

Peter Long
whitehorsewalks.com
58 Kluane Crescent, Hillcrest, Whitehorse
pjl@whitehorsewalks.com
May 29, 2014



Sorry about late submission, and my ideas not well thought out.

There's a number of principals or themes I'll touch on. Let me address them here so I don't have to be too repetitive. Quotes are from my upcoming Yukon Walking Strategy document.

Walkers and walking not represented at appropriate city level.

Health/walking needs to be at the level of roads, sewers, water in city importance.

Is there a public demand for walking trails?

Perhaps the question should be, "Would we be healthier if governments and communities worked to create demand for walking?"

Is there a voice speaking for walking.

However, in the Yukon, although friends walk together, there's no organized voice for walking: no walking coordinator within any of the governments; no sports and recreation body for walking; and no NGO with a specific walking focus.

walking not a sport or an organized activity.

Problem users

Walking trails are not generally environmental problems. It's usually vehicles that cause problems.

Meetings

(provoked by page 5 of PDF: Only 13 on-line surveys.) You need feedback but the process to get it needs to be better.

I'll draw in examples from recent city processes so you see what doesn't work. That's what I see as a walker and neighbourhood resident.

I'm sure it's complicated but I really think that charettes would be the thing to try. Feedback on PDF documents is hard to do. We as citizens have been burned by putting a lot of effort into city processes only to have it ignored, or incorporated into the plan and the plan later reinterpreted because of revisiting/ revisioning by the city. If you don't want input, better to not ask for it. Cheaper and less aggravating for all.

Two hour round table meetings are too fast to be of great value. Doesn't allow time for reflection. Dependant on skills and bias of notetakers. City people shouldn't chair a meeting, nor sit at round table as a participant, nor puts up dots to choose what priorities should be.

Too much philosophy and not enough actual problem solving because meeting has been visualized as part of some process most of us don't believe in.

Map-based meetings should have maps that are usable.

True minutes need to be quickly posted from committees. Some minutes seem like they are top secret. And then some minutes seem like they say nothing.

Dot process is bad. These issues are often complex and solutions need to be broad in scope, not one sided. The herd mentality of putting dots on motherhood issues often leaves the interesting and critical ideas dropping off the table, not even being recorded as important. The dot placers may well not understand the point, or the recorder may have botched the phrasing, or the dot placers may be exposing their bias.

Wordsmithing ideas into fitting into slots, getting as many possible items under few headings; then allowing the dot process to drop them means a very short sighted approach and most of the idea gathering goes out the window.

City needs to be neutral.

Some current process do not take point of view of residents. Membership at meetings need to be appropriate. If there's neighbourhoods involved then they need representation. Or cancel the meeting or hold a separate meeting for neighbourhoods. It's too easy to just get the user groups who have representatives focussed on making their needs paramount.

So the takeaway message for engagement on parks planning, need to have neighbourhood/regional meetings open to individuals. We can't count on community associations to speak because they can only help inform members about happenings.

Initial Parameters

It would be useful for initial parameters to be part of this document. Trying to avoid the mess with motorized vehicles by not allowing motorized discussion into this process seems underhanded.

page 7

1 stewardship: all citizens.

This means that individual need to have same legitimacy as groups such as snowmobiles and mountainbikes. An individual is more likely to be ecological than might an ATV enthusiast who only sees their right to ride unfettered. A walker is more likely to be ecological because they travel slowly.

2. Interesting because currently official stewards are vehicle groups: mountainbikers and snowmobiles.

3. Knowledge-based. Whatever the reason, having no public FN presence on city trail/greenspace committees make me feel this is a very flawed process.

page 8

The vision for Regional Parks is to inspire and motivate residents and visitors to enjoy, discover, and value the natural world and the benefits it provides for current and future generations; Missing is a concept of how. Let me suggest that walking trails will be my answer in lots of places here.

page 10

Lots of promote, support but no do, create, build,....

page 11

1.1, 1.2 Here's where we pretend that recreational vehicles are not a problem. Walkers are not wrecking wetlands. By not allowing this to be said you're ignoring problems. Some places can be fixed if the city and vehicle organizations worked to get their groups to stay away.

Aside: A topic I don't see addressed is ethics. During ATV By-law process we couldn't say don't do things. Rather it came under the heading of education or a code of conduct. Of course, the ATV people didn't see that they were any different than other trail users so didn't like Codes of conduct for ATVs, for mountainbikes, for walkers, etc. Wanted just one code of conduct. But the Task Force recommended we have one, and that's the last I've heard of it.

I believe peer pressure could help stop wrecking trails if the official clubs frowned on this and brought the weight of the club to repair damage, rather than fight restrictions.

1.1.2 Our Paddy's Pond wetland was redefined for the winter to be not environmentally sensitive. Done to address a long-standing claim by snowmobiles that they don't cause problems. The snowmobile map removed the wetland from the city's environmentally sensitive map. I think this was the only area where that happened in the city. I never got any answer back when I challenged this.

Now the summer ATV map uses the winter map telling ATVs that there are no motorized trails they can be on. But the area is shown as not environmentally sensitive. So the rogue drivers continue to chew up the trails. Doesn't help a parent who might flaunt the law and send kids out to play on the family ATV but might say, don't go into the wetlands.

Very annoying is then the city says that it's not a sustainable thing to fix our trails because they are in wetlands! Catch 22!!!

Page 12

2.1.1 Facilities? In my walking stuff I refer to boardwalks, bridges, staircases and trail surfacing as walking trail infrastructure. Walking trail infrastructure should be here also.

2.1.4 Integrated community sustainability plan, 2007 says: Preserve green spaces; Five minute walking distance to green space from residence; Plans are done before development.

I suggest that a minimum distance to access a Park be looked at. Example, Arkell and Ingram's use of McIntyre Creek Park is hampered by Arkell wetlands. The neighbourhoods were built without planning walking trails. People are still buying new homes in Ingram.

If we're serious about wanting residents to get out and recreate then a boardwalk across wetland to connect to city-made trails needs to be important. The city should want to do it. They should insist on doing it. They should fund doing it. Certainly they can ask residents to help apply for funding like CDF, but it should be a city-led project. See my page on this issue *Snowshoe, Hike in Mount McIntyre Recreation Area*: http://whitehorsewalks.com/_docs/MountMcIntyreRecreationArea.pdf

2.2.1 all residents where feasible. See my rant at the beginning re meeting with friendly accessible organized user groups but ignoring the unorganized.

2.2.2 Watched a mountain biker pulling a trailer with 2 kids try to get thru our barrier that theoretically is to keep out motorized vehicles. We helped lift the trailer over the barrier. If motor vehicle culture would stop saying 'you can't tell us what to do' there would be less need for barriers.

2.3.1 Interesting to look at city's active living fun flyer: summer 2014. Think walking. Think trails. Problem is that most of parks and rec is about organized things. How about a how many trails have you walked this week or this week's featured trails is, or something.

page 13

3.1.1 other activities aligned. Again, walking, health ?

3.2.1. Bit repetitive but walking, health, seniors, adults with no interest in sports or organized activities, over stressed screen-bound workers needing nature time.

3.2.3 What about walk leaders for regular walking events, community/neighbourhood trail steward training, Trail wardens, a system for reporting trail problems.

3.2.6 how about connecting local citizen scientists.

3.4.2 It would be useful to be a public process. And to fit disadvantaged groups like walkers or neighbourhoods without strong community associations into this.

page 14

4.2.1 especially interconnections to other parks and wilderness.

Interim protection for expressions on interest (rock gardens) Yukon river Walking Trail. The problem will be under staffing, poor prioritizing where it could be decades before there's time to look at these. Meanwhile, developers can come in rezone and carry on.

4.3.2 add citizen scientists.

4.5.2 Is this meant to be bylaw, trail crews? If we can get parks and rec to include walking trails as a legitimate activity, then walk leaders, interpreters, liaison staff with neighbourhood steward groups.

4.5.6 See my piece at beginning about fixing problem designations in Paddy's Pond and wherever else it's needed.

page 15

1.7 neighbourhood connections and 5 min sustainable connection rule needs to also be an issue.

2.2 obligation by city to make this happen. Weak community assn or no community assn should trigger public forum events. See my bit at beginning about this.

2.6 allow for volunteers by individuals not just by recognized groups

2.7 start on outside where people live, apply 5 minute rule and see whether a neighbourhood can get to their park. We have cliffs, rivers, wetlands that act as barriers. Then throw in roads (mountainview, Hamilton in particular) and highways (alaska hwy) and they can just as effectively block access.

page 16

3.2. not sure this fits here but it sure fits somewhere. There should be significant areas where quiet can be had. Yup. No motorized vehicles. They should not be allowed to go everywhere. Otherwise our 'parks' are just vehicle playgrounds. Park needs to have some degree of sanctity. Council wrong in not allowing this to even be discussed.

Aside: No time to fit this, but it seems that if we found a rare plant or a nesting bird that stronger rules apply against disturbance than for people out for a walk could be protected against being buzzed by a snowmobile.

3.3 residents. ie neighbourhood trail benefits a resident and a tourist. Why should a business get to make profit selling a vehicle that gets used to wrecking a wetland, but a resident doesn't get to claim value after paying \$xxx,000 for a home?

3.6 We need a true parks and greenspaces organization with a budget and a baseline task of environmental and walking trails.

We're starting from a disadvantaged point. Unfair. Trail people can't keep up servicing snowmobile and mountain bikes. Hardly able to talk to residents. Add in all Park infrastructure and progress on parks are lost.

1.5 The City has traditionally focused its recreation efforts on providing or supporting facilities for active sports....trails and classes

Walking needs help. Just because it doesn't lend itself to programming or sports stuff doesn't mean it can be ignored. Too much trail stuff is around vehicles: mountainbikes, ATVs, snowmobiles.

There's only me talking walking. So unless you consider me an organization, then there's no walking voice. My take-a-picture-of-every-Yukon-plant project (<http://www.yukonviews.com/yukon/flowers/index.html>) is on the back burner while I see if I can change the system. I assure you I'll get jaded or burned out and move on one day back to plants.

I see an obligation on part of city to create a walking voice in the city, not a part of general trails or sidewalks but a higher level ethical position with clout. Someone who can argue with engineering or parks and rec or zoning or sustainable city and say 'hold on, that's not acceptable'

Where do we come off thinking a person driving a car should have more rights than individuals walking? This is a dinosaur viewpoint.

page 17

If this is an ordered list it's telling that citizens are last, way after army cadets!

page 19

2.1 under fourth: let's call getting a tourist out of their car and walking in the woods, staying in a B&B and buying a muffin and a coffee, a loaf of bread, potatoes, lettuce, tomatoes and hot dogs 'passive commercial recreation'. I claim they are valuable even if they don't rent a high end guide, or rent a canoe, or other recognized tourist activities. So if we want these people, we need to advertise our walking trails, interpret them, make them easy to follow, safe without a vehicle crashing downhill at them.

page 22

I get to the end and wonder at not including the Territorial Government's 2014 Wellness Plan, the Renewed active living strategy, the Trails Maintenance Policy, the many applicable by-laws esp ATV, snowmobile, protected areas, Zoning...

And how about relevant parts of the O&M and Capital budgets showing where parks and rec money goes (and where it doesn't). Or the Growth Policy, Strategic Priorities Report, Community Economic Development Strategy...

or Environmentally sensitive areas, ... no time...some of this is at <http://whitehorsewalks.com/guideToCity.html> bottom of page

page 24

2.5 Easy access to nature... how about 5 or 10 min walk, or not have to drive,. How about the residents can walk in their neighbourhoods in all seasons. Barriers are breached at significant intervals to encourage walking. Wetlands, cliffs, ski trails, golf courses, are barriers to healthy living for most people and should be crossable by walking trails.

Aside: Have you covered interpretation of areas as important? Encouragement of schools to adopt an area with walking trails so they are co-stewards with local residents? Youth leadership roles in this?

page 25

good access to public open space close to home. Public open space sounds like a dusty bare field. Park sounds like a place to go. The city, 'The Wilderness City' should aim higher. It's our taxes that are paying so let's be more ambitious for our quality of life. Parks need to be easily and closely accessible to people. Walk, not drive.

Para "budgets are being... Repetitive but... both residents and walkers need access to things and have no voice. Partnering with a group and giving them say over taxpayer funded trails is easier than taking a stand for residents who are not demanding the ability to walk.

page 26

ensures reasonable public access: reasonable to who? again, if walkers are not important then a solitary walking voice could well be construed as unreasonable. I've been refused a seat in a city process because I wouldn't start an association that I could represent, and they didn't want individuals.

page 27

3.1 Environmentally sensitive. See intro piece.

page 28

3.3 current roles missing things...

who's in charge of paving trails? Who is active transportation?

What about the zoning people, one of our lines of defence protecting things.

Who controls Parks as process goes on and into the future? Does Planning run things until each official individual Park Management Plan, then give to some department? When all's said and done what is a Park? A collection of trails surrounded by empty land? Lands with trails running through them? Will a group interested in the land be in charge? Outreach and events? Doesn't sound right. Trails people? Too narrow a focus, over extended. By-law? Hope not necessary. Environmental sustainability? More about engineering. Planning? doesn't seem their jurisdiction either.

page 29

The City will make special efforts to reach out to First Nation communities to encourage participation in Regional Park planning and management.

It would seem that supreme efforts be made to have first nation participation. Like the idea of walkers and residents, the city should feel an obligation to court input.

page 30

Says facility includes trails, yet report talks of facilities and trails as separate things?

typo: that could supports (support) park visitor experiences

Inclusion. Walking.

Peter