DON'T KNOW
- DECLINE TO ANSWER

C02 Have you ever been in foster care and/or group home?

- YES
- NO
- DON'T KNOW
- DECLINE TO ANSWER

→ C02b Approximately how long after leaving foster care/group home did you become homeless?

- LENGTH _____ DAYS / WEEKS / MONTHS / YEARS
- DON'T KNOW
- DECLINE TO ANSWER

C03 In the past year (12 months) have you: [Ask respondents to give their best estimate]

- BEEN TO AN EMERGENCY ROOM
- BEEN HOSPITALIZED
- DAYS YOU HAVE SPENT HOSPITALIZED
- INTERACTED WITH POLICE (Tickets, arrests, searches)
- BEEN TO PRISON/JAIL
- DAYS YOU HAVE SPENT IN PRISON/JAIL

BEEN TO AN EMERGENCY ROOM   Y _____ N _____ # ________ Times
BEEN HOSPITALIZED           Y _____ N _____ # ________ Times
→ DAYS YOU HAVE SPENT HOSPITALIZED __________ Days Total
INTERACTED WITH POLICE (Tickets, arrests, searches)   Y _____ N _____ # ________ Times
BEEN TO PRISON/JAIL         Y _____ N _____ # ________ Times
→ DAYS YOU HAVE SPENT IN PRISON/JAIL __________ Days Total
**C04 Do you want permanent housing?**

- [ ] YES  
- [ ] NO  
- [ ] DON’T KNOW  
- [ ] DECLINE TO ANSWER

- [ ] ____________________________  
- [ ] DON’T KNOW  
- [ ] DECLINE TO ANSWER

**C05 What resources do you need to get a place of your own?**

**C06 What challenges or problems have you experienced when trying to find housing?**  
[Select all that apply]

- [ ] LOW INCOME  
- [ ] NO INCOME ASSISTANCE  
- [ ] RENTS TOO HIGH  
- [ ] POOR HOUSING CONDITIONS  
- [ ] DOMESTIC VIOLENCE  
- [ ] HEALTH/DISABILITY ISSUES  
- [ ] MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES  
- [ ] ADDICTION  
- [ ] FAMILY BREAKDOWN/CONFLICT  
- [ ] CRIMINAL HISTORY  
- [ ] PETS  
- [ ] CHILDREN  
- [ ] DISCRIMINATION  
- [ ] DON’T WANT HOUSING  
- [ ] OTHER: ____________  
- [ ] NO BARRIERS TO HOUSING  
- [ ] NONE OF THE ABOVE  
- [ ] DECLINE TO ANSWER
MEMORANDUM TO COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE: Governance and Priorities

DATE: October 22, 2018

DEPARTMENT: Community Services

ISSUE: Whether to adopt for information the Aquatic Centre Pre-Design Plan as prepared for the Aquatic Centre Advisory Committee by Stantec Architecture Ltd. and to consider funding for the project in the 2019-2021 budget.

RECOMMENDATION:
That Council:
1. Adopt for information the Aquatic Centre Pre-Design Plan as prepared for the Aquatic Centre Advisory Committee by Stantec Architecture Ltd.
2. To direct Administration to bring forward funding consideration in the 2019-2021 Budget for Architectural and Engineering design phase of the project.

BACKGROUND:
Currently the Ruth Inch Memorial Pool (RIMP) is at capacity and has been for many years. On a regular basis each of the swimming program sessions offered has a waiting list ranging from 300-350. That totals between 900-1,050 individuals on a waiting list annually. There are several instances throughout a typical week where pool sharing occurs to ensure the limited pool time is optimized. For example, lane swims are shared with other rentals and instructional programs such as aqua jog and scuba.

The City completed an Asset Management Plan in 2012 with the assistance of Dillon Consulting Ltd. This report concluded that the RIMP would reach its full life expectancy by 2020. To ensure that the facility remains functional and meets this expectation, several capital projects have been undertaken over the past several years.

In 2016 the City was provided the opportunity to apply for funding to assist with the development of an aquatic facility under the Building Canada Fund, Provincial-Territorial Infrastructure Component. The application was supported by Council and the City was awarded $12,900,000 on a 75%-25% funding model. The City must match the awarded funding with a minimum of $4,300,000 contribution. This funding must be spent by March 31, 2023.
The 2018 Capital Budget included an allocation of $75,000 to carry out a public consultation to determine the breadth and scope of an aquatic centre that would be supported by the community. In February of 2018, Council adopted the Terms of Reference for the establishment of the Aquatic Centre Advisory Committee (ACAC). The ACAC included a broad range of membership including representation from the Yellowknives Dene First Nation, City Council, Polar Bear Swim Club, Seniors, School Districts, Youth, Persons with Disabilities, Yellowknife Business and the general public. The purpose of the ACAC is to assist the City in an advisory capacity by making recommendations to Council through the appropriate Standing Committee of Council on issues relating to the development of an aquatic centre.

Also within this timeframe the City, through a competitive Request for Proposal process, secured the services of Stantec Architecture Ltd to carry out the public consultation process in conjunction with the ACAC.

Through a series of public engagement opportunities including an on-line surveys and public open houses, the ACAC and the consulting team received important comments and feedback on the components desired from the community on what to include in an aquatic centre. These comments and feedback were compiled and deliberated on by the ACAC with the result being the Report submitted for adoption by Council.

### COUNCIL POLICY / RESOLUTION OR GOAL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Goal #1</th>
<th>Better Engagement with Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Goal #3</td>
<td>Strengthen and Diversify the Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Goal #4</td>
<td>Community Sustainability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motion #0119-18: That Council appoint the following members to serve on the Aquatic Centre Advisory Committee.

Motion #0058-18: That Council adopt the Terms of Reference for an Aquatic Centre Advisory Committee and directed Administration to take the required step to fulfill the positions outlined in the Terms of Reference.

Motion #0273-16: That Council accept the funding provided to the City of Yellowknife by the Government of the Northwest Territories under the Building Canada Fund, Provincial-Territorial Infrastructure Component in the amount of $12,900,000 by committing a minimum contribution of $4,300,000 upon successful notification of the grant application.

### APPLICABLE LEGISLATION, BY-LAWS, STUDIES, PLANS:

N/A
CONSIDERATIONS:

Financial Considerations and Budget
The 2018 Budget identified the funding required to complete the Pre-Design Report as well as indicating the next two phases, design development and construction of the project based on an estimated project cost of $45M.

The Report has estimated the project at $49.8M with a notation that actual costs may vary. Throughout the process and the time that the consulting team had to fine tune the capital estimates the initial cost of $1000/ft² was adjusted to $860/ft². The new estimated cost, based on the work of the consulting team will necessitate an adjustment to the 2019 design and development phase of the project to $7.47M from the $6.75M identified in the 2018 Capital Budget.

The Report identifies that the net operating cost is estimated at $3.2M. This number reflects an estimate based on the square foot cost to operate the current RIMP.

It is important to note that these prices are based on the conceptual design and should Council support the next phase of the project, the costs will be refined. The current estimates are considered a Class D estimate which is based on a cost per meter pricing. As the project moves through the design development phase, the project cost will be adjusted based on the actual elements of the facility to the point where pre-tendering pricing is available. Council will be advised of these adjustments should the next phase be supported.

Departmental Consultation
From the outset of the project an administrative working committee was established including Public Works, Corporate Services, City Administrator, Planning & Development and Community Services to discuss and address various aspects of the project.

Accessibility
Building on the completion of the Accessibility Audit and through input from the various organizations and the public, the concepts presented in the report identify the need for universal accessibility. These concepts will be finalized in the detailed design stage of the project.

Existing Programs / Services
As detailed in the Report the staff at the RIMP has maximized the usage of the facility. Through creative use of the five lanes and lagoon area various uses of the pool can be combined at one time. This flexible use of the space allows for the greatest amount of recreational, sport and fitness use by the greatest amount of people as possible.

In addition, in each of the swim lesson sessions that are offered, there are a 300+ on the wait list, most of which do not have the opportunity in that particular session and must wait for the next.

There are a number of other user groups or users such as the canoe/kayak club and the aqua size/water joggers that have limited space to carry out their training/fitness needs due to the constraints of the current pool size and configuration.
The addition of an expanded new facility with a larger tank, a teaching pool, lazy river etc. will address much, if not all of the needs expressed throughout the consultation phase and input from the ACAC members.

**Public Consultation**
The ACAC, through the Consulting team carried out a consultative process that included input opportunities from the public and the various user groups in Yellowknife.

In June there was an on-line household survey where households were provided with a unique access code to access the survey and provide comments that reflected the views of the household. Through this process it was identified through feedback from the public that not all households received their unique code. To address this, a public notice was issued indicating that those that did not receive a code but wished to participate in the survey could contact the City and a code was provided.

This process resulted in a total of 425 responses which is considered representative of the community with a margin of error of +/-4.7% 19 times out of 20. Also during this time frame, 42 community groups responded to a separate survey opportunity. The details of these surveys are included in the report.

Following the compilation of these results, the ACAC carried out a planning and design workshop over two days in July. This feedback was utilized by the consulting team to provide the ACAC with various drafts concepts and site selections to consider when deliberating on their recommendations to Council.

Based on a number of factors detailed in the Report, the ACAC agreed on two concepts and two locations to move forward to the next round of public consultations. At the Community Showcase, the Public Open House and the Online Survey held throughout September the ACAC presented a standalone facility that could be located adjacent to the Fieldhouse or the RIMP as well as a concept that included renovating the RIMP.

The public feedback and deliberation of the ACAC from this consultative phase is reflected in the Report’s recommendations.

**Facility Components**
As detailed in the report the following facility components are recommended to be included in the design of a standalone facility: (one that is not attached to an existing facility)

- Universal accessibility
- Hot tub
- Shallow end/beach entry
- Spectator viewing area
- Steam room
- Springboards
- 50m swim lanes
- Warm water teach pool
- Climbing play feature
- Lazy river
- Water spray features
The proposed warm water teach pool includes three 25m swim lanes along with a beach entry shallow area, a lazy river and play features comprising an area of 4,000ft². The current RIMP which includes five 25m swim lanes, a beach entry shallow area and play features comprises an area of 3,500ft².

The 52m lap pool will include a sliding bulkhead. This feature will add to the staffing requirement for the facility to ensure the safety of the swimmers, but it will allow for the pool to be configured into two 25m pools or any other configuration required for programming.

The ACAC specifically did not include a few items that were identified in the consultation phase and were ranked by the public and community organizations. Specifically the waterslide component was not included as the ACAC concluded that the added costs, both Capital as well and O&M would not be well spent due to the short time that water slides hold the public’s interest.

Additionally, the fitness/gym studio component identified in the consultation was not included. The ACAC concluded that with the number of fitness/gym studios in Yellowknife and more to open in the near future, the inclusion in the aquatic centre would be redundant.

There are a few components identified that will assist the City in offsetting some of the operational costs by generating additional revenue for the facility including the canteen and multipurpose areas.

The development of a standalone facility will ensure that the current aquatic programs and services offered by the City and its community partners will remain as-is. The RIMP will remain functional throughout the construction of a new aquatic centre.

**Site Selection**
The consulting team and the ACAC identified seven potential sites where an aquatic centre might be situated in the community. Through the development of a rubric that identified 14 criteria for evaluating the identified sites, the ACAC concluded that two areas would be suitable – an area adjacent to the Fieldhouse and another adjacent to the RIMP.

The Report details the information and the two site locations. The ACAC recommendation in the Report is that a more detailed analysis be carried out as the project moves forward. This analysis will include an evaluation on the geotechnical feasibility, traffic patterns, walkability, ability to be serviced by a district energy system and ability to be serviced by transit.

**Staffing**
Over the past several years there have been occasions where the current programming of the RIMP had to be modified due to the shortage of staff to properly fulfill the duties as per regulations set out in the Public Health Act and the guard to patron ratio could not be met. Additionally, the swim programs that were offered had to be reduced due to the lack of instructors. This has led to questions on how the City will be able to staff a new facility that will be larger than the current.
In the fall of 2018 a concerted effort to attract and hire locally, as well as across Canada was undertaken. Staff attended the Community Showcase and the Open Houses for the Aquatic Centre to carry out a local recruitment drive. Within a few weeks of launching the campaign, the vacant staffing positions were filled. In addition to filling the vacancies, the recruitment drive has also attracted a number of past staff back to the RIMP.

The City will build on this success and continue to recruit staff to ensure that the staffing levels for a new aquatic centre will be met.

**Economic Development and Tourism**

There are a few avenues where the development of a new facility will have a positive effect on tourism. In the first instance, the addition of a new facility that lends itself to a wide range of guests needs based on the amenities available, will attract travellers from the regions.

Secondly, as one more mechanism to attract various conferences or similar type gatherings to Yellowknife, the aquatic centre will have the added bonus for family activities outside of the conference programming which will increase the number of visitors to Yellowknife.

Thirdly, Yellowknife will have the ability to bid on various competitions to build on the Sport Tourism opportunities. The current configuration of the RIMP limits the ability to host sanctioned events; however the development of a new facility will enhance this capability.

In addition, there is an opportunity to develop sports such as Water Polo and Synchronized Swimming which may have additional competitions.

**Zoning**

All development within the Zoning By-law falls into a specific definition(s). An Aquatics Centre can be defined as within the following uses: parks and recreation, public or quasi-public uses, or commercial recreation. There are two sites currently under review for the Aquatics Centre, Site A: 6002 50 Avenue as well as Site B: located along Kam Lake Road.

The area adjacent to the RIMP is zoned PR - Parks and Recreation. Within this zone parks and recreation uses are permitted.

The area adjacent to the Fieldhouse has a combination of zoning, Site Specific #12 as well as Public Service. Within the SS12 and PS zone parks and recreation as well as public or quasi-public uses are permitted.

**ALTERNATIVES TO RECOMMENDATION:**

The Council not adopt the Aquatic Centre Pre-Design Report and provide specific feedback to the Aquatic Centre Advisory Committee for consideration to re-draft the Report.

**RATIONALE:**

Through the 2018 budget process funding was allocated to carry out a public engagement to determine the community’s needs regarding the development of an aquatic centre. Council appointed
an advisory committee (ACAC) that represented a wide range of community views to carry out this engagement process along with a consulting team, Stantec Architectural Ltd.

The Report presented is the result of several months of meetings and various public engagement opportunities that assisted the ACAC and consulting team in developing the program components presented.

The components of the aquatic centre as described in the Report will assist Council in meeting the established goal of strengthening and diversifying the economy by providing additional venues for tourism and sport tourism as well as benefiting the economy through the construction phase.

Through the public engagement and ACAC discussions it was very apparent that the community would support a new facility that includes components that are sustainable. Through a detailed design process items such as district heating or pellet heating, environmentally sensitive filtering material, chlorine versus salt water disinfecting and more will all be investigated to meet Council’s stated goal of Yellowknife being a sustainable community.

The adoption of the Report and the allocation of funding in the 2019 Capital Budget to allow for the detailed design to commence will ensure that the new aquatic centre will be developed within the March 31, 2023 time frame of the funding provided through the Building Canada Infrastructure program.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Aquatic Centre Pre-Design Plan (DM #534279).

Prepared: October 15, 2018; GW
After 30+ years of serving the Yellowknife community, the Ruth Inch Memorial Pool (RIMP) is reaching the end of its lifespan. The demands on the facility have increased over the years and there are expectations for the facility that are not currently being met. The City of Yellowknife struck the Aquatic Centre Advisory Committee (ACAC) to lead the development of this study and make a recommendation about a new aquatics centre.

A program of research was implemented to provide some fodder for the development of a concept for a new facility. This research program included a household survey (425 responses) and a survey of community organizations (42 responses). Utilizing the research undertaken the ACAC developed a preliminary facility program that identified the components of a new aquatics centre. Two preliminary concepts were then developed and shared with the public. Upon review of these concepts the public provided comments. Considering this feedback as part of their deliberations the ACAC ultimately recommended a facility program.
### Recommended Facility Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Space</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Rectangular tank / lap pool | • 52 metre tank with moveable bulk head  
• 6 lanes  
• Accommodates lessons, lane swim, competitions, training  
• Deep end to accommodate SCUBA, synchro, etc |
| Leisure pool                | • Tot pool  
• Warm water  
• Zero depth entry  
• Play and spray features including small slide  
• Lazy river  
• 3 lanes of 25 m  
• Splash deck (enables dry land and guard training; reduces guarding levels) |
| Lobby                       | • Building entrance  
• Access control point  
• Enables some viewing of leisure pool |
| Spectator / family viewing  | • Viewing to watch swim lessons  
• Some spectator viewing of 52m pool |
| Hot tub                     | • Used by those from lane pool and leisure pool |
| Steam room                  | • Therapeutic and recreation purposes |
| Multipurpose rooms          | • Ability to have two rooms or one large room  
• Accommodates courses, dryland warm-up, birthday parties |
| Springboards                | • 1m and 3m boards |
| Office space for youth clubs| • Small office space dedicated for the Youth aquatic users |
| Storage for youth clubs     | • Enables regular users of the aquatic centre space to house their equipment |
| Change Rooms                | • Universal design  
• Men and women  
• Larger and improved from current |
| Staff areas                 | • Administration spaces  
• Staff room  
• First aid room  
• Facility access point |
| Canteen                     | • Food service  
• Limited selection of items |
Facility Concept

The Recommended Option

Legend

- **Lobby and Viewing**
  - Public viewing from an environmentally controlled lobby
- **Administration**
  - Administration space for lifeguards and first aid room are positioned to provide easy of supervision of pool and change rooms
- **Circulation**
  - Spectator seating for about 200 persons
- **Multipurpose / Classroom**
  - Multipurpose room with deck access for birthday parties and training
- **Service and Mechanical**
  - Mechanical tower on three levels includes electrical, pool storage, steam and sauna
- **Change Rooms**
  - Male and female dressing rooms, as well as universal change rooms will provide access to persons of all abilities
- **Steam / Sauna**
- **Canteen**
- **Lap, Leisure and Hot Pool**
  - 6 lane (2.5m each), 52m lap pool with ramp and stair access to accommodate all types of swimming
  - 1m and 3m diving boards with stairs and platforms for enhanced user safety
  - Family size hot pool with ramp and stair access
  - The leisure pool includes features enjoyed by young and old including beach entry and sprays
  - Splash pad, deck level sprays and water features fun for tots and deck activities

---

ground floor
3,900 m² (42,000 ft²)
Estimated Costs

Capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$36.1 million</td>
<td>New construction (42,000 sq.ft @ $860 / sq.ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.4 million</td>
<td>Site development allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$37.5 million</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9.5 million</td>
<td>Soft costs (~25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$47.0 million</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.8 million</td>
<td>Escalation @ 6% to Q1 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$49.8 million</strong></td>
<td><strong>Capital Cost (estimate)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operating Subsidy

The estimated annual operating subsidy for the recommended option is $3.2M.

Site

There are two sites to consider for a new aquatic centre:

- The multiplex / fieldhouse site; and
- The RIMP site.
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Introduction

The City of Yellowknife owns and operates the Ruth Inch Memorial Pool (RIMP) which recently celebrated its 30th year of operation. As the only public aquatic centre in Yellowknife, the facility is an integral component to the sport and recreation needs of the community. The centre provides programming for all segments of the community including young children and families, competitive swimmers of all ages, as well as a plethora of community organizations delivering a range of programs.

The facility is reaching the end of its lifespan without some significant attention. A facility assessment was undertaken that suggest the “bones” of the structure does have some life but may require investment. The needs of the community however have changed dramatically over RIMP’s tenure. RIMP is experiencing growing demands from the public and community groups. As well the types of amenities and supports demanded in a public aquatic facility are limited in RIMP.

These dynamics have all conspired to motivate this study – an Aquatic Centre Pre-Design Plan. This Plan will ultimately result in a recommended course of action for the development of a new aquatic centre. Led by the Aquatic Centre Advisory Committee (ACAC), the recommendation was based on a program of research including comprehensive community engagement. The ACAC includes representation from a number of different constituencies in Yellowknife including: City Council, Yellowknife Polar Bear Swim Club, youth, seniors, the business sector, Yellowknives Dene First Nation, the education district, NWT Recreation and Parks Association, and the general public.

The research included a broad public survey, an examination of trends in aquatic facility design and provision, as well as public review of preliminary concept designs. The ACAC as well looked at potential siting of a new facility and developed a rubric to adjudicate several sites. Through debate, discussion, and thinking about the community needs, the Committee was able to produce a recommendation. The recommendation needed to balance community demand along with budget realities faced by the City. The work the ACAC was tasked with is not without difficulty trying to balance these dynamics.

It should be noted that the City of Yellowknife was successful in securing $12.9M in funding from the Federal Government’s Building Canada Fund to cover part of the development of an aquatic centre.

This report presents the research undertaken, the preliminary concepts that were vetted with the public along with public response, and finally the ACAC’s recommendation. The report has been structured to walk the reader through the steps taken in the Pre-Design process. Sections 1 through 5 represent the background and research completed. This led to a preliminary facility program and preliminary concepts (Section 5, 6, and 7) These concepts were vetted with the public and ultimately the recommended facility is presented in Section 11.
2.1 About RIMP

Located centrally in Yellowknife, the Ruth Inch Memorial Pool is a bright, warm and welcoming place to exercise, learn, and play. The facility includes a 25 metre tank that accommodates lane swimming and competitions; it also has a beach entry enabling greater accessibility to the water. There is a springboard and climbing wall that overhangs the pool surface as well as a tot slide. The pool also has a wave machine.

The facility includes a whirlpool (with chair lift) and a steam room. There is a tot slide as well and the indoor aquatics area is connected to the outdoors through a large outdoor deck with BBQ and picnic tables that overlooks Frame Lake. The integration of outdoor and indoor spaces is furthered with a solarium set up. RIMP has male and female change rooms; there is a large washroom that functions as a family change room.

1 The wave machine has not been operational in some time.
2.2 Utilization

The aquatic centre gets a variety of use from the community. As illustrated in the accompanying table multiple use pass holders have increased approximately 17% between 2013 and 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scanned Passes</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIMP Multiple Use Pass</td>
<td>23,202</td>
<td>23,453</td>
<td>24,548</td>
<td>28,201</td>
<td>27,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIMP Single Admission Pass</td>
<td>56,045</td>
<td>57,081</td>
<td>52,057</td>
<td>49,991</td>
<td>50,104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attendance in 2017 was the highest it has been in five years. Since 2015 annual attendance has risen by 15%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIMP - Pool Attendance</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Attendance</td>
<td>79,760</td>
<td>77,986</td>
<td>71,986</td>
<td>72,209</td>
<td>82,859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over half (58%) of the usage of RIMP in 2017 was dedicated to programs and 55% was dedicated to lane and leisure swims. Rentals declined in 2017 by 13% from 2016. See the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pool Open (hrs)</td>
<td>6,387</td>
<td>6,387</td>
<td>6,387</td>
<td>6,405</td>
<td>6,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented (hrs)</td>
<td>2,678</td>
<td>2,095</td>
<td>3,545</td>
<td>3,208</td>
<td>2,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane and Leisure Swims (hrs)</td>
<td>3,188</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,347</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>3,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (hrs)</td>
<td>3,369</td>
<td>3,391</td>
<td>3,454</td>
<td>3,603</td>
<td>3,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance (hrs)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Pool Usage (hrs)</td>
<td>9,379</td>
<td>9,130</td>
<td>10,490</td>
<td>10,355</td>
<td>9,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Facility Utilized</td>
<td>147%</td>
<td>143%</td>
<td>164%</td>
<td>162%</td>
<td>160%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Polar Bear Swim Club is the single largest user of RIMP. In 2017 the swim club used 1,114 hours of time which accounted for approximately 11% of pool hours. In 2016 a similar proportion of hours was consumed by the club. Over three-quarters (77%) of households used RIMP in the previous year.

The aquatic centre does serve a variety of uses. Aside from the Polar Bears Swim Club, swim lessons, and simply as a location for recreational swimming and water use, there are many other uses. These include sport training for others beyond swim athletes, paddling, birthday parties and social gatherings, SCUBA training, and rehabilitation and health. RIMP serves a social gathering function as well as a centre for aquatic leisure and training.

---

2 The hours captured for each use was calculated as a proportion of the hours the pool was open.
3.1 Population and Growth

Yellowknife is the capital city of the Northwest Territories (NWT), with a population of 20,834 (2017). Nearly 50% of the NWT population resides in Yellowknife and the city is a critical economic and governmental hub. With the Territory’s only international airport, Yellowknife serves as the gateway to the NWT for industry, tourists, and the broader Territorial population. The Yellowknife area is also the traditional territory of the Dene First Nations (Yellowknives and Tłįcho). The city serves a population base that spans nearly the entire NWT.

Yellowknife’s population has remained relatively stable over the past decade, growing at an annual rate of 0.6% between 2007 and 2017, while the NWT population overall grew by 0.3% per year. Between 2011 and 2017, the city’s population grew by 4%. Over the same period, the city’s population under the age of 15 grew by 0.8% per year (-0.2% Territorially) and its population over the age of 60 grew by 7.4% per year (4.8%). These trends suggest that the city’s population is likely to continue to grow steadily in the coming years, even if growth rates more broadly within the Territory slow. It is also important to recognize that the city’s over-60 population is increasing quite rapidly, likely affecting the demand for local and regional health care, seniors’ support services, and access to recreational amenities. Compared to Canada’s other two Territorial capitals, Whitehorse and Iqaluit, Yellowknife’s population is much more stable. Between 2011 and 2017, Whitehorse’s population grew by 7.8% (2016 population 25,085) and Iqaluit’s by 10.3% (2016 population 7,082).

It can reasonably be expected that Yellowknife’s population will grow slowly over the next 10, 20, and 30 years. While the NWT Bureau of Statistics estimates a population growth rate of approximately 0.6% per year between 2007 and 2017, Yellowknife’s population growth is heavily affected by economic activity levels in the NWT, primarily driven by natural resource extraction projects. As such, it is somewhat difficult to accurately estimate what the city’s population may be in the future. However, three scenarios have been prepared based on historic data and population growth that has been observed previously between 2001 and 2006. The moderate growth scenario is based on an average of the low and high annual growth rates. The table below illustrates these three growth scenarios, with Yellowknife’s population ranging from just under 25,000 to nearly 45,000 by 2048, depending on annual growth rates.

### Yellowknife Growth Scenarios, 2028 - 2048

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Annual Growth</th>
<th>Based On</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2038</th>
<th>2048</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>NWT Bureau of Statistics</td>
<td>22,118</td>
<td>23,481</td>
<td>24,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.6%+2.6% / 2</td>
<td>24,417</td>
<td>28,617</td>
<td>33,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2001-2006</td>
<td>26,930</td>
<td>34,810</td>
<td>44,996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Demographics

Comparison of Age Cohorts as Percentage of Total Population, Yellowknife and Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Cohort</th>
<th>Yellowknife</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-19</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-39</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-79</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>Much Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80+</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>Much Lower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yellowknife’s population is, on average, much younger than the Canadian population. The table above illustrates that Yellowknife’s 0-19 and 20-39 age cohorts comprise a larger percentage of the population than is observed at a national level. In addition, the percentage of the 60 – 79 and 80+ age cohorts in Yellowknife is significantly lower than national levels. However, as identified by the NWT Bureau of Statistics, the city’s population over the age of 60 grew by an average of 7.4% per year between 2007 and 2017. It is likely that the city’s senior population will grow significantly, owing to both the high quality of life that Yellowknife offers its residents and the broader national trend of the Canadian population aging rapidly.

Comparison of Economic and Demographic Statistics, Yellowknife and Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Yellowknife</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Income*</td>
<td>$159,434</td>
<td>$92,764</td>
<td>Significantly Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Households Earning on Average &lt;$24,999*</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>Significantly Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation Rate</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>Significantly Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Walking or Cycling to Work</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>Significantly Higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* based on 2015 total before-tax household income statistics
The table on the previous page outlines selected economic and demographic statistics for Yellowknife, compared to figures calculated for Canada overall. Due to the low population of the NWT, Statistics Canada supresses some Census data to protect the privacy of households and individuals (e.g. low-income measure stats). Compared to national levels, households in Yellowknife earn nearly $67,000 more per year than Canadian households. Yellowknife also has a lower unemployment rate and higher participation rate in the labour force than the national average.

NWT Bureau of Statistics data indicates that there were 666 monthly recipients of income assistance programs in Yellowknife in 2017. Household incomes in Yellowknife are offset somewhat by a higher cost of living relative to other Canadian cities. In 2013, for example, the cost of living in Yellowknife was approximately 22.5% higher than it was in Edmonton, Alberta. The percentage of Yellowknife households earning less than $25,000 per year is nearly 9 percent lower than the national average. However, research by the Homeless Hub in 2011 suggests that poverty in Yellowknife remains somewhat hidden due to few official statistics being available, with homelessness per capita estimated to be higher than in other Canadian cities.

It should also be noted that just over 22% of Yellowknife residents report utilizing an active form of transportation to commute to work, either walking or cycling. Of those 22%, 90% indicated that they walk to work. This is significantly higher than the national average and suggests that Yellowknife residents make the most of existing active transportation infrastructure. Investments in additional active transportation infrastructure is likely to further support such commuting modes.


Aquatic provision has changed and will continue to change as user expectation changes and the uses for the facility change. While the items presented below may be reflected to various degrees in a new aquatic centre in Yellowknife they do present a snapshot that reflects both expectations of the public when it comes to these types of facilities as well as aquatic facility planning. It is important to note that the identification of some of these items does not necessarily mean that these ideas and concepts have not been reflected in RIMP; rather this section is intended to identify some of the primary considerations for aquatic facility provision.

Change Room Design

Change rooms have and will continue to change as societal norms change. These changes also reflect fiscal realities. Some efficiencies can be gained through staffing costs as a single gender can monitor all change facilities (if structured that way). Others can be considered a source of revenue generation.

- **Accessibility**: some of this can be captured in response to pertinent construction codes, such as ADA Standards for Accessible Design, the Canadian Standards Association, and the National Building Code of Canada. This can refer to ensuring that people of all abilities are able to fully use the different elements of the change rooms. *(Note: these points relate to overall facility design as well.)*

- **Universal only, gender neutral**: there are a number of ways to build this type of change room. With this concept there are not separate male and female change rooms. Rather there is a single large open room that includes lockers for storage. Often these spaces are visible into the natatorium which has an impact on security of the lockers. For actual changing and bathing there are separate and private areas to accommodate that. This type of solution reflects the changing nature of gender in our society as well.

- **Hands free**: health concerns abound and hands free design means that there are fewer surfaces that require people to touch them. This can be reflected in entrances and exits (maybe there are no doors) as well as in touchless sinks and faucets and dryers.

- **Spa quality**: this refers to the provision of services that one historically may have seen in a spa. Items like steam rooms and saunas are reflections of this. As well the provision of massage and aesthetic services are becoming more available in aquatic facilities.
Pool Tanks

- **Temperatures:** depending on the types of use for a pool, different temperatures are preferred. For tanks that are used for high activity (think swim clubs etc) a cooler pool is preferable. However those pools that serve a more leisure type of focus, a warmer temperature is preferred. It is not uncommon to have cool, warm, and hot tanks to accommodate the various uses.

- **Accessibility:** this refers to how people access the tanks. In earlier years the tanks were rectangular with entry being a ladder or some vertical stairs. This has changed. Access to a rectangular tank is now not limited to the ladder or vertical steps. Rather there are gradual steps in tanks or ramps that go into tanks. This ensures that a much broader segment of the community can more easily access the tanks including the very young and very old and those with mobility challenges.

Water Features

- **Skill development:** these are often associated with training and clubs. These components can vary but are important in the development of certain skills. Elements can simply be deep water. To facilitate synchronized swimming for example (and other sports) deep water is needed. Starting blocks, underwater sound, timing pads, and so on are elements that hasten skill development.

- **Resistant training (moving water):** water can serve as a very therapeutic mechanism. More specifically using moving water as a means to build strength and endurance is becoming more main stream in public facilities. While these river type of amenities are generally viewed as leisure elements, they can also serve a health and fitness role.

- **Person powered play:** as components of leisure services, these type of components blend the fun and whimsical components of water play and add the person control element. These become more interactive when people are required to power them and / or aim them. These might be water spray elements or other type of splash elements.

- **Diving:** certainly not found in all aquatic centres, including spring boards and / or dive platforms can offer a training element or – depending on the height – a leisure element.

- **Leisure pool components:** while there is significant use in an aquatics centre from sport and exercise groups, main stream use is driven by leisure components. These are not restricted solely to children’s use. They include river elements, water slides, spray decks and features, hot tubs, and others.

- **Novelty items:** while not common place, some facilities include more novel items such as flow riders or wave pools. Portable equipment can also provide leisure opportunities – these include inflatables and other toys.
Blurring Outdoor and Indoor Spaces

There is a greater emphasis on getting people to experience the outdoors. While it may seem counter intuitive to look at facility design to address this that is exactly what is happening. The solarium features and deck area of RIMP are great examples of this. The inclusion of windows (done properly) and the ability to access the outdoors (during the right conditions) can help people using the aquatics facility to enjoy and connect with the outdoors.

Complementary Services

It is becoming more commonplace to “bundle” the amenities in aquatic centres so that the facility offers more than simply the tank. These can include spaces that directly support the in-water activities such as classroom space to facilitate the training elements for water based activities. Other services can be dryland training space – the swim club can do some warm-up and cool down for example. Other complementary types of spaces include fitness spaces and even storage for those activities and groups who make significant use of the aquatic facility.
5 Consultation

While it is important to consider trends and leading practices in the provision of aquatics services, to develop a concept for a new aquatics centre in Yellowknife, it is critical to engage the community. For this Pre-Design Plan two main streams of consultation were employed up front. A broad survey was fielded with households in the community. Secondly, community organizations were invited to participate in a survey. The findings from each mechanism are presented below.

5.1 Household Survey

Households in Yellowknife were invited to participate in an online survey. A postcard was developed and inserted into each post office box in Yellowknife describing the Aquatic Pre-Design Plan; encouraging the household’s participation; and providing instructions for completion of the questionnaire. Each postcard included a unique access code necessary to log-in and complete the questionnaire on the City’s website. In total 425 responses were gathered. These findings are considered statistically representative of the community with a margin of error of +4.7% 19 times out of 20.

Current Assessment

To begin, respondents were asked if anyone in their households used the Ruth Inch Memorial Pool as an active participant in the previous 12 months. As illustrated in the following graph approximately three-quarters (77%) of respondent households had used the pool.

In the past 12 months has anyone in your household used the Ruth Inch Memorial Pool as an active participant?

3 If the survey was fielded twenty times, the findings would be within 4.7% of the findings presented in this report.
Of those who had used the pool, they were further asked to indicate their frequency of visitation according to season. As can be seen from the table below, Winter (December to February) experienced the greatest visitation with 42% of households using the pool on 11 or more occasions. Conversely, twenty-eight percent (28%) used the pool 11 or more times during the Summer (June to August).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>1 to 5 Uses</th>
<th>6-10 Uses</th>
<th>11 or more Uses</th>
<th>Did Not Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer</strong></td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(June to Aug)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autumn</strong></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sept to Nov)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter</strong></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dec to Feb)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(March to May)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next the motivations for people to use the pool were identified. The primary motivation – identified by over three-quarters of respondents (77%) – was recreation and leisure. Swim lessons (44%) and lane swim / aquajog (41%) were the next most prevalent reasons to use the pool.

Why did household members use the pool?

- Recreational / leisure swimming (for fun): 77%
- Swim lessons and other skill development programs: 44%
- Lane swim / aquajog: 41%
- Birthday parties: 36%
- School visit: 36%
- Aquatic programs (e.g. aquafit): 10%
- Sport training for water sports (e.g. swim clubs): 10%
- Special event / private booking: 9%
- Competitions: 7%
- Paddling: 5%
- First aid programs: 5%
- Rehabilitation or therapy: 4%
- Other training (e.g. lifeboat, government): 3%
- Sport training for others (e.g. DND, RCMP): 2%
- SCUBA: 2%
At least half of respondents expressed satisfaction (very or somewhat) with the whirlpool (51%) and for the entryway/foyer (50%). The wave machine received the lowest satisfaction ratings. (It should be noted that the wave machine has been non-operational for some time.) Refer to the graph for more information.

Respondents were able to provide comments related to their satisfaction ratings. Most comments were directed to needed improvements and areas of concern. Comments made by at least twenty respondents are noted below.

- The change rooms are very crowded and more privacy is needed. (64 comments)
- The play structures and leisure components are in need of upgrading. (52)
- The entry way is small and gets congested. (48)
- A modernized family change room is needed. (48)
- The wave machine is not operational. (48)
- The water is very cold, particularly for infants and children. (41)
- There were concerns expressed about the cleanliness of the facility. (32)
- A new pool is needed; the facility is dated. (31)
- The hot tub and steam room are often over crowded. (27)
- The hot tub and steam room are frequently not working. (23)
Just over half (52%) of households that used the Ruth Inch Memorial Pool in the previous 12 months expressed overall satisfaction with it. Over one-third (39%) expressed dissatisfaction.

Overall, how satisfied is your household with Ruth Inch Memorial Pool?
All respondents were asked to identify issues that have prevented household members from using the pool more frequently. The single most identified issue is the lack of desired amenities (41%) followed by hours of operation (31%). Half provided a reason beyond those listed.

**What, if anything, prevents members of your household from using/visiting the Ruth Inch Memorial Pool more frequently?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It doesn't have the amenities desired</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of operation</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission cost to the pool</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs to get into programs/lessons</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not interested</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know how to swim</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult for us to get to the pool</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was unaware of the pool</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the “other” reasons, the most commonly cited included the following.

- The water is too cold. (46 comments)
- It is very difficult to register child for swim lessons. (28)
- The pool is crowded. (23)
- Concerns about cleanliness and maintenance. (16)
- Chlorine / chemicals are too strong. (10)
Future Considerations

Respondents were provided with a list of potential amenities on the questionnaire. They were asked to indicate how important it is to consider each for inclusion in a new aquatic centre. As illustrated in the following graph, the top five amenities to consider are: universal accessibility (96% think it is important); hot tub (94%); shallow end / beach entry (93%); tot pool (91%); and play features / water slides (91%).
Respondents were also provided with a list of non-aquatic services and asked to indicate their level of agreement that each should be included in a future aquatic centre. The top two services were fitness gym / studio (68% agreed it should be included in a future aquatic centre) and storage for clubs (64%).

Non-Aquatic Components to be Considered
(level of agreement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fitness gym/studio</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage for clubs</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose areas for meetings/programming</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapy services</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care services</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office space for clubs</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space for the arts</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were able to suggest other non-aquatic services that should be considered in a new aquatic facility. Those suggestions most frequently identified are noted.

- Meeting rooms / multipurpose program rooms. (16 comments)
- Library. (15)
- Gym / fitness area. (12)
- Café / concession. (9)
- Indoor playground structure. (8)
- Pro shop / rental spot. (7)
- Walking track. (5)
Respondents were able to provide other comments related to a new aquatic centre in Yellowknife. Some took the opportunity to reiterate comments previously made while others offered new thoughts. Those comments most frequently cited are noted below.

- Ensure there are leisure elements included like a splash pad/ water park, waterslide, etc. (27)
- Particularly for young children but for all, the pool water needs to be warmer. (26)
- The new aquatic centre is needed in the city. (25)
- There needs to be separate areas and tanks for lane swimming versus leisure swimming. Maybe a separate area for toddlers as well is needed. (24)
- The preferred location is near the multiplex. (18)
- Combine the new aquatic centre with other facilities and amenities. (17)
- The hours of the facility and of different activities (e.g. lane swim, family swim) need to be extended. (16)
- The new facility should include a 50m tank. (15)
- Family change rooms are needed (16) and there needs to be a greater level of privacy in the change rooms. (9)
- Include a system that does not use chlorine; it is very strong. (9)
- Do not get too grandiose and limit it to aquatic components only. (8)

### Respondent Profile

#### How long have you lived in the Yellowknife community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15 years</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 years</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Household Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 years and younger</td>
<td>14% (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 12 years</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 19 years</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 29 years</td>
<td>8% (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 39 years</td>
<td>19% (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49 years</td>
<td>17% (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 59 years</td>
<td>12% (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 69 years</td>
<td>6% (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 years and older</td>
<td>2% (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: figures in blue are the proportions from Statistics Canada.*
5.2 Community Group Survey

Community organizations were invited to participate in a survey to provide insight into their utilization of RIMP and to identify elements they would like to see in an aquatic centre. In total forty-two organizations provided some response; they represented recreation, sport and leisure groups, social organizations, community associations, and school boards. For a complete listing please refer to the Appendix. The findings are noted below.4

Current Assessment

Half of the groups had used RIMP in the past year as illustrated in the accompanying graph.

In the past 12 months has your group used RIMP?

![Graph showing the distribution of responses to the question about using RIMP in the past 12 months.]

There was a range of uses these groups had for RIMP. The most commonly cited reason was simply for recreational or leisure purposes. Other main purposes included special event/private booking, sport training for water sports, swim lessons and other skill development, and competitions. School trips, birthday parties, rehabilitation, and team building were other uses mentioned by more than one group.

Groups commented on their levels of satisfaction with a number of the elements of RIMP. The greatest level of satisfaction was for the whirlpool – 70% were very or somewhat satisfied with it. The highest level of dissatisfaction was for the entryway/foyer with 40% somewhat or very dissatisfied. See the table for more information.

---

4 Not all organizations provided a response to each question. The findings presented represent the answers from those who responded to each particular question.
### Overall Satisfaction with RIMP Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Unsure/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solarium</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave machine</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure components for small children</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor deck</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springboard</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam room</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane pool and starting blocks</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing wall</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entryway/foyer</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change rooms</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whirlpool</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some comments were provided related to the satisfaction ratings. The most prevalent themes related to the facility being small, crowded, and outdated. There were some comments as well about elements of the facility that were at times not operational: climbing wall, wave machine, whirlpool, springboards.
Potential Components of a New Aquatic Centre

![Graph showing the importance of various components in a new aquatic centre based on respondent preferences. The components include Universal accessibility, Hot tub, Tot pool (warm water pool), Shallow end/beach entry, Community/program/party rooms, Spectator viewing area, Steam room, Springboard, Play features/water slides, 25m swim lanes, Warm water teach pool, Outdoor deck area, 50m swim lanes, Climbing wall, Lazy river, Water spray features, and Concession area. The graph indicates the percentage of respondents who found each component very important (blue) and somewhat important (black) in the design of a future pool.]

Future Considerations

Respondents were provided with a list of amenities and components and asked to indicate their importance in the design of a future pool. Universal accessibility was deemed important by 92% of respondents – 86% in fact identified it as very important. A hot tub was the second most important element to consider. Rounding out the top five were a tot pool, shallow end / beach entry, and community / program / party rooms. See the graph.
Three-quarters (75%) of respondents agreed that multipurpose areas for meetings 
/ programming should be included in a future aquatic centre. Approximately two-
thirds agreed that office space for clubs (70%) and storage for clubs (69%) should be 
included. See the accompanying graph.

Non-Aquatic Components to be Considered
(level of agreement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose areas for meetings/programming</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office space for clubs</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage for clubs</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness gym/studio</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care services</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space for the arts</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapy services</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were multiple comments that suggested a new facility should be able to host 
competitive events. Some specifics were identified including start blocks, touch pads, 
and score boards.

Finally respondents were able to provide other comments. Those mentioned more 
than once referred to the ability to have greater and better access to pool time and 
use. As well there were calls for greater indoor storage.
A preliminary facility program was developed by the Aquatic Centre Advisory Committee (ACAC). Through a workshop the ACAC reviewed the information presented in the preceding sections and engaged in a fulsome discussion leading to a preliminary facility program. The facility program identifies the spaces to include in a new or redeveloped aquatic centre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Space</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular tank/lap pool (25m or 52m)</td>
<td>• Swim lanes (6 or 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lessons, lane swim, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Deep end to accommodate scuba, synchro, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby</td>
<td>• Building entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access to control point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enables some viewing of leisure pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure pool</td>
<td>• Zero depth entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Play and spray features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lazy river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 3 lanes of 25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Splash deck (enables dry land and guard training; reduces guarding levels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family viewing</td>
<td>• Viewing to watch swim lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some spectator viewing of 25m or 52m tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Tub</td>
<td>• Used by those from lane pool and leisure pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauna and/or steam room</td>
<td>• Therapeutic and recreation purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose rooms</td>
<td>• Ability to have two rooms or one large room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accommodates courses, dryland warm-up, birthday parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff areas</td>
<td>• Administration spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• First aid room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Facility access point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change rooms</td>
<td>• Universal design(^5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Larger than current and improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>• Pool equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aquatic club equipment storage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This facility program was then used to develop the facility concepts.

---

\(^5\) A universal locker-room is designed to accommodate all genders. The design is similar to a large family locker-room - it is an open concept. The washrooms and showers remain segregated for males and females, and there are private changing stalls. It allows parents to bring children of both sexes into the common room and still have a private cubicle. It is also intended for people with disabilities who have an attendant of the opposite gender.
Preliminary Facility Concepts

Based on the preliminary facility program two potential concepts were developed. One concept presented is a new build while the second concept is a renovation of the Ruth Inch Memorial Pool.
7.1 New Build

**Estimated Project Cost**
$47.0 million

- **Site Development Allowance**
  - Sub total: $1.0 million
  - Add soft costs at 30%: $33.5 million
  - $10.0 million
  - $3.5 million
  - Sub total: $43.5 million

- **New Construction (32,500 ft² @ $1,000)**
  - $32.5 million

- **Escalation @ 8% for one year (2019)**
  - $7.7 million

**Facilities**

- **FAMILY HOT POOL**
  - 20 persons (24 M2)
  - Ramp and stairs
  - Universal change
  - 400 m²
  - Storage
  - Mechanical
  - Steam

- **NATATORIUM**
  - 1,850 m² (20,000 ft²)
  - Multipurpose
  - 90 m²
  - Admin
  - 100 m²
  - Public
  - Washrooms
  - Multipurpose
  - 90 m²
  - 3 lanes @ 25 meters
  - Lazy river
  - Bubbles
  - Waterfall

- **LEISURE POOL**
  - 460 m² (5,000 ft²)
  - 90° - 94°
  - Wide stairs
  - Ramp
  - Slide
  - Water features

- **Lap, Leisure and Hot Pool**
  - 6 lanes (2.5m each), 25m lap pool with ramp and stair access to accommodate all types of swimming
  - Spectator seating for competitive events
  - Large family style hot pool with ramp and stairs
  - Generous leisure pool includes features enjoyed by young and old including beach entry and sprays
  - Multipurpose room with pool deck access for birthday parties and training
  - Administration space for lifeguards and first aid room are positioned to provide easy supervision of pool and change rooms

**Legend**

- Change Rooms
- Lobby and Viewing
- Steam / Sauna
- Administration
- Lap, Leisure and Hot Pool
- Service and Mechanical
- Circulation
- Public Washroom

---

**Ground Floor**

3,000 m² (32,500 ft²)
7.2 Renovated Ruth Inch Memorial Pool

- **Fitness**
  - Remove and renovate existing change into fitness or multipurpose space with views and possible connections to the deck

- **Lobby and Viewing**
  - Public viewing from a new expanded cool lobby

- **Change Rooms**
  - Male and female dressing rooms, as well as universal change rooms will provide access to persons of all abilities

- **Steam / Sauna**
  - Renovate and upgrade steam room

---

**Legend**

- **Lap, Leisure and Hot Pool**
  - Significant renovation of the existing tank with more spa and play features including lazy river, upgraded mechanical and warmer water
  - 6 lanes (2.2m), 25m lap pool with ramp and stair access to accommodate all types of swimming
  - Spectator Seating for about 200 persons

- **Administration**
- **Circulation**
- **Service and Mechanical**
- **Multipurpose**
- **Public Washroom**

---

**ground floor**

3,128 m² (34,000 ft²)
## 7.3 Capital Estimates

The Class D capital estimates are presented in the following table. The Renovated option has an estimated capital cost of $41M for a 25 metre lap tank option. Changing the concept to include a 52 metre tank instead of a 25 metre tank would result in a capital estimate of $48.7M.

The New Build option’s estimated capital cost is $47M including a 25 metre lap tank. This would increase to $54.7M if the 25 metre tank were replaced by a 52 metre tank.

### Renovated Ruth Inch Memorial Pool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$7.5 million</td>
<td>Renovation (15,000 sq. ft @ $500 / sq. ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20.0 million</td>
<td>New construction (20,000 sq. ft @ $1,000 / sq. ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.0 million</td>
<td>Site development allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$28.5 million</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8.5 million</td>
<td>Soft costs (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$37.0 million</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3.0 million</td>
<td>Escalation @ 8% for one year (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$41.0 million</strong></td>
<td><strong>Capital Cost (estimate)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7.7 million</td>
<td>To change from 25m to 52m lane tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$48.7 million</strong></td>
<td><strong>Capital Cost (estimate)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Build Pool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$32.5 million</td>
<td>New construction (32,500 sq.ft @ $1,000 / sq ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.0 million</td>
<td>Site development allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$33.5 million</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10.0 million</td>
<td>Soft costs (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$43.5 million</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3.5 million</td>
<td>Escalation @ 8% for one year (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$47.0 million</strong></td>
<td><strong>Capital Cost (estimate)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7.7 million</td>
<td>To change from 25m to 52m lane tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$54.7 million</strong></td>
<td><strong>Capital Cost (estimate)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6 These estimates are “order of magnitude” and are primarily for cost comparison between alternative selections. These estimates are arrived upon by utilizing unit rates ($ per sq. ft). As more refinement is made with the concept, the cost estimates become more precise.
7.4 Operating Subsidy

Aquatic facilities generally require subsidy to operate and the Ruth Inch Memorial Pool is no exception. Between 2013 and 2017 the annual recovery rate varied between 29% and 33% which necessitated a subsidy from the City of Yellowknife of approximately $1M per year. To determine an annual subsidy for the two proposed concepts the existing dynamic at RIMP was applied.

Utilizing the annual subsidy from each year from 2013 through to and including 2017, a per square foot unit rate was determined. This rate was then applied to the square footage of the two proposed concepts. While a new aquatic centre would see an increase in utilization, the costs would also increase. Each concept is larger than RIMP meaning that staffing costs can reasonably be assumed to increase. As well utility costs will increase.

Based on the information in the following table, the annual subsidy per square foot is $76.08 for RIMP8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$446,265</td>
<td>$482,159</td>
<td>$475,955</td>
<td>$527,225</td>
<td>$516,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$1,515,537</td>
<td>$1,555,835</td>
<td>$1,578,159</td>
<td>$1,576,460</td>
<td>$1,624,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy</td>
<td>-$1,069,272</td>
<td>-$1,073,676</td>
<td>-$1,102,204</td>
<td>-$1,049,235</td>
<td>-$1,107,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy/sq ft</td>
<td>$75.30</td>
<td>$75.61</td>
<td>$77.62</td>
<td>$73.89</td>
<td>$78.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The **stand alone concept** has an area of 32,500 sq. ft. which results in an estimated **annual subsidy** of $2.47M.

The **renovated Ruth Inch Memorial Pool** has an area of 35,000 sq. ft which means the estimated **annual subsidy** is $2.66M.

---

7 The subsidy from each year was divided by the area of RIMP. This provided an annual amount of subsidy from the City to operate the aquatics centre on a square foot basis. This annual subsidy amount was then averaged out.

8 This is based on RIMP’s area of 14,200 square feet.
Site Selection

The Aquatic Centre Advisory Committee (ACAC) considered seven potential sites for a new aquatic centre.

1. Pitch & Putt (beside Ruth Inch Memorial Pool)
2. Multiplex/ Field House
3. Taylor Road site (across the road from William Macdonald / Ecole Allain St Cyr Complex)
4. Old Akaitcho Hall Site (adjacent to Sir John Franklin High School)
5. Frame Lake West Park
6. Junction of Franklin Ave & School Draw
7. Shore South-West of Somba K’e Park

In order to select the “best” site as the recommended one, the ACAC developed a rubric. This rubric provided a structured approach to this difficult decision. Fourteen criteria were identified across which each of the sites were scored. The criteria are noted below.

- Servicing all of Yellowknife (sites that serve all of the city are better)
- Proximity to other recreational, social, and cultural amenities (sites that are close to other amenities are better)
- Co-locations of activities (being near other activities is better)
- Highly accessible especially for seniors (we want it to be highly accessible)
- Highly accessible especially for kids (we want it to be highly accessible)
- Proximity to public transit (being on an existing route is ideal)
- Pedestrian and bike connections (being on the trail network is ideal)
- Parking and traffic impacts (minimal impact on parking and traffic is the best case scenario)
- Re-use or sharing of existing facilities (connecting or using existing buildings is positive)
- Land use and density (is a pool one of the best uses for the site?)
- Site servicing and conditions (is the site serviced already? do its existing conditions make it easy to build there?)
- Greenfield / brownfield* (is the site already serviced and been developed or is it undeveloped completely?)
- Property ownership/cost* (is the property owned by the City?)
- Zoning* (does the current zoning allow for an aquatic facility?)

*Note: these three criteria are factual and not opinion based. These fields were completed for each potential site prior to asking ACAC members to score the sites. Any brownfield sites received a score of 3 while a greenfield site was scored 1. City owned sites were scored a 3 and if the site was zoned for recreational use it received a score of 3.
A higher score in each of the criteria meant that the potential site scored more positively than a lower score. Each criteria could be scored with a 1, 2, or 3 where:

3 = site scores “very good” for this criteria
2 = site scores “okay” for this criteria
1 = site scores “fair to poor” for this criteria

Each ACAC member was asked to complete the rubric scoring each of the sites. Once completed all completed scores were combined. The highest score then represented the preferred site.

Upon conclusion of the scoring, two sites were obviously much preferred over the others. These two however were very close in score. The two sites were:

1. The Ruth Inch Memorial Pool site (this site could accommodate a new build)
2. Multiplex / Fieldhouse site.
Regardless of the final concept recommended by the ACAC, the costs of building and operating an aquatic centre are high. With $12.9 M coming from the Federal Grants Building Canada Fund a sizeable proportion of the capital cost is covered. However the majority of the capital cost still needs to be secured. While sponsorship is commonly viewed as the panacea when sourcing capital funds, the reality is very different.

Determining the amount that could be secured through sponsorship can be a complicated task. There needs to be an inventory of available sponsorship opportunities (e.g. facility naming, room naming). Accompanying this is the “price” of each item in the inventory. These prices are set through knowledge of the community and prices set elsewhere for similar spaces. There are often very few direct comparisons; this is particularly true in Yellowknife. Typically as well this inventory is not solidified until further into the design process. Greater clarity is needed as to the facility program, layout of the facility, and its appearance. A sponsorship prospectus is then developed and used as a marketing tool when meeting with prospective sponsors. The amounts secured through sponsorship and community fundraising are often a very small proportion of total costs.

Including the Building Canada Grant, this would still leave a significant shortfall of capital dollars that needs to be found. Other sources become the Territorial government and the City of Yellowknife itself. Considering municipal sources the City can look to a number of areas for funds including municipal reserve. Many municipalities finance construction through a debenture which may be serviced through a reallocation of taxation funds, government operating grants, or new taxation.

Partnerships are another avenue that can be used to offset capital costs. One of the common partnerships is between a municipality and a school jurisdiction (Yellowknife Catholic Schools, Yellowknife Education District No. 1) or a post-secondary institution (Aurora College). In these circumstances agreements are put in place related to development, maintenance, and utilization.

To some degree partnerships may help offset operational costs as well. Municipalities do have some other mechanisms to address operating costs besides entrance fees and taxation. The delivery of programs can bring people into the facility and can deliver needed revenue as they are net positive initiatives. (Program fees cover the marginal costs associated with the program such as instructor costs.) The rental of facilities or spaces within facilities (e.g. multipurpose rooms) can also bring in needed revenue. Many municipalities lease spaces to private enterprise; it is not uncommon for food and retail franchises / businesses to operate out of recreational facilities; health and wellness services also often lease facility space. Some municipalities may directly deliver a retail experience through a “pro shop” or concession using facility staff.

9 It is important to note that no discussions related to a new aquatic centre were held between the City of Yellowknife and the school jurisdictions or Aurora College as part of this project.
Should a new aquatic centre be developed there is a question of what would occur with RIMP. Repurposing an aquatic centre does provide some options for the community and there are a number of considerations that are part of that decision. These include any limitations imposed due to the existing facility consideration as well as community need for recreation space.

Making a determination about this potential repurposing takes a similar approach to the development of a new facility in a community. In other words an examination of community needs should be undertaken or referenced if one has occurred. It is important to ensure that appropriate and necessary program spaces are developed to meet community need. Depending upon this community need, the size of the needed amenity, available partnerships, and costs a decision can be made. It is recommended that a feasibility study be undertaken to assist in making this decision.

There are examples in other communities of repurposing aquatic centres. A brief overview of four repurposing projects are presented below. These occurred in Canmore, Whitecourt, and Grande Prairie, all of which are in Alberta. Edinburg Scotland also presents an example. The City of Fort Saskatchewan Alberta did some preliminary planning to transform an aquatic centre. Its concept is included below.
10.1 Canmore, Alberta

In 2013 the Town of Canmore, Alberta decommissioned an old swimming pool located in its Community Recreation Centre and converted the space into a 12,000 square foot gymnastics centre leased to the Canmore Illusions Gymnastics Club. The facility includes a spring floor and an in-ground trampoline into foam pit. The space also includes an indoor walking lane that is often utilized by the Town’s seniors. The pool decommissioning was part of a long-term capital plan to address deficiencies in the Recreation Centre. The approximate total cost for the entire rehabilitation of the facility was $12 million.

Canmore Recreation Centre Pool Retrofit into Gymnastics Studio

Image Credit: https://canmoregymnastics.com/location/

Links:  
https://canmoregymnastics.com/location/  
https://www.rmoutlook.com/article/rec-centre-project-sticks-to-original-scope-20170706
10.2 Grande Prairie, Alberta

In 2011, the City of Grande Prairie, Alberta, decommissioned a pool located within the City’s 40 year old Leisure Centre. The facility also includes a fitness area, soccer pitch, and reception area. The City initially planned to renovate the pool at a cost of approximately $11 million, but funds were diverted to another project when it was determined there was significant remediation work required. It has recently been announced that $200,000 in renovations has been approved to upgrade some areas of the facility. However, Grande Prairie Council has yet to decide the future use for the pool area of the building.

Grande Prairie Leisure Centre Pool

Image Credit: https://www.mygrandeprairienow.com/26143/leisure-centre-receive-upgrades/

10.3 Whitecourt, Alberta

Whitecourt, Alberta converted an old pool facility into a fully-featured community centre at a cost of approximately $3.5 million. Today, the facility is called the Carlan Services Community Resource Centre and it is home to the Whitecourt Food Bank, Boys and Girls Club, the Whitecourt Early Learning and Childcare Centre, and the Whitecourt Gymnastics Club. A skatepark is also adjacently located.

Carlan Community Resource Centre


10.4 Edinburgh, Scotland

In 2008, a historic Victorian bath in Edinburgh was converted into an art studio space at a cost of £8 million (appx. $13.5 million CAD). The space now houses art installations, a gallery, exhibition and event spaces, and a café.

Retrofitted Tapestry Gallery out of Old Pool

Image Credit:https://www.urbanghostsmedia.com/2013/05/adaptive-reuse-edinburgh-swimming-pool-infirmary-street-baths-dovecot-studios/
10.5 Fort Saskatchewan, Alberta

In 2017, the City of Fort Saskatchewan, Alberta, explored repurposing an existing municipally owned pool facility to accommodate the use of a local gymnastics club. The estimated capital cost for the project was approximately $5.7 million and would provide the local club with over 23,000 square feet of usable space. The figure below illustrates the floor plan that was explored. As of October 2018, this plan has not been developed further.

Fort Saskatchewan Harbour Pool Retrofit Exploratory Study

Image Credit: City of Fort Saskatchewan & RC Strategies + PERC
11.1 Public Review

The Aquatic Centre Advisory Committee (ACAC) was in attendance at the Community Showcase on Wednesday, September 12th and hosted an open house on Thursday, September 20th. At both events ACAC members presented the two preliminary aquatic centre concepts along with their deliberations on the potential aquatic centre. They solicited responses from the public through a feedback form. The information panels utilized at the open house were posted on the City’s website along with an electronic version of the feedback form to gather feedback from those unable to attend the open house.

11.2 Facility Concept Recommendations

The Aquatic Centre Advisory Committee (ACAC) met following the review open house to discuss the information collected as well to revisit the draft facility program, concepts, and potential site. Ultimately the ACAC formulated its recommendation as noted below.
### 11.2.1 Facility Program

Based in part on the feedback provided throughout the public review, the committee arrived at the recommended facility program presented below. The significant change from the preliminary program include a 52m tank, spring board, and office and storage space for youth clubs. See the Appendices for a more detailed program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Space</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular tank / lap pool</td>
<td>• 52 metre tank with moveable bulk head&lt;br&gt;• 6 lanes&lt;br&gt;• Accommodates lessons, lane swim, competitions, training&lt;br&gt;• Deep end to accommodate SCUBA, synchro, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure pool</td>
<td>• Tot pool&lt;br&gt;• Warm water&lt;br&gt;• Zero depth entry&lt;br&gt;• Play and spray features including small slide&lt;br&gt;• Lazy river&lt;br&gt;• 3 lanes of 25 m&lt;br&gt;• Splash deck (enables dry land and guard training; reduces guarding levels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby</td>
<td>• Building entrance&lt;br&gt;• Access control point&lt;br&gt;• Enables some viewing of leisure pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectator / family viewing</td>
<td>• Viewing to watch swim lessons&lt;br&gt;• Some spectator viewing of 52m pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot tub</td>
<td>• Used by those from lane pool and leisure pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam room</td>
<td>• Therapeutic and recreation purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose rooms</td>
<td>• Ability to have two rooms or one large room&lt;br&gt;• Accommodates courses, dryland warm-up, birthday parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springboards</td>
<td>• 1m and 3m boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office space for youth clubs</td>
<td>• Small office space dedicated for the Youth aquatic users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage for youth clubs</td>
<td>• Enables regular users of the aquatic centre space to house their equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Rooms</td>
<td>• Universal design&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;br&gt;• Men and women&lt;br&gt;• Larger and improved from current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff areas</td>
<td>• Administration spaces&lt;br&gt;• Staff room&lt;br&gt;• First aid room&lt;br&gt;• Facility access point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canteen</td>
<td>• Food service&lt;br&gt;• Limited selection of items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>10</sup> A universal locker-room is designed to accommodate all genders. The design is similar to a large family locker-room - it is an open concept.

The washrooms and showers remain segregated for males and females, and there are private changing stalls. It allows parents to bring children of both sexes into the common room and still have a private cubicle. It is also intended for people with disabilities who have an attendant of the opposite gender.
11.2.2 Facility Concept

New construction is recommended rather than renovating the existing aquatic centre. Undertaking a renovation would necessitate working with the constraints inherent in the existing facility. A new construction does mean a blank slate which can help ensure the facility is developed exactly as desired to meet community needs. The stand alone concept is presented below.

The Recommended Option

Legend

- Lobby and Viewing
  Public viewing from a environmentally controlled lobby
- Administration
  Administration space for lifeguards and first aid room are positioned to provide easy of supervision of pool and change rooms
- Circulation
  Spectator seating for about 200 persons
- Multipurpose / Classroom
  Multipurpose room with deck access for birthday parties and training
- Service and Mechanical
  mechanical tower on three levels includes electrical, pool storage, steam and sauna
- Change Rooms
  Male and female dressing rooms, as well as universal change rooms will provide access to persons of all abilities
- Steam / Sauna
- Canteen
- Lap, Leisure and Hot Pool
  6 lane (2.5m each), 52m lap pool with ramp and stair access to accommodate all types of swimming
  1m and 3m diving boards with stairs and platforms for enhanced user safety
  Family size hot pool with ramp and stair access
  The leisure pool includes features enjoyed by young and old including beach entry and sprays
  Splash pad, deck level sprays and water features fun for tots and deck activities

ground floor
3,900 m2 (42,000 f2)
11.2.3 Estimated Costs

Capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$36.1 million</td>
<td>New construction (42,000 sq.ft @ $860/sq.ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.4 million</td>
<td>Site development allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$37.5 million</td>
<td><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9.5 million</td>
<td>Soft costs (~25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$47.0 million</td>
<td><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.8 million</td>
<td>Escalation @ 6% to Q1 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$49.8 million</td>
<td><strong>Capital Cost (estimate)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The costs included in the table are a refinement from the previously presented capital estimates. The unit cost declined from $1000 per sq. ft to $860 per sq. ft, as further investigation occurred. The costs reflect a competitive tendering process. It is important to note that the actual costs may vary.

Operating Subsidy

The annual subsidy (estimate) has been determined by applying a square footage unit rate based on actual costs from the existing facility. Utilizing a subsidy rate of $76.08/sq ft and the area of 42,000 sq ft, the estimated annual operating subsidy of the recommended option is $3.2M.

11.3 Site

Two preferred sites were identified previously. These included the multiplex / fieldhouse site as well as the Ruth Inch Memorial Pool site. Through the ACAC’s adjudication process of all available sites these two were very closely scored. Subsequent feedback from the public and further discussion revealed proponents for each site. The ACAC determined that additional investigation of the two sites should be undertaken before a final decision is made. The rubric utilized by the ACAC (see pg 29) could form the basis for Council’s discussion and decision about the site. Considering the criteria in the rubric, Council may determine that certain ones are of more importance than others and therefore may weight them differently. This will assist in arriving at a decision.

11.4 Next Steps

The recommendation provided by the ACAC will be presented to City of Yellowknife Council. Ultimately, City Council will make a decision on whether to proceed with the project. In this determination a site will be selected and the facility program finalized. At that point, more detailed planning work would need to be initiated – on the concept and design and on the costing. It is in these subsequent planning stages that the detail related to the leisure components, the set-up and layout of change rooms, and all other elements are determined. The authority rests with City Council on the direction of the aquatic centre.

---

11 There were 14 criteria that included variables such as accessibility, co-location of activities, and site servicing.
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A: Community Group Survey Respondents
B: Open house panels
C: Detailed Program - Recommended Concept
Community Group Survey Respondents

1. 825 Air Cadets
2. Aurora Fiddle Society
3. Dayhomes Collective
4. Diamond City Roller Derby
5. Ecology North
6. Girl Guides
7. Goodwin Society
8. Great Slave Snowmobile Association
9. JTFN - Canadian Armed Forces
10. Kids Corner Childcare
11. La Fédération franco-ténoise
12. Moms, Boobs and Babies
13. Movement
14. NARWAL Northern Adventures
15. NWT 55+ Games Association
16. NWT Breast Health/Breast Cancer Action Group
17. NWT Broomball Association
18. NWT DISABILITIES COUNCIL
19. NWT Gymnastics Association
20. NWT Literacy Council
21. NWT SPCA
22. NWT Soccer Association
23. NWT Swimming
24. NWT Wellness Society
25. Old Town Community Association
26. Potential Volleyball Club
27. Rainbow Coalition of Yellowknife
28. Somba K'e Paddling Club
29. Sport North
30. Unlimited Potential Community Services - TTC
31. Wimps Hockey Yellowknife
32. YK ARCC
33. YWCA
34. Yellowknife Association for Community Living
35. Yellowknife Catholic Schools
36. Yellowknife Curling Club
37. Yellowknife Playschool Association
38. Yellowknife Polar Bear Swim Club
39. Yellowknife Skating Club
40. Yellowknife Slopitch Association
41. Yellowknife Ultimate Club
42. Yellowknife Women's Society
Open House Panels
About the Aquatic Centre Pre-Design Plan

- City of Yellowknife owns and operates the Ruth Inch Memorial Pool (RIMP) which recently celebrated its 30th year of operation.

- RIMP is an important part of the sport and recreation landscape in the community.

  » The facility is reaching the end of its lifespan. Coupled with the growing demands from the public and community groups plus the changing demands for amenities, the City is undertaking an Aquatic Centre Pre-Design Plan.

- The project is led by the Aquatic Centre Advisory Committee (ACAC).

  » ACAC includes representation from a number of constituents in Yellowknife including City Council, Yellowknife Polar Bear Swim Club, youth, seniors, the business sector, Yellowknives Dene First Nation, the education district, NWT Recreation and Parks Association, and the general public.

- Utilizing input from the community as well as trends and leading practices in aquatic facility design and provision, a concept for a new aquatic centre in Yellowknife is being developed.

  » The concept needs to balance community need with the budget realities faced by the City.

- The City has been successful in securing $12.9M in funding for part of the development of an aquatic centre from the Federal Government’s Building Canada Fund.
Household Survey Findings

- 425 responses (margin of error is ±4.7% 19 times out of 20)

In the past 12 months has anyone in your household used the Ruth Inch Memorial Pool as an active participant?

- Yes: 77%
- No: 22%
- Unsure: 1%

Potential Components of a New Aquatic Centre

Non-Aquatic Components to be Considered (level of agreement)

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

- Fitness gym/studio
- Storage for clubs
- Multipurpose areas for meetings/programming
- Physiotherapy services
- Childcare services
- Office space for clubs
- Space for the arts
Community Organizations
Survey Findings

- 42 responses from a variety of organizations (recreation, sport, leisure, social, community associations, school boards)

Potential Components of a New Aquatic Centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Very important to consider</th>
<th>Somewhat important to consider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universal accessibility</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot tub</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot pool (warm water pool)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shallow end/beach entry</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/program/party rooms</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectator viewing area</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam room</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springboard</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water slide/play features</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25m swim lanes</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm water play pool</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor deck area</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50m swim lanes</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing wall</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy river</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water spray features</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concession area</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Aquatic Components to be Considered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose areas for meetings/programming</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office space for clubs</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage for clubs</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness gym/studio</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care services</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space for the arts</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapy services</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Trends & Leading Practices

- Universal Change Rooms
- Water Features
- Spa Themes
- Family Change Rooms
- Blurring Boundaries Between Indoor and Outdoor
Facility Program

- The facility program identifies the different spaces to include in the facility concept.
- The facility program was developed by the Aquatic Centre Advisory Committee (ACAC) through an examination of the findings from the community household and group surveys, and a review of trends and leading practices in aquatic facility provision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Space</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular tank/lap pool</td>
<td>- Swim lanes (6 or 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pool (25m or 52m)</td>
<td>- Lessons, lane swim, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Deep end to accommodate scuba, synchro, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby</td>
<td>- Building entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Access to control point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Enables some viewing of leisure pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure pool</td>
<td>- Zero depth entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Play and spray features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lazy river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 3 lanes of 25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Splash deck (enables dry land and guard training; reduces guarding levels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family viewing</td>
<td>- Viewing to watch swim lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Some spectator viewing of 25m tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot tub</td>
<td>- Used by those from lane pool and leisure pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauna and/or steam room</td>
<td>- Therapeutic and recreation purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose rooms</td>
<td>- Ability to have two rooms or one large room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Accommodates courses, dryland warm-up, birthday parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff areas</td>
<td>- Administration spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Staff room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- First aid room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Facility access point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change rooms</td>
<td>- Universal design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Larger than current and improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>- Pool equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Aquatic club equipment storage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6

Potential Sites

- The ACAC used a framework to evaluate sites throughout Yellowknife to identify preferred sites. Any site would be “scored” according to fourteen (14) criteria listed.

Criteria

- **Servicing all of Yellowknife** (sites that serve all of the city are better)
- **Proximity to other recreational, social, and cultural amenities** (sites that are close to other amenities are better)
- **Co-locations of activities** (being near other activities is better)
- **Highly accessible especially for seniors** (we want it to be highly accessible)
- **Highly accessible especially for kids** (we want it to be highly accessible)
- **Proximity to public transit** (being on an existing route is ideal)
- **Pedestrian and bike connections** (being on the trail network is ideal)
- **Parking and traffic impacts** (minimal impact on parking and traffic is the best case scenario)
- **Re-use or sharing of existing facilities** (connecting or using existing buildings is positive)
- **Land use and density** (is a pool one of the best uses for the site?)
- **Site servicing and conditions** (is the site serviced already? Do its existing conditions make it easy to build there?)
- **Greenfield / brownfield* (is the site already serviced and been developed or is it undeveloped completely?)
- **Property ownership/cost* (is the property owned by the City?)
- **Zoning* (does the current zoning allow for an aquatic facility?)
Preferred Sites

• The top two sites were:
  1. The Ruth Inch Memorial Pool Site
     - Parking and infrastructure exists
     - Arena and Curling Club on site
  2. Multiplex / Fieldhouse Site
     - Parking infrastructure exists
     - Fieldhouse and Multiplex on site
Potential Concepts

The preferred stand alone concept

Lap, Leisure and Hot Pool
- 6 lanes (2.5 m each), 25 m lap pool with ramp and stair access to accommodate all types of swimming
- Spectator seating for competitive events
- Multifunctional leisure pool includes features enjoyed by young and old including beach entry and sprays
- Multi-purpose room with pool deck access for birthday parties and training
- Administration space for managers and first aid room are positioned to provide easy supervision of pool and change rooms

Ground floor
3,000 m2 (32,500 f2)

Legend
- **Change Rooms**: Male and female dressing rooms, as well as universal change rooms will provide access to persons of all abilities
- **Lobby and Viewing**: Public viewing from a environmentally controlled lobby
- **Steam / Sauna**: Steam and Sauna in a spa like area with views out
- **Administration**: Administration space for managers and first aid room are positioned to provide easy supervision of pool and change rooms
- **Fitness**: Multi-purpose room with pool deck access for birthday parties and training
- **Circulation**
- **Public Washroom**

**ESTIMATED PROJECT COST**

- **$32.5 million**
- **$1.6 million**
- **$13.5 million**
- **$10.0 million**
- **$3.5 million**

- **$47.8 million** + **$7.7 million**

- **$47.0 million**
- **$7.7 million**

- **New construction (32,500 ft² @ $1,000)**
- **Site Development Allowance**
- **Soft costs**
- **Add soft costs at 30%**
- **Site-base**
- **Escalation @ 8% for one year (2019)**
- **ESTIMATED PROJECT COST**
- **To change 25m to 52m lane tank**
Renovated Ruth Inch Memorial Pool

This renovation reinvents the existing tank into a modern leisure pool with spa features enjoyable by young and old.

Legend
- Change Rooms: Male and female dressing rooms, as well as universal change rooms, will provide access to persons of all abilities.
- Lobby and Viewing: Public viewing from a new expanded cool lobby.
- Fitness: Remove and renovate existing change into fitness or multipurpose space with views and possible connections to the deck.
- Steam / Sauna: Renovate and upgrade steam room.
- Lap, Leisure and Hot Pool: Significant renovation of the existing tank with more spa and play features including lazy river, upgraded mechanical and warmer water. 6 lanes (2.2m), 25m lap pool with ramp and stair access to accommodate all types of swimming.
- Male and female dressing rooms, as well as universal change rooms will provide access to persons of all abilities.
- Spectator Seating: for about 200 persons.

ESTIMATED PROJECT COST
- $41.0 million
  + $7.7 million to change 25m to 52m lane tank

Site Development Allowance
- $1.0 million
- $28.5 million
- $8.5 million
- $3.0 million
- Sub total $37.0 million
- add soft costs at 30% $11.1 million
- Site Development Allowance $41.0 million

New construction (20,000 ft² @ $1,000)
- $20.0 million

Administration
- $7.6 million
  + $0.5 million
- $8.6 million
- $3.0 million
- Sub total $19.3 million
- escalation @ 8% for one year (2019) $1.6 million
- $41.0 million
- ESTIMATED PROJECT COST
- to change 25m to 52m lane tank

Legend
- GL
- Multipurpose
- Service and Mechanical
Next Steps

**Public Review**
- Community Showcase Sept. 12
- Open House Sept. 20
- Online Sept. 20-25 (www.yellowknife.ca)

**Aquatic Advisory Committee (ACAC)**
- Develop a recommended aquatic centre concept Sept. 26

**Municipal Services Committee**
- Accept or revise recommended concept Oct. 22

**City Council**
- Accept, revise, or reject recommended concept Oct. 29

If to proceed...

- 2019 Budget Deliberations - funding for design
- 2020 Budget Deliberations - funding for construction
The Preferred Program, revised

This panel provides an overview of the features, functions, and technical requirements of the proposed aquatic centre and has been tailored to suit the community.

**AQUATIC FACILITY PROGRAM**

**Public Spaces**
245 m² (2,600 ft²)
1. Lobby and Entry
2. Public Washrooms
3. Public Viewing

**Activity Spaces**
315 m² (3,400 ft²)
1. Multipurpose Studio, divisible in two (90 m² ea)
2. Aquatic Classroom (40 m²)

**Aquatic Spaces**
2,500 m² (27,000 ft²)
1. 6 Lane 52m Lap Pool, ramp, stairs, diving
2. Leisure Pool (450 m²)
3. Hot Pool (20 persons)
4. Splash Pad (50m²)
5. Spectator seating, bleachers seating (included above)
6. Steam Room

**Change Rooms**
540 m² (5,800 ft²)
1. Women
2. Men
3. Universal

**Administration Space**
140 m² (1,500 ft²)
1. Reception & control
2. Office(s) Manager/Aquatic Leader
3. Office for Clubs (14 m²)

**Service / Support Spaces**
160 m² (1,700 ft²)
1. Janitorial Office/Closets
2. Pool Storage
3. Club Storage
4. Pool Mechanical (140 m² on each of 3 levels)
5. Chemical Storage (incl above)
6. Electrical Room (incl above)

**Circulation and Walls**
20%

**SAMPLE BATHER LOAD CALCULATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pool Type</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>m²</th>
<th>H2</th>
<th>m²</th>
<th>H2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lap Pool</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>6.400</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm Pool (4,000 ft²)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>6.400</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>6.400</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHANGE ROOM AREA CALCULATIONS**

Area required per bather (.37 m² per bather load) = 1,050 Bathers x .37 m² = 393.5 m²
Gross up by 70% = 213 m²

Approx. total required change area = 648 m² (57 m²) approx.
The Preferred Program, revised

This concept option is stand alone facility and includes a 52m pool with bulkheads, leisure pool, spray pad and support spaces.

Legend
- Lobby and Viewing
- Administration
- Circulation
- Service and Mechanical
- Change Rooms
- Lap, Leisure and Hot Pool
- Steam / Sauna
- Canteen
- Multipurpose / Classroom

Male and female dressing rooms, as well as universal change rooms will provide access to persons of all abilities.

Spectator seating for about 200 persons.

6 lane (2.5m each), 52m lap pool with ramp and stair access to accommodate all types of swimming.

1m and 3m diving boards with stairs and platforms for enhanced user safety.

Ground floor
3,900 m2 (42,000 ft²)

Mechanical tower on three levels includes electrical, pool storage, steam and sauna.

Family size hot pool with ramp and stair access.

The leisure pool includes features enjoyed by young and old including beach entry and sprays.

Splash pad, deck level sprays and water features fun for tots and deck activities.

Multipurpose room with deck access for birthday parties and training.

Public viewing from a environmentally controlled lobby.

Administration space for lifeguards and first aid room are positioned to provide easy of supervision of pool and change rooms.