

Vancouver Park Board - 2018 MUNICIPAL ELECTION CANDIDATE SURVEY RESULTS

QUESTION 1 *Park Board staff proposed potential solutions to the dangerous part of the Seaside Greenway at Kits Beach on March 12, 2018 with a recommended process for getting it improved. Park Board commissioners voted to return it to the drawing board yet again. Will you vote for a separated bike path to improve cycling and walking safety at Kits Beach? If so, what would be your timeline of action to make it happen?*



Camil Dumont		I am a 1st time candidate and I've been struck by the emotion and in some cases vitriol of the Kits Beach bike path schmozzel. All that stated, I believe I am more or less up to speed on the situation. I have biked that beach for years and recently took a ride down there to look at the issue specifically through the lens of a potential Parks Commissioner. Certainly, as is, it doesn't work. I would love to see a separated bikeway that is safe for cyclists and for non-cyclists alike. I think that would be great. I'm also sensitive to the viewpoint that we should limit paving in parks. I think there is compromise to be had on the issue but I worry that in some cases emotion has clouded evidence. I think I would rather see roadway re-purposed myself but it may be that there is a need for wiggle room on all sides. What I need to see first and foremost is safety. That's the issue that trumps the others for me. As for timeline, I find it hard to comment. I'm not going to make promises I can't keep. I'm not sure how much influence I will genuinely have on timeline so it would be empty of me to state anything specific. I would like to see it done in a way that works well long-term so we can put this issue to rest. I would hope quickly, feels like it's been long enough. But a rash decision that falls short would be very troubling. It's a bit of a balancing act I suppose.
Gewn Giesbrecht	Yes	COPE Park Board Comissioners would work to get this done by working with staff to organize a process to facilitate the planning and implementation over the first year of our mandate. This would include: no loss of greenspace, and participation from all interested parties.
Jamie Lee Hamilton	Yes	Everyone whether walking or cycling needs to feel safe. I am open to hearing what stakeholders believe is the best solution and I would encourage public engagement on this issue.
Rick Hurlbut		It really depends on what you want the cycling path to accomplish. Is it to enjoy the park itself and the views along the waterfront? As a recreational use, the portion of the existing pathway in question asks cyclists to dismount, to show consideration for other park users. Given the relatively short distance involved, that's not too much to ask. If, however, a new pathway is to be considered part of the commuter network, then it makes more sense to integrate dedicated bike lanes into the roadways around the periphery of the park. The proposal that came from Park Board staff would have removed significant green space, and still might have created conflict with other park users as they intersected with the bike lanes. I would rather see a solution which takes a little from the roads, and includes some easement along the periphery of the park, as was proposed for the section along Cornwall Avenue. Just as has already been done elsewhere in the City, there's no reason two-direction bike traffic can't be placed on just the one side of Cornwall, Arbutus and the other streets - so long as it's physically separated from the streets themselves.
John Irwin	Yes	COPE Park Board Comissioners would work to get this done by working with staff to organize a process to facilitate the planning and implementation over the first year of our mandate. This would include: no loss of greenspace, and participation from all interested parties.
Mathew Kagis	Yes	As soon as is feasible. I understand that sometimes these processes move at "the speed of government" and can seem frustratingly slow. I'm in favor of a process that is as fast as possible, while keeping in mind that we want to do RIGHT once. And not rush the job in a way that gives us an inadequate result.
Shamim Shivji	Yes	Vision Vancouver supports the separated path. The timeline for action should be as soon as possible. It is worth noting that not all Park Board Commissioners voted to return the report to staff and in particular Vision Commissioner Catherine Evans did not vote to return this already much discussed proposal to staff.
Cameron Zubko	Yes	Vision Vancouver supports the separated path. The timeline for action should be as soon as possible. It is worth noting that not all Park Board Commissioners voted to return the report to staff and in particular Vision Commissioner Catherine Evans did not vote to return this already much discussed proposal to staff.



Vancouver Park Board - 2018 MUNICIPAL ELECTION CANDIDATE SURVEY RESULTS

QUESTION 2 *Park Board produced the 2012 Stanley Park Cycling Plan complete with an implementation plan and budget. This plan remains largely unimplemented. How do you propose to make Park Board accountable for implementing this plan? What would be your timeline of action to make it happen?*

Camil Dumont	From the question I gather that this delay has been a cause of frustration. It does seem like an awful long one time to implement a plan if it has already been approved. I would like to know why there is such foot-dragging on this plan before I commit to anything - has it been delayed for legitimate reasons? If no, let's just get on with it.
Gewn Giesbrecht	COPE Park Board Commissioners would review this plan and budget, advocate for funds to be released from general revenues (council decision) and plan and implement it over a three year timeline. If we cannot convince our Park Board colleagues to implement this plan, we will work to ensure that it is in the next capital plan.
Jamie Lee Hamilton	If Park Board voted to implement this plan and did not, it needs to come before the Board again. If elected I would certainly want to know why this has been stalled.
Rick Hurlbut	I'll be honest. Even after sitting in on Park Board meetings for 2 years and making every effort to become knowledgeable of what's happening at Park Board, the 2012 Stanley Park Cycling Plan is news to me. There is so much that has happened during this 2-year period - VanSplash, VanPlay, OnWater, renegotiating the JOA - that it's easy for a project, which was implemented under a Park Board of two administrations ago, to get lost in the shuffle. During those 2 years, the Plan hasn't even been mentioned around the Park Board table, so it seems to have gone underground. I do know that a major refurbishment of the Sea Wall is underway, and cycling was no doubt included in the upgrades. Beyond that, the cycling community is encouraged to bring the issue back to the next Board. I would personally make every effort to become familiar with the Plan. No doubt this very question was intended to bring the matter back to the top of the Board's in-basket. Regardless, and in the most generalized of terms, there are hundreds of millions of dollars of wish lists all though the Park system - more public washrooms, refurbishing or replacing community centres, pools and arenas, etc. To keep the capital plan coming back to cycling is a matter of the squeaky wheel getting the grease - literally and figuratively. If you're not in front of the Board on a regular basis, attention will naturally drift to the most pressing issue of the day.
John Irwin	COPE Park Board Commissioners would review this plan and budget, advocate for funds to be released from general revenues (council decision) and plan and implement it over a three year timeline. If we cannot convince our Park Board colleagues to implement this plan, we will work to ensure that it is in the next capital plan.
Mathew Kagis	First, I will take the time to read through the report BEFORE the election. Then I will be in a position to ask staff where are we at? What's the Holdup? And to make it an action item on the Park Board agenda. I would begin agitating for this from the first meeting of the newly elected board.
Shamim Shivji	There are 11 locations identified for improvement in Stanley Park, 6 of them along the Causeway. The improvement plan is currently being reviewed by the Stanley Park Intergovernmental Working Group. The Working Group is made up of representatives of the Musqueam, Squamish, and Tsleil-Waututh First Nations, the Park Board, and the governments of BC and Canada. When the Working Group completes its review and provided the improvements are approved, the work will be immediately tendered.
Cameron Zubko	There are 11 locations identified for improvement in Stanley Park, 6 of them along the Causeway. The improvement plan is currently being reviewed by the Stanley Park Intergovernmental Working Group. The Working Group is made up of representatives of the Musqueam, Squamish, and Tsleil-Waututh First Nations, the Park Board, and the governments of BC and Canada. When the Working Group completes its review and provided the improvements are approved, the work will be immediately tendered.

Vancouver Park Board - 2018 MUNICIPAL ELECTION CANDIDATE SURVEY RESULTS

QUESTION 3 *The Park Board has discussed the idea of “to, not through” parks for people on bikes. This is a frightening idea for people who love to enjoy parks on bicycles, especially with their children and elders, and would preclude biking on most parts of the Seaside Greenway. What do you think of this concept?*



Camil Dumont	I think this is a park-by-park, scenario by scenario issue. It just seems that a one-size fits all "solution" on this will lead to conflict and to ineffective policy. As I stated above, safety is my first priority, for cyclists and non-cyclists alike. I too like biking by the beach, it's great. I'm also cautious regarding my preferences overriding the experience of others. I would like an equitable solution that works for as many park patrons as possible. That seems within reach to me.
Gewn Giesbrecht	This should apply only to parks where access is very limited. The current, well designed Seaside Greenway system should be maintained and have spot improvements.
Jamie Lee Hamilton	I believe there is a solution as parks should be accessible for all.
Rick Hurlbut	<p>As with my discussion of Kits Beach Park above, and as is the case throughout the park system, there will always be competing demands as to what happens in our parks. Do we create more playing fields, swimming pools, picnic shelters, seniors' centres, etc. - or only allow lawns, flowers and trees? Do we remove institutions from our parks - Bard on the Beach, Museum of Vancouver, the PNE - to make way for other purposes? We're not getting any more land for parks in any significant way, which puts us in the position to consider every new request with care. If there is space, and if in each situation it makes sense, then cycling within our parks allows one more way for them to be enjoyed, while also providing exercise away from congested surface streets.</p> <p>But Park Board also needs to have a more fulsome conversation with the cycling community. Although few in number, there are still incidents where cyclists aren't being courteous to other park users. While it seems unfair, it's still the reality in public perception that one bad apple spoils the bunch. Urban cycling at the level we're currently experiencing is still new and some gentle public education is needed, much as is already happening with dog owners. Instead of an us-versus-them stance, I'd rather the Park Board worked through the issues with cyclists, finding the right fit based on the particular needs of each park. If you do consider yourselves a community, when asking for the City to provide accommodation you must be willing to come part way on resolving these issues - if only for the sake of perception.</p> <p>One final comment: I'm not an active cyclist myself, but have been in the past. I completely support the movement toward increased cycling for both recreation and commuting. But like the vast majority of cities, Vancouver wasn't built for cycling, or at least not since the 1930s. During this difficult transitional period, there will be voices on both side calling for either MORE or LESS (cough, cough, Coalition Vancouver, cough, cough) cycling infrastructure, and each wanting it now. Sure, you need to push your agenda forward, and sometimes that means pushing hard. But it will take time, and it will take buckets of money. Even given all I've written above, and assuming I'm successful in my bid for Park Board, that squeaky wheel will still need to be applied on occasion.</p>
John Irwin	This should apply only to parks where access is very limited. The current, well designed Seaside Greenway system should be maintained and have spot improvements.
Mathew Kagis	I think it sucks! I am not an active cyclist any more, but I was a cycling fiend in my 20's & 30's. I had an "Off Road Toad"... Your older mountain bikers will get that reference. Cycling IN parks was all I wanted to do, getting to the park was the boring part.
Shamim Shivji	Bikes are an important way to get to parks, through parks, and enjoying our parks. Parks are the safest place to learn how to ride.
Cameron Zubko	Bikes are an important way to get to parks, through parks, and enjoying our parks. Parks are the safest place to learn how to ride.