



A Shared Community Vision

Electoral Area 'A' OCP Review,

Citizen's Committee Speaker Series

Transit, Parks, and Recreation Workbook Results

This document presents the community's responses to the questions and policy options presented in the workbook on transit, parks, and recreation. The workbook is available on the Official Community Plan review project website at www.asharedcommunityvision.ca, by emailing a request to areaaocpreview@rdn.bc.ca, or by contacting the Regional District of Nanaimo planning department at (250) 390-6510

Transit Expectations

Do you support having additional transit services in Electoral Area 'A'?

1. I support additional transit in area A. Citizens will be more and more reliant on public transit for economic and environmental reasons. Test runs could be made to see if more or new runs are viable.
2. Yes and No. Yes because it provides people with a valid option to the personal automobile but No if the routes are continued the way they are currently structured. The routes must be direct in and direct out of an area and not milk runs. You need little compact loops that intersect with others delivering more riders to hubs where other routes and transit options exist be it rail, pathway, bike, walking or the car through park and ride type options.
3. Yes
4. Yes, but only if usage can support it.
5. Only if the ridership supports it.
6. Yes, I support having additional transit services in Electoral Area 'A'.
7. No I do not. I think what we have is plenty. There's no one ever on the bus as is.
8. Only if and when there is adequate population density to support an increase in services.
9. Yes – strongly support transit services. The Community Vision is not achievable without a functioning transit service.
10. Yes.
11. Yes.
12. Yes.
13. Yes.

Transit Expectations

How frequent and what kind of transit service do you support?

1. Transit could be with smaller buses or vans until larger buses are needed. Many elderly and disabled citizens would benefit from the "dial-a ride" option. Early morning and later afternoon service would support commuters. Park and ride options should be explored. Connections with the airport and ferry systems would be beneficial.
2. The frequency for me is not really an issue as I never honestly intend on using the service. I will bike or walk or drive 99% of the time.
3. Hourly
4. Bus service should be as often as the community can support by usage.
5. The frequency should be dictated by the ridership needs. Service should be village centres only along routes that will contribute riders. Rural areas should look after themselves (except for special services for seniors and the disabled).
6. I support bus, train incorporation, and handiDart service, as frequently as is economically feasible in all areas of Electoral Area 'A'.
7. The current on or less. To run these large busses with a few people on then is way worse for the environment than driving. You can never please everyone.
8. I support the present service improved to the level planned by Transit in the short term i.e. 3 additional trips/day.
9. Frequency is a factor of cost. Bussing appears to be the only viable option at this time. Planners may want to look at, and encourage, the possibility of small private services and/or a cooperative as long as it does not compete with the core services.
10. I support and encourage the use of rail and trail.
11. ANY infrequent small community bus. Even twice a day service would give us some value for the various transportation taxes paid.
12. The transit improvements in the Nanaimo Regional Transit Business Plan look pretty realistic to me.
13. Community buses covering larger areas linking to a centralized transportation hub where people can link to major transportation modes (rail, airport, ferries, highway and city buses).

Transit Expectations

What areas would you like transit to service? Where do you live and where would you like to be able to go on transit?

1. I reside in Cassidy and work in Nanaimo so service from Cassidy to Nanaimo would benefit me and many other Cassidy residents. Many of the elderly residents that reside in the manufactured home parks feel there is a real and desperate need for transit in this area.
2. Transit should focus on a hub based point to point system. Milk run loops are ineffective, have little actual ridership and generally take too long to get to where one needs to be so they don't use it. Having transit run from 0530 to 0900 and then again from 1530 to 1900 would be a good thing.
3. From South Wellington, I would like to be able to ride a bus to Cassidy, the Cedar Village Centre, the Cedar Community Hall, and connect with the City's bus services at Chase River
4. Cedar Village and immediately adjacent neighbourhoods.
5. I live at Boat Harbour and if I am to use the bus I will drive to Cedar, where there is service.
6. Duke Point, the airport, Cassidy, Yellow Point, Cedar Central, South Wellington. I live by Malaspina Collage and would like to take transit to my work in South Wellington.
7. The current is fine. You couldn't pay me enough to get on a bus.
8. I can not see regular transit fitting my needs.
9. Reliable service located primarily in the more densely populated residential and business areas. eg. Main St. and inside the UCB. Trying to stretch the service and compromise the quality will inevitably lead to failure and an uphill climb to get acceptance at any later date. Would like to see the RDN A and CVRD-H reach a joint transfer station at the Nanaimo Airport.
10. South Wellington to and from Nanaimo mainly. I look forward to train service from Nanaimo to Victoria and Nanaimo to Campbell River.
11. A) Should Be Able To: Walk from any of the 1000m2 residences along Pylades Drive to the same turnabout corner that the school bus goes to (ie Pylades Dr and DeCourcey Rd) to a local community bus stop. B) Compromise Would Be To: Walk or cycle (in seasonal weather ,with some form of grocery cart or bike pannier) to a Yellowpoint Rd -DeCourcey regular bus stop. C) Minimum Expectation Would Be To: Drive (if healthy) to the publicly funded North Cedar Improvement District's rear parking lot ,which should also be designated as a Park & Ride for unserviced transit patrons. and catch the bus there as the southerly terminus. D) Novel Implementation: Why not extend the southerly transit route and designate a gravel Park & Ride to at least the Cedar / Crow & Gate outdoor market area. Attract ridership from all over the district to patronize the market , give local people a safer place to park than the dangerous roadside at the agribusiness marketplace, provide a park & ride hub for new transit patrons presently utilizing their cars, and enhance community market Place-Making as a spinoff ?
12. I live in Yellowpoint so transit is unrealistic at this time because I'm 5 km from the nearest bus stop. Long term, transit to the airport / Cassidy area and a park & ride there may be feasible.
13. I live in Cedar. I would like to have the option of catching a small community bus that would link up to a major transportation hub. There could be community buses servicing each area. Cassidy, South Wellington, North Oyster, Yellowpoint, etc.

Transit Expectations

How often would you use transit and for what purpose (i.e. go to work, school, shopping, health care, etc.)

1. I would use transit to go back and forth to work almost daily if the schedule and connections work.
2. I can not use transit for work as it does not leave early enough and does not provide direct access to where I need to be.
3. With the above, at least three or four return trips per week; shopping, VIU, library, meetings.
4. Don't use
5. I don't use transit.
6. I would use transit for work daily.
7. I have not been on a bus since I was in grade 9. I wouldn't use it for any reason, nor most people I know.
8. I can't ever see using transit in the foreseeable future. Handy Dart may be a possibility at some point if unable to drive.
9. Would use it as much as possible as long as it is safe and reliable. The focus should be on young and older transit users. If it works for them it will most likely be useable for all other potential riders if timing is coordinated with working people's schedules.
10. Yes.
11. 2 people * 4 round trips a week in this household: Transit if available to local & regional shopping, greenhouses, health care, recreation facilities, financial services, district meetings, adjacent communities, cultural events, sailing marinas like boat harbour, kayaking courses, community halls, Duke Point ferry, regional parks, train access point.
12. I might use transit to go to work at the university. (VIU encourages bus passes and parking is hard to find and expensive). But there would have to be a park & ride for me to do this.
13. If the scheduling worked I would use transit for all of the examples noted as well as visiting relatives on the island if connections could be made with major modes of transportation.

Policy Options For How the OCP Could Support Transit

Policy Option: Do nothing

1. "Do Nothing" is short sighted and would do nothing to achieve the community vision. Currently people in Cassidy that wish to take transit have to hitchhike, flag down the PCL bus by the highway, or the train. I know of a handicapped girl who would take the PCL bus in the morning and connect to transit in Nanaimo in order to take classes at VIU and then do the reverse to get home. It's not good enough.
2. This head-in-the-sand approach is not the right thing to do and should be avoided.
3. Climate change, Peak Oil, and food and water preclude this option. Do nothing and Area A and Nanaimo will implode.
4. A reasonable option for some areas considering it will be a long time before growth will support increased services. Rural living means living in an area that has fewer services than urban Area A. Many of the demands for increased services come from newer residents who want a rural lifestyle but are not ready to accept it comes with a price.
5. Without growth and redevelopment this may well be the best option.
6. Not an option.
7. Transit is a huge issue if you are trying to get people out of their cars. Doing nothing does not seem like a suitable option. Anyone without a car in Area A cannot rely on transit as it is today. Takes too long to go in and out of the area.
8. I support this very much.
9. There needs to be an expansion in service in the future and it should happen as a result of demand.
10. *Disagree – this runs counter to all common sense and the Community Vision.*
11. *No.*
12. Bad idea.
13. Not a suitable option.

Policy Options For How the OCP Could Support Transit

Policy Option: Support Transit Oriented Development within the village centres

1. Transit orientated development would make transportation options viable for the two village centers. A higher housing density and pre- built pull-outs would facilitate transit. Currently in Cassidy there is no transit, but there are pockets of high density and the possibility of additional development would make transit a necessity.
2. This is more effective but should link the nodes together.
3. Development itself is problematic but yes, any that proceeds must enhance the mobility of those living in Area A.
4. Yes, but transit should not be the entire focus and support for this option should not be construed as support for high density development.
5. This is by far the best option, and would work well within redevelopment within existing UCB's.
6. Yes, I agree. This would encourage the use of transit by the area of most density, therefore providing the greatest chance of success also providing access to commerce for rural residents.
7. As stated in this package earlier, a smaller bus could be used to go throughout the area to Southgate on a much more regular basis and expanded route.
8. Not at all. Leave everything how it is.
9. Don't think that we can achieve adequate densities in UCB's to trigger improvements.
10. Support. Supply transit only where it can essentially support itself and only add on new services as each new route is evaluated based on demand. Encourage other transportation options in low density areas but do not subsidize bad options.
11. YES. But also on a less frequent basis to the 'urban-like' hamlets that already meet the guidelines for local service (ie 1000m2 or 1/4 acre) lots. These are also often highly taxed properties with next -to- no services.
12. Good idea.
13. Slightly better but would still result in no service for larger portions of the population. Probability of creating unnecessary congestion at village centres.
14. Within villages—seems too small—unless someone wants to offer part time taxi service. Transit out to other communities is not warranted by small population. Increasing the population changes the character of the rural area and the villages themselves surely don't have the land base. Forestry land should remain as ALR, forestry land. Not to be developed and villages into suburbs.

Policy Options For How the OCP Could Support Transit

Policy Option: Support transit in Electoral Area 'A' where the costs are justified by density and demand

1. The cost of having several hundred people riding automobiles is great financially and environmentally. Anything we can do to encourage people to get out of their automobiles and into other forms of transportation is a good thing. Granted density should be the primary factor. Demand will certainly increase as gas prices rise and environmental sensitivity increases.
2. I'm not sure this is applicable.
3. Keeping in mind that the real costs of not providing public transit far exceed the cost of providing public transit, an enhanced and functioning Active Transportation system feeding a BRT system would minimize the concerns of the bean counters.
4. Yes
5. This makes good economical sense and should be applied to other options such as transit oriented development.
6. Yes, I believe there has to be cost justification, but with planning for future expansion as demand dictates.
7. Costs obviously need to be met by the users. Demand would need to be in place. Don't know how you increase demand without increasing the amount of trips first. How do you get demand up with such a limited service?
8. That's how the current system is set up and it seem to work just fine.
9. This is the most practical option for Area "A" and the one I support.
10. Support. Transit should be in step with population growth and demographics which will determine the amount of use through demand.
11. The 'true' cost of motor vehicles would not justify driving them either. Now is the best time to make changes for the future.
12. NO. Lose the big bus paradym here. Consider the success of community buses like in the White Rock / South Surrey peninsula. The cost-demand-density equation (including capital /leasing expenditure and operation) may come up with different results when coupled with the Community Vision benefits and a small nimble transportation service.
13. I agree but I don't think we've proven Area A's density or demand as yet.
14. There is still the cost and environmental issues with respect to getting the buses to those more densely populated areas of Area 'A'. I think smaller community buses would be the most cost effective. Frequency could be adjusted based on demand.
15. No. The density does not justify now and don't increase population just to finance a cost—it changes the rural area and threatens to change zoning for further expansion, where does expansion stop. 50 years from now, there will still be the arguments of needing more land for housing and 100 years from now Vancouver Island will be like Tokyo, Japan. Wise people look far ahead—7 generations.

Policy Options For How the OCP Could Support Transit

Policy Option: Support a broad range of transit services best suited to Electoral Area 'A'

1. A broad range of options should be considered: park and ride, smaller buses, dial a ride, handi-dart, bike racks, etc.
2. Services for this area must reflect on the automobile, the HOV type application and the bus. LRT is too expensive and likely not effective since there is no real down town core that would attract a final destination like say Surrey, Vancouver or Victoria does.
3. Integration is the key to transit in Area 'A'. Where busses cannot (or will not) go, alternatives must be provided for. I.e. If buses cannot service people living near the intersections on Minto/Dick/Minetown and Scotchtown Roads, and as the cost of a rail trail appears overly problematic, a commuter rail system must become a priority - similar considerations must be given for other areas refused bus service.
4. Yes .
5. This is a good idea when considering seniors or special needs people, but not able bodied, independent people.
6. Yes, I believe exploring transit services and choosing custom made for the area options are the ultimate in supporting our community vision.
7. In a rural setting such as Area A a broad range of services should be looked at. Cost sharing could be an option.
8. No.
9. This option has some merit. Include car pooling.
10. It's not clear what this might look like but stick to the old rule of "keeping it simple" and grow with the community. Innovation and experimentation is good but not at the expense of the core Service.
11. Yes including creative thinking.
12. Yes.
13. Worth exploring / studying
14. This option has the most logical merit.
15. Not if it means increasing development and population.

Policy Options For How the OCP Could Support Transit

Policy Option: Ensure that transit is a consideration for all new development

1. All development within the village boundaries should be cognizant of transit. The current trend in environmentally friendly communities is to have narrower roadways so if additional development is within walking distance to transit services, then that would facilitate transit use.
2. Unless zoning and the OCP match this will be a waste of time. Clarify the objective here and determine what would actually work.
3. Again yes and again with the note that development, itself is problematic.
4. Yes , but this option is mostly in the hands of Highways and great caution must be used when including such statements in an OCP so as not to create unreasonable expectations of the community.
5. Only if transit is or will be present. If a proposed development is located away from existing transit services and such services are not envisaged for that area than the development should be exempt.
6. Yes, costs are shared when transit is considered for all new development. Also it brings the transit from concept to reality along with development. More density, more transit options.
7. No - unless transit is part of the cost sharing, need to expand more of what kinds of consideration is meant by this question. Too many aspect and considerations being written into Official Community Plan that will only make it so any development is almost impossible. We cannot policy people to death on absolutely everything.
8. No.
9. Not a practical option for Area "A". Would increase cost of any development with low potential that residents would see transit in a reasonable time period.
10. Obvious benefits - and it should be included in the process to be done as a “matter of course”. Where there are questions new developments should be required to do ridership evaluations and provide commensurate transit facilities or at least provide for them during the earth moving stages and placing in-ground infrastructure, eg. lighting and buss pull-outs.
11. yes- for example the duke point ferry service in and out OR some rapid system are the only transportation system acceptable for the cable bay development. adding so many more commuters is contrary to the intent of the Area A OCP for sustainability, as it is Area A which will be affected.
12. Yes.
13. Yes. This encourages development within the UCB and “managed” increased density will make transit more feasible.
14. Yes this is a good idea.
15. Assumes development

Policy Options For How the OCP Could Support Transit

Policy Option: Support infrastructure that enables transit

1. The roads in Cassidy are heavily used daily by logging trucks, transport trucks, gravel trucks, and heavy equipment used by Terasen. The roads are heavily used by industry, but that causes the roadways to degrade fairly rapidly. Transit obviously needs roadways that have pull-outs and are relatively free from pot-holes. Because our roads are heavily used by heavy vehicles can we have upgraded roadways that would also support transit?
2. This makes sense. When planning roads, bridges and overpasses one should not discount the requirements of future transit growth.
3. An unqualified yes, noting also that within the framework of a BRT system connecting Nanaimo to Ladysmith or just YCD, the roads and roadways are already more than adequate to support bus service.
4. Yes ,but wary of such motherhood statements that create community expectations when the issues are beyond community and Region control.
5. Yes, but only if transit is or will be present. If a proposed development is located away from existing transit services and such services are not envisaged for that area than the development should be exempt.
6. Yes, without property infrastructure we will not be able to provide transit.
7. Yes.
8. No.
9. Putting the cart before the horse. This is the same as the faulty Airport expansion mentality. Building the infrastructure doesn't ensure that transit will come. Must be based on economics.
10. Support - the benefits are obvious.
11. I'm not sure what this question is asking. No to more development to justify transit with higher density but yes to a train platform or bus shelter or other infrastructure necessary to providing transit.
12. Yes.
13. In our OCP, I think we should encourage the Min. of Transport ensure that future upgrades will accommodate transit.
14. Yes.

Other Ideas?

Please use this space to provide any other ideas and suggestions you may have for how the Official Community Plan should support transit.

1. I support the linkage of various forms of transit and the linkage of trail-ways and transit.
2. Point development in the direction of zoning changes to accommodate more public institutional and services with each of the several communities to minimize the need to rely on transit and access to public institutions and services situated elsewhere. That RGS definition of community.
3. Provide Park and Ride facilities in village centres.
4. The provision of transit services should be practical and as economical as possible. If the ridership is not there - don't provide the service. If the service is there and ridership drops off - reduce or eliminate the service.
5. All these people who complain about not having enough transit services would never take the bus either. They get out of their SUV's and complain about greenhouse gas emissions and rant about peak oil. We live out in the country for crying out loud to have peace and quiet not to have busses revving their engines outside our homes. People live out here to get away from the luxuries and services of cities. We are proud of being more self-sustained, of living off our lands. Anyone who wants more transit should move to the city and leave us alone in peace and quiet.
6. Ensure that new transit facilities are clean, safe, and most of all convenient for users or don't do it at all. It does not take much to put people off from using a public facility if it is not maintained in good condition. Because it is a rural service does not mean that it can be operated at a lower standard – in fact the opposite is probably true.
7. We need to see vehicle traffic slowed. Country roads especially, provide opportunities for very fast driving and is dangerous for anyone attempting to utilise the roadways in any other way. (even slower driving!) We have allowed motorised vehicles, and drivers, to attain status and rights that define our communities without considering the true costs, financial, social and environmental, of doing so. The continued expansion and development of our roads to allow more, and faster, mostly single user vehicles, IS a big problem, and we have to modify our behaviour. Perhaps the infrastructure we already have in place can be used to get around in Area A and the surrounding rural communities, with transportation centers to provide rapid transit to the node of Nanaimo. So, for example, the roadways of Area A...take as much of one lane as required, to allow for 2-way non motorised and foot traffic. The remaining road allowance would force cars to slow down. The main 4-lane highways also, dedicate one lane to non motorised/or slower (electric/golf carts etc) and foot traffic, another lane to public transport and HOV. Slowing traffic would mean less carbon emissions, fewer traffic related accidents, less infrastructure maintenance, quieter roads, as well as incentives for people to use faster public transport or alternative transport. Perhaps a rural lifestyle would seem less attractive to those who would be unwilling to allow for any additional travel time that reducing travel speeds from say 80 kph to 60 kph would entail, and this would have the added benefit of increasing downtown densification and reducing urban sprawl. We have said that we would like to see Area A become a model for sustainability. We will have to consider moving around slower if we are to put our words into action and help make Area A more attractive to residents and visitors alike, long term. With political will the E&N rail and trail way would become a priority.
8. It would be awesome to be able to ride a bicycle from Pylades Dr. to Boat Harbour or Yellowpoint Rd, catch transit to a nearby train station, travel towards the South Island, get off and follow the Galloping Goose Trail, then return the same day or stay with guests visiting at an RDN B&B. Blueway & Greenway Cycling, Transit, Rail multi-modal transportation.YES!
9. Encourage more farming, farmer's markets. Keep village, as villages, with the few shops and adequate parking. Educate people to do their shopping in one trip, instead of several, to keep schools local and encourage small community living, not subdivision style with its little malls and growing box stores.

Policy Options for Active Transportation in Area 'A'

Establish compatible land use framework

1. Yes I think the OCP should support this because it would identify land that could be used in the future for parks and trails.
2. This may be difficult to obtain with private land owners etc.
3. As the online file seems to be incompatible with my older computer. I can only concur that what was identified at the workshops is appropriate.
4. Yes .
5. I believe this is a principle which should be used in all community planning. Compatibility avoids conflict.
6. Yes, establishing a compatible land use framework provides planning ahead for the preservation of areas in the future. Mapping private, public, vulnerable, and specific habitat in our area would be a start.
7. Yes.
8. No compatible land use is not displaying maps of private land without explicit consent of the landowner.
9. No.
10. I support this option.
11. *Benefit are obvious.*
12. We need to see vehicle traffic slowed. Country roads especially, provide opportunities for very fast driving and is dangerous for anyone attempting to utilise the roadways in any other way. (even slower driving!) We have allowed motorised vehicles, and drivers, to attain status and rights that define our communities without considering the true costs, financial, social and environmental, of doing so. The continued expansion and development of our roads to allow more, and faster, mostly single user vehicles, IS a big problem, and we have to modify our behaviour. Perhaps use the infrastructure we already have in place can be used to get around in Area A and the surrounding rural communities, with transportation centers to provide rapid transit to the node of Nanaimo. So, for example, the roadways of Area A...take as much of one lane as required, to allow for 2-way non motorised and foot traffic. The remaining road allowance would force cars to slow down. The main 4-lane highways also, dedicate one lane to non motorised/or slower (electric/golf carts etc) and foot traffic, another lane to public transport and HOV. Slowing traffic would mean less carbon emissions, fewer traffic related accidents, less infrastructure maintenance, quieter roads, as well as incentives for people to use faster public transport or alternative transport. Perhaps a rural lifestyle would seem less attractive to those who would be unwilling to allow for any additional travel time that reducing travels speeds from say 80 kph to 60 kph would entail, and this would have the added benefit of increasing downtown densification and reducing urban sprawl. We have said that we would like to see Area A become a model for sustainability. We will have consider moving around slower if we are to put our words into action and help make Area A more attractive to residents and visitors alike, long term.
13. Yes.
14. It's always good to make a list of compatible land for non-motorized travel. However, please protect ALR from active transportation. People, dogs, garbage, broken gates and fences can be destructive to the production of local food.
15. Yes.
16. I don't have time to read the intro to this

Policy Options for Active Transportation in Area 'A'

Improve roadside conditions

1. Roadside conditions in area A can be hazardous to pedestrians and cyclists. When roads are upgraded a widened shoulder on one side of the road could be considered
2. This has to happen. MOT / BCT / RDN need to improve the local curb lanes, gutters, street parking and ditches to promote better use of the AT type situation. Currently, too many people find it dangerous to ride bikes, horses or even walk on the streets in Area A. The shoulder width should be at least 1.5 times the width of a vehicle so that if one is parked on the side of the road there is still room to get around it safely.
3. Yes, but again caution must be exercised to ensure expectations are not raised beyond capabilities.
4. I support this based on safety.
5. Yes, improving roadside conditions enables active transportation to become a reality. Particularly from a safety standpoint. Any road improvement, subdivision or development must include roadside upgrades.
6. Yes.
7. No. It costs too much \$\$ and the way it is right now is just fine.
8. Along Cedar Road.
9. Yes.
10. This is necessary to allow safe use of the road to other than vehicular traffic.
11. *Agree but based on use and should include bike paths adjacent to roads in the future.*
12. Or slow traffic down and reduce motorised vehicle road allowance.
13. Yes.
14. Yes. The OCP should encourage that the Ministry of Transport ensures future upgrades will improve roadside conditions for active transportation.
15. Yes if it is economically feasible.

Policy Options for Active Transportation in Area 'A'

Support continuing development of regional trails in EAA

1. The OCP should fully support the development of these trails because it leads to more active transportation. Wouldn't it be great if we had a trail system like the Galloping Goose trail which runs from Metchosin through Sooke and into Victoria. It is used daily by recreational enthusiasts and by commuters including electric bikes.
2. Yes . There was clear community support for this initiative
3. Continues development should include round-trip trails (either by creating loops or connecting two or more trails) with a view to an active transportation network.
4. Yes I support the continued development of regional trails in Electoral Area 'A' as I feel the more interlinking tails to communities in our Area A only encourages connection between various nodes, promotes activity (at). Work with MOT to continue trail development and Ministry of Environment.
5. Yes and no. Do not support forced trails on private land if the land owner does not want it. Under the summary of what community has said is a bullet - many informal trails not recognized by Regional District of Nanaimo and on private property that were desirable to obtain legal access to. Don't agree with this statement at all. Private owners bought and paid for their land and if public want access then it has to be bought and paid for by the public or an agreed upon right of way.
6. No. We have enough trails and not many people use them as is. Leave wildlife alone and stop taking away their space more.
7. Yes as long as private land is not affected without the consent of the landowner.
8. No there are currently enough trails.
9. Less important an option if roadside conditions are improved.
10. Benefits are obvious.
11. Yes.
12. *Yes.*
13. Yes. Walking and hiking are probably the biggest part of active transportation.
14. Yes—walking trails

Policy Options for Active Transportation in Area 'A'

Make full use of existing public lands for trails

1. I support this option because it is probably the most economic way to get land for trails.
2. His option avoids land acquisition costs, (either title or lease).
3. Yes, public lands need not be purchased are already established highway routes, and funding/grants may be available.
4. Where possible this would be wonderful. Obviously funding is a big factor. Pursuing trails on public lands should be the first priority as they are already public lands. Right of way agreements should be pursued on private lands first, acquisition would be second choice.
5. They already are fully used. All these people who want more trails will never use them anyhow. They all just want to feel important. Not many people even go to the beaches or current trails who live around here.
6. No I do not support this the statement is too broad and is subject to interpretation.
7. No there are already trails on public land.
8. No we do not need full use.
9. I support this option.
10. Agree – ensuring that most public lands and Right of Ways are kept public. Blocked accesses and no trespassing signs etc. should be removed where not appropriate and public access restored and new signs installed. Establish and/or maintain ownership at all times.
11. Yes.
12. Yes.
13. Yes. These seem to be the simplest way to create AT trails.
14. Yes.

Policy Options for Active Transportation in Area 'A'

Prepare for future trail corridor acquisition

1. If future trail corridor acquisition is needed to develop a network of trails then it is something that should be planned for.
2. This is a difficult item to develop. A hot topic for sure.
3. This should be part of a long term trail master plan.
4. Yes I support preparing for future trail corridor as I see long term mapping and planning provides the best opportunity of creating innovative ideas for acquisition.
5. Yes. Prepare financially for future trail acquisitions that co-include with property owner agreements.
6. No. There's enough trails already. Not many people use them as is.
7. No your mapping is incorrect and private land is being compromised.
8. There are enough trails already.
9. No we do not need more trails.
10. Not high on my priority list.
11. *Should always be one of the primary considerations on the check-off list.*
12. *Yes.*
13. *Yes.*
14. It's always good to plan... Also, private land licence agreements reduce conflicts between the public / hikers and private land owners. And of course, continued use of the residential land development process.
15. Yes.

Policy Options for Active Transportation in Area 'A'

Formalize blueway network

1. A formalized blueway network that was publicized would be great for residents and an attraction for tourists.
2. Other than providing adequate water access (and parking at each location) I see no need for additional planning. Unlike on land, there are few restrictions once you are on the water.
3. Don't know what this means.
4. No the river should be left as is not promoted in this way.
5. No this would encourage trespassing.
6. No this is not an environmentally sound idea.
7. Better to have formalized.
8. Agree but focus on land based networks first.
9. I have concerns about access to sensitive ecosystems.
10. Yes.
11. Further consultation is needed to develop an access management strategy and to determine appropriate types of uses and to address environmental impacts.
12. Absolutely

Policy Options for Active Transportation in Area 'A'

Provide trip-end facilities

1. Trip beginning and ending facilities would be great. Parking, picnic area, signs, garbage cans, washrooms, and maps could all be considered for high usage areas on blueways or trails.
2. This is a good idea to provide those using AT the ability to store things or whatever other activity is developed from the original transit activity source. This could be storage, showers, lockers and other such facilities both private and public for a fee for use.
3. These should entail minimum capital outlay and maintenance costs (especially the latter which is ongoing). Expanded facilities should be limited to population centres and preferably provided by private business.
4. I think providing trip end facilities is premature at this time. More emphasis needs to be on trail links at this time.
5. Yes.
6. No we don't need some scummy bus depot in our area.
7. No these are not necessary.
8. No/unneeded
9. No/unneeded.
10. Don't have a problem with this providing basic facilities is what we're talking about.
11. Agree to the provision of basic facilities and only at high use areas – keep cost minimal.
12. Possibly.
13. Yes.
14. Especially parking, bicycle stands, garbage cans and outhouse toilets.
15. Yes—transportation hubs could and should have toilet facilities, snack bar, telephone and parking.

Policy Options for Active Transportation in Area 'A'

Improve community signage

1. Once again improved signage would attract resident users and tourists.
2. This is a great idea. Currently most roads are poorly marked if at all in the RDN. There are no hundred blocks on the signs and no idea if the street is public or has a turn around or is narrow in sections or whatever.
3. A must for visitors. It should be discrete and well designed to fit in the area and it's function.
4. Yes any improvement to community signage only promotes the identification and usage of local parks and trails.
5. Yes.
6. No. I think our current signage is sufficient.
7. Yes however, as long as they are not places on private land.
8. Yes on public land.
9. Yes on public land.
10. Yes to this option.
11. Agree – do a limited amount of high quality signage. More importantly control the presentation of signs already in place. Sign policies and enforcement are needed to control signage.
12. As required.
13. Yes.
14. Yes, especially cyclists and horseback riders. Trail signs are also a great idea.
15. Yes. Could reduce traffic— those people who are “lost” and driving about aimlessly looking for their destinations.

Policy Options for Active Transportation in Area 'A'

Undertake community-based social marketing

1. If you mean to promote the blueways and trails I think you just have to build them. People will use them.
2. If it gets people out and using the trail network and parks it will be a “must”.
3. For what reason? No.
4. No your marketing techniques are questionable.
5. No this should be undertaken by the business community.
6. No there are already existing roadways.
7. No this should be undertaken by the business community.
8. I could see the RDN as being supportive of this but would be up to members of the communities to develop it.
9. *Only if it's highly efficient and low cost. Low priority after main centres is developed.*
10. Absolutely-I'm curious to know how a program could be implemented? Would the RDN allocate planning and monies? I think this is a good idea and many of the CBSM concepts are being initiated at community group level. however limited recourses make headway slow. OCP support would be very welcome.
11. Yes.
12. Good idea! I like the 4 tasks of the webpage:
 1. AT “champion” group
 2. Organising regular events
 3. Promotional materials
 4. Advertise in Area A (I suggest using Take 5)
13. Less need to travel. Shop at home type concept. This is an excellent idea. A directory of area services could be developed. This could be done on a volunteer basis (I would be interested in assisting with the compilation of information—databases, etc). Surveys could be developed and distributed to gather the information.
- 14.

Policy Options for Active Transportation in Area 'A'

Improve neighbourhood connections

1. Neighbourhood connections are important. I'm a runner and cyclist who lives in Cassidy. I can't even cross the island highway because there is no crosswalk or walk light at the Timberlands light. Cassidy is, in a sense, cut off from all neighbourhoods. I have ridden my bike to Nanaimo, and run to and from Nanaimo. Each time I do this it is an unpleasant experience because of traffic and fumes. It is a risky route with several high risk areas. A safe route would be appreciated by all cyclists, walkers and runners. Connections with other neighbourhoods like Cedar and S Wellington would be great, but probably difficult.
2. I support this but all infrastructure that is built must be multi-use design even if the intent of a foot bridge is to only permit emergency vehicles across it.
3. If it promotes A.T. it will be good.
4. Absolutely support this as a way of connecting various areas of Area A with one another to just begin to cultivate a community feel. Trail connections AT connections.
5. Yes.
6. No. It's fine as it is.
7. No roadways already connect.
8. There is already connecting roadways.
9. I don't support this option. Except for primary schooling in the past there has been no historical connection between Cedar, Cassidy and South Wellington that I am aware of.
10. *Low priority until after main centres are more fully developed.*
11. *Yes.*
12. If the Cedar village / Main street happens, it would be logical to connect Cassidy and S. Wellington to Cedar using safe access across the Trans Canada Hwy.
13. Absolutely
14. We like our community as it is. We have a community group and doubt that everyone will always be involved.

Policy Options for Active Transportation in Area 'A'

Support transit improvements

1. I support transit improvements in all areas of area A.
2. Only if the ridership will support it.
3. Yes, density and cost permitting.
4. Yes.
5. No. It's fine as it is.
6. I support the increase of BC transit schedules to serve the community. I also support a smaller commuter bus system.
7. Increased scheduling.
8. Yes.
9. I can support this option.
10. Yes.
11. Yes.
12. Park and ride facilities would be supportive of AT.
13. Yes in an efficient and cost effective way. Most likely a combination of several improvement options.
14. No. We don't want buses on our street. Maybe at the Hwy—but still need to drive there, and someone to drop us off and pick up

Policy Options for Active Transportation in Area 'A'

Pursue use of Harmac pipeline

1. This would make a great trail way and may in the future become available.
2. This again is private land and will be difficult to get use of.
3. Good idea but beware of the possible liabilities such as vandalism.
4. Perhaps.
5. Yes.
6. No. I don't think that would be widely used at all given the pure nature of the pipes and lack of views.
7. No this should not be pursued this could be detrimental to the pipeline itself.
8. No/vandalism.
9. No would be a problem and increase vandalism.
10. Would be a major problem for Harmac Pacific from a security and liability perspective. It is the life blood of the mill. Property owners along the right-of-way would also have significant concerns re trespass.
11. *Do not agree invitation to vandalism and liability issues.*
12. *Yes.*
13. *Yes.*
14. Nice idea but the costs of safety and security are huge.
15. Yes—if an infrastructure is in place utilize it—not logical to duplicate something that is already in existence.

Policy Options for Active Transportation in Area 'A'

Prevent motorized users on trails

1. In Cassidy there are many, many motorized ATV's, and motor cross bikes. On weekends they come from Cedar, Ladysmith, and Nanaimo to ride in Cassidy. They do shop in Cassidy and buy fuel. There are also many horse-back trail riders, mountain bikers, and hikers and runners. I have been to places where there are many trails and they have signage designating who can use what trail. It may be necessary to have a few trails or areas designated for motorized users only and keep most of the other trails for non-motorized users. As I mentioned earlier in greater Victoria electric bikes are allowed on some trails.
2. Absolutely, safety must be our #1 objective. Motorized vehicles are non-compatible.
3. Absolutely, damage by dirt bikes and ATV's should be strictly prohibited.
4. Yes.
5. Yes I agree with this one. I have been nearly run over by several ATV's and dirt bikes who disturb local wildlife with noise and pollution.
6. No this could prevent motorized scooters for people with disabilities although ATV's should have designated trails.
7. No.
8. No.
9. Yes.
10. Agree. It's a nuisance and cost to repair damage and police can be substantial without considering potential liability even if legal costs are infrequent and only for defense.
11. Yes.
12. Yes.
13. If its got a motor, use the roadways and keep noise / speed and pollution off the trails. Motors are not part of active transportation.
14. Yes—safety and tranquility reasons alone support this.
15. Yes.

Policy Options for Active Transportation in Area 'A'

Mitigate truck traffic

1. Designated truck routes would help mitigate truck traffic. Ladysmith has designated truck parking. It's something worth considering.
2. This is a complete waste of time with out proper routes, roadways and other such modern infrastructure like interchanges and such. Stop lights do nothing but increase the level of GHG from idling vehicles. Trucks are not to blame here as diesel is far less a problem than unleaded powered motors.
3. As above, but some truck traffic may be unavoidable for servicing business in some areas.
4. Absolutely this ties in to safety of the use of roadside AT use. Use highway areas as much as possible.
5. Yes.
6. Yes. Most roads here cannot handle truck traffic over a certain weight. Cities have policies and truck routes, so should we.
7. Only with unanimous support of the truckers.
8. Yes.
9. Good idea but difficult to do in practice - Cedar Road is an important secondary highway.
10. Agree with designed truck routes for public safety reasons where feasible and they do not seriously affect economic activity.
11. Yes.
12. Yes.
13. As Area A population increases, we'll need truck routes for the comfort and safety of all ~ including the truck drivers.
14. Yes—reduces road repair costs.
15. What do you mean mitigate.

Policy Options for Park and Trail Acquisition in Area 'A'

Policy Option: Support a range of approaches to obtaining park and trail

1. Yes I support the multi-faceted approach to obtaining park and trail land.
2. There must be a way to plan for the future but to ensure that local private land owners are respected and protected of their rights. Understanding that some may not ever want to sell their land for the greater good you may be forced into a land acquisition situation whereby the landowner is paid for the lands requested by the EAA. This is even more difficult when those lands are pasture or farm lands inside or outside of the ALR.
3. Yes
4. Yes , within reason . This is a very broad statement with far reaching implications , and my support is not all encompassing.
5. If they are proven and successful and add to the community plan for the benefit of the majority then they should be used.
6. I do support the options described as I believe the more diverse the ability to obtain park and trail lands the greater opportunity and ultimately success.
7. Cedar has a wonderful park. Do not know about Cassidy or South Wellington.
8. No. We have enough parks and trails. Keep the rest wild and rustic.
9. No there are already enough parks and trails.
10. No we have enough parks.
11. I can support this option.
12. Agree - benefits are obvious.
13. Please note it is the Nanaimo & Area Land Trust-the and is very important.
14. Yes.
15. Yes. The list on the previous page seems quite thorough.
16. Yes.

Policy Options for Park and Trail Acquisition in Area 'A'

Policy Option: Support park and trail on any land within Area 'A' where there is an opportunity to meet a set of predefined criteria

1. I support this policy option. I'm wondering if features that are historically significant could be looked at and preserved as a park or part of a park. For instance in Cassidy we did, in recent history, have the original Cassidy one room schoolhouse. It was moved to the back of someone's yard , and eventually caught on fire. It would be nice to preserve some of the local area A farming and mining history.
2. Yes
3. Limited support . It would be preferable to have the areas predefined or have a master plan developed before unlimited support is provided
4. Yes. Provided there is benefit to the community and fits within the long range plan.
5. Yes I support this concept. I believe all potential lands need to be included in scrutiny, where there is an opportunity to raise the quality of our community for generations to come to enjoy.
6. If everyone is in favour including land owner.
7. No. Especially not on private properties.
8. No the parks and trails are sufficient.
9. No definitely not on any land and again there is enough parks.
10. I can support this option provided the criteria is established and included in the OCP.
11. Agree – but develop only what the community can handle effectively. Go for quality development and maintenance on a few good options.
12. I'm not sure what the criteria is?
13. YES. These are all reasonable criteria. However when there are more opportunities than resources a decision weighting process is one way to prioritize efforts and capital programs. I recommend in this instance putting more weight on the criteria which enable full end-to-end trail completion sooner , versus criteria which add to disparate inventory. For example the criteria that focus on "land that is a contiguous parcel" and "land that interconnects greenways" or "land that improves access to water" should receive a higher priority rating , thereby delivering the product/trail to the public sooner. Such an end-to-end strategy of implementation might produce for instance a coastline to commercial centre or rail access trailway preferably before we are too elderly to enjoy some of the (low hanging) fruits of the Community Vision. Earlier infrastructure and routes will promote rural ecotourism and ecoagribusines tours with their inherent quality-of-life spinoffs. End-to-End trails delivery can be a driving force that speaks volumes to the fact that this is not an academic exercise.
14. I think we should be very careful of access to water and especially the use of motorized boats that leave a much messier “footprint” (or “water stain”) than active transportation boats.
15. Yes.
16. Do you mean on private land? No.

Future Parks and Trails in Area 'A'

Please use this space and the map on the previous page to identify any specific areas that you feel should be designated in the Official Community Plan as areas where park and trail is desirable.

1. In Cassidy we have no park, no field, no trails that are in area A. At one time when we had Waterloo School and old Waterloo school we had two fields and a playground. Soccer teams, t-ball teams and softball teams used to call these fields home. Young families could take their children to the playground and run around the fields. Both schools are sold and now children hang out in the store and local pub parking lots. Some of the local recreation areas that Cassidy residents use are the Cross-Canada trail system, the trails on private forest land, Timberlands Lake, and Haslam Creek. Unfortunately to access Haslam Creek and Timberlands Lake you have to cross private land. The area of Haslam Creek below the suspension bridge to the bridge on the logging road would make a fantastic regional park. It is more beautiful than Sooke Pothole Regional Park. Access to Haslam Creek would be ideal. More and more development has occurred by the creek which restricts access. Logging road access to Timberlands Lake is tightly controlled. The gate is most often locked. I have been stopped by security while running up there and asked what I was doing. Of course I replied, "Just running." Increased pressure on our natural beauty spots will occur, but it would be nice to preserve them and allow all to enjoy them. We also used to be able to drive to the top of Mount Heyes and enjoy some terrific views, but that access is denied because of the Terasen project. Cassidy needs a park and a playing field. It also needs access to the beautiful natural features that surround us. Since the land in the current urban containment boundary has been developed, it would be necessary to increase the land within the boundary or build a park, field and trails outside of area A.
2. Completion of the Morden Colliery Trail by way of access acquisition to the two missing segments with inclusion of trails linking the MCT to the "black track" trails within South Wellington (thereby providing a link to the new parklands below Kip Road (A-09) and the abandoned rail line which leads from near Fiddick's Crossing to Extension (thereby providing a link with the Trans Canada Trail. Tying those trails into the Nanaimo River Regional Park would be nice too.
3. None especially not on private land. Your map is being presented without any consideration to private landowners and continual display of these maps even with the objection of landowners illustrates the lack of regard the Regional District of Nanaimo places on private property rights. The promotion of encouraging trespassing by displaying these routes on private land when you are aware that there is an objection is a violation of your duty to act responsibly.
4. In addition to local use locations should be evaluated on their potential to attract visitors from other communities that will notice, stop, and support local businesses.
5. We (the interested community participants and planners and politicians) have identified the preferred areas in prior workshops.
6. I am encouraged by the RDN's Implementation Strategies and particularly the funding opportunities: land development and provincial & federal grants. We need to follow up on the initial actions and ongoing communications.
7. Too bad I don't have more time to speak on these issues.

Other Ideas?

Please use this space to provide any other ideas and suggestions you may have for how the Official Community Plan could support parks, recreation, and culture in Electoral Area 'A'.

1. I feel that parks are a huge necessity to the future residents of Area A. We should think big. I was reading a history of Vancouver and one of the first acts the first city council did was ask for the land where Stanley Park is now situated. They received the land from the federal gov't. The city only had a population of 10 000. Nanaimo has Bowen Park and Newcastle Island. It would be great if Area A had at least one significant, large piece of park/ forest land it could possess and preserve for future generations. Little parks are great for neighbourhoods and necessary, but a large park becomes a focal point for all.
2. Dedicated community centres in each community.
3. Use the tax money that is already being collected and fix our sports fields. Put in lights so we can have night time practices. Support our skate park committee, give them some funding. Support our very active and large boys and girls scouts organization in Area A, we have one of the biggest groups on the island. How about a grant for that group. Work with the school district in order to fix our fields that are used all the time. Baseball and soccer are huge in Area A with our kids, we could be providing much better fields than we do now.
4. Art centre, programs at the skateboard park that is being planned, a large farmers market.
5. I personally believe Blueways & Greenways could be one strategic opportunity for this area's differentiation over other area's which are competing for triple bottom line (Economic, Social, Environmental) initiatives.

Other Ideas?

Please use this space to provide any other ideas, suggestions, or concerns on any other transportation issue in Electoral Area 'A' that you feel should be addressed in the new Official Community Plan.

1. The feasibility and costs of a rail system south of Cassidy, from the RDN/CVRD boundary to Ladysmith, is not available from the info supplied, but, as the data seems to indicate a prohibitive likelihood to a Cassidy to Nanaimo Rail Trail construction should be undertaken to investigate providing Cassidy with an alternate Active Transport route south. That and/or commuter rail service. Or else Cassidy remains the poster child for greenhouse gas production - YCD and no means to and from but by auto.
2. I am in full support of allowing our community to develop in a way that means less distance in our cars. I do not understand how we went from limiting how far we go in our cars to not getting in the car at all. Area A is extremely rural and cars are a fact of life. Promoting of ideas work far better when they have a basis in reality. This goal of no cars out in Area A is not realistic. Why not focus on what is realistic? We pay for pools, ice rinks and such amenities that are in town. We need better services so our children can access these facilities which is a much more realistic goal than no cars. Area A is not going to become a major employment centre and everyone needs to get over it and accept that fact as well. Promote no cars in town where it has a chance of working, not in areas that are over 30 minutes away from almost everything!
3. My concern is the lack of regard for private property and landowners rights under the auspices of selective community feedback. The Regional District of Nanaimo is creating a climate to promote trespassing and mislead the public by the continual display of their maps.
4. I think this is something that needs more group discussion. Applications are too onerous. Consider RDN staff dedicated to assisting with applications. There are rumours that much of the allocated funding is dedicated to administration costs. I recognise the need for accountability but perhaps it's time for review .
5. How can we get the Ministry of Transport to the table?