

ISL Engineering and Land Services

Buena Vista/Sir Wilfrid Laurier Park Master Plan

Concept Review Workshop, June 23, 2012
What We Heard

BUENA VISTA / SIR WILFRID LAURIER PARK (BVLP) MASTER PLAN CONCEPT REVIEW WORKSHOP WHAT WE HEARD REPORT

Purpose of Concept Review Workshop:

The purpose of the workshop was as follows:

- To obtain input from the public regarding three draft concept plans that provide a range of development options that fit within the park's vision.
- To identify which concept elements should form the basis for preparing the draft Master Plan.
- To provide the public with information regarding recommended changes for Yorath House and Grounds.

Concept Review Workshop Outputs (the products or results of the event):

The desired outputs from the workshop were as follows:

- Increased understanding by both participants and the Project Team about what is important to participants/ Edmontonians to include in the Master Plan for BVLP.
- Identification of the preferred concept plan elements to be used as the basis for preparing the draft Master Plan.

Format of the Concept Review Workshop:

The Concept Review Workshop was designed as a mix of short presentations and three rounds of small group discussion. Participants were advised that it was not a drop in session, and it was intended that they stay for the full time of the workshop. The workshop ran for 3.5 hours, from 9:00 am to 12:30 pm on Saturday, June 23, 2012, and was held at the West End Christian Reformed Church.

As participants arrived, they were asked to make themselves a name tag and go to the table corresponding to the number on their name tag. This was intended to ensure that different interests were represented at each table. Each participant also received an individual copy of the Discussion Guide questions and Evaluation form, and was asked to complete and submit these at the end of the workshop.

Each table was hosted by a neutral facilitator who led the discussion at the table and took notes of the group discussion. Copies of the concept maps and various background documents were provided at each table.

At the start of the workshop, participants were asked to introduce themselves to each other at their tables, and to identify what organizations (if any) that they represented, their home community, as well as how they use the park. If they didn't use the park, they were asked to explain why not.

A brief overview of the Master Plan process to date and how the draft concepts were developed was provided. Participants were advised that they would have the opportunity during the workshop to review and provide comments on the three draft concept plans that provide a range of development options that fit within the park's vision. It was further explained that the Project Team is seeking input regarding what the public likes and doesn't like about the different design elements presented in the three concepts. It was emphasized that the final concept will not likely be one of the three concepts presented; rather it will likely be a combination of various pieces of any or all of the concepts.

A short presentation of the highlights of the elements common to all concepts, as well as those that are unique to Concept 1, was followed by facilitated discussion at each of the tables. The Discussion Guide for the workshop provided information about specific elements in the concepts, and participants were asked specific questions regarding the extent that they supported or did not support these elements, and what they particularly liked or disliked about them.

Two more rounds of short presentation followed by facilitated discussion at the tables addressed Concepts 2 and 3.

Responses from the group at the table were recorded by the facilitators. Participants at the tables indicated by a show of hands the extent to which they agreed with each concept, and these were recorded and are included in this report. Since the numbers of participants changed throughout the workshop, percentages cannot be accurately determined. In addition, not all groups completed discussion of all of the questions, and/or wished to provide their level of support each one.

Individuals were also encouraged to complete and submit their own responses to the questions.

The results of both the table group responses (15 table groups) and individual responses (94 individual discussion guides were submitted) have been compiled in this report. These are presented, along with the discussion questions, with separate summaries of both the group responses and individual responses.

INTRODUCTIONS

What Communities are represented?

Community/Neighbourhood	Number	Community/Neighbourhood	Number
Alberta Avenue	1	McQueen	1
Belmead	1	Meadowlark	1
Buena Vista	4	Mill Creek	1
Castledowns	2	Millwoods	1
Capilano	1	North Glenora	2
Crestwood	10	Parkallen	2
Donsdale	1	Parkview	10
East Crestwood	2	Patricia Heights	1
Elmwood	2	Prince Rupert	2
Fulton Place	1	Rio Terrace	1
Garneau	3	Riverbend	1
Glenora	6	Rutherford	1
Grovenor	5	Strathcona	3
Idylwylde	1	Strathcona County	1
Inglewood	1	Summerlea	1
Jamieson	2	Terwillegar	4
Jasper Park	1	Valleyview	2
Laurier Heights	10	West Jasper	1
Lynnwood	7	West Edmonton	2
Mayfield	1	Westmount	3
McKernan	1	Windsor Park	1

How do you use the Park?

Walk /Run	Walk My Dog	Cross Country Ski/Snowshoe	Bicycle	Picnic	Family/ Other Events	Visit Rowing Club	Visit Paddling Centre	Visit Zoo	Other
36	75	9	23	14	5	9	0	6	6

Other Uses:

- Canoeing (2)
- Orienteering
- Boat Launch (2)
- Swimming
- Roller blading
- Berry Picking (3)
- Socializing

Do not Use:

- Avid bicyclist but choose not to use this park because of dogs; dogs and bikes don't mix

ROUND 1 - Common Elements (Figures 1 &2)

A. Asphalt pathway extension: Asphalt surfacing of the main shared use pathway (SUP) through the entire park: increases barrier free accessibility in all four seasons. The main shared use pathway is part of the City wide river valley network, and the Trans Canada Trail.

A.1. Group Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support paving of the shared use pathway through the park that is included in all three concepts?

20 (21%)	27 (28%)	6 (6%)	8 (8%)	32 (33%)	4 (4%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Fourteen groups representing 97 participants responded to this question, and one group did not provide a response.
- Just over half (53 or 55%) of the group responses support to strongly support paving of the shared use pathway.
- Conversely, 40 or 41% of the group responses somewhat or strongly do not support paving of the shared pathway, and 4 (4%) are not sure.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about extending asphalt surface along the SUP (Group Response):

Like:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Like asphalt; centre yellow line adds to courtesy and control • Yellow lines create delineation- reduce safety issues • Makes sense to pave (Hawrelak and Laurier are paved) BV should be too • Increase accessibility for all users; more people can use it • Better for wheelchairs; Not on a hill | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased mobility is good • Make it safer • Better access if it was different • Paved paths make it easy • Young moms with strollers can't go there now; women with carriages • Easier for families to bike • Audience not necessarily considered- young families with children (baby carriages) |
|--|---|

- If it was paved, it would encourage bikers and others to use trails for correct use
- Low spots and when it rains causes issues; Low spots could be a routine problem
- Good access to Hawrelak Park
- Think as transportation corridor; extension of Hawrelak
- Should be dog on leash
- Important to consider year round
- If asphalt, then it can be cleared in the winter
- In winter have to walk around path, a paved path would be able to be cleared in the winter
- Likes dog leg to increase safety for kids, dogs, and bikes.
- Asphalt paths preserve ecology, allow access by more people
- Wood chips not a good solution for pathway
- Utilize existing 3m wide pathway as Trans-Canada trail
- Alternate hard surfaces are good
- Concern with speed (as an issue), mountain bike use; This is a park, not a freeway
- Is it a designated trail for cyclists?
- Don't want to be an extension of Hawrelak
- Need for city bylaw
- Don't think rollerblades will use it
- Paving will add to congestion
- Won't like it on my hike
- Will decrease safety
- Attract more people would make the park busy
- Dogs would be on concrete
- Taking away from nature; Asphalt would compromise integrity of natural elements
- Paving will require maintenance, cost will be an issue
- No paving
- Can it be something besides asphalt? Could be Calgary asphalt - Asphalt is unforgiving- bumping/ freeze and thaw; Bad for dog paws
- People already using – Winter snow removal?

Dislike

- Parks are for recreational use - Why does it have to be paved?
- Use by cyclists an issue: speed, too quick for sight lines, paving will increase speed of bikers
- Paving will encourage speed with bicyclists
- Will increase speed with bikes and rollerblades
- Asphalt encourages speeding (bikes, rollerblades) freeway
- Asphalt means people will speed up
- Opens the way for speeders on bikes (i.e. McKernan ravine)
- Speed an issue

Neither Like/Dislike

- Good for all-inclusive access, but worried about bike speed, signage would help
- Indifferent, not a good use of dollars (all)
- Don't think use will go up whether paved or not.
- Must be properly maintained but leave as is
- Who says wheelchair people want it?
- Signage: Clear this is the access path
- Fencing in right pieces would help; City vehicles drive across clearing, need fence
- Needs may be different in BV vs. Laurier (pave Laurier, not BV)
- Who will use the paved trail if the dogs are on a leash?

A.2. Individual Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support paving of the shared use pathway through the park that is included in all three concepts?

18 (19%)	12 (13%)	7 (7%)	11 (12%)	36 (38%)	2 (2%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Half of individual respondents (47 or 50%) do not support paving of the shared use pathway.
- Over one third of respondents (37 or 39%) support to strongly support paving of the pathway.
- Two respondents are not sure, and 8 (9%) skipped this question.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about extending asphalt surface along the SUP (Individual Responses):

Strongly Support

- Agree, pave the portion of the river valley trail that connects the pedestrian bridge and LP trail
- Brings this area up to the standard of the river valley network
- Link existing bikeways!
Very clear and focusing on main usage
- Including clear obvious signage
Speed? safety?
- Accessibility for all and in all 4 seasons
- Clear it in the winter
- Major connections through the park can encourage youth and alternative uses (rollerblades, bike, longboard) and multiuse
- Better for rollerblading/cycling
- Very NB! It could be paved through to allow for more and diverse people use
- Provides access to full range of users
- Increase access to park (current for bikes)
- Provide control access for dog crossing
- Use environmentally friendly materials
- Does it have to be asphalt? Could it be some other hard surface?

Somewhat Support

- Good idea
- Does not really require improvement
- Maintain in winter (snow clearing)
- Like increased access for people with restricted mobility
- I understand that accessibility needs to be better
- Greater accessibility
- Support for inclusive access
- Somewhat unneeded expense but needed for wheelchairs and motorized chairs
- It will keep bikes on paved road
- Allows good bike access
- Parallel gravel trails available for those wanting to avoid bikes
- Focuses cyclists on a specific trail rather than throughout the park
- Focuses traffic on main trail and provides continuity with adjacent park areas
- Use existing 2M trail for SUP
- Pave part of SUP for bikes
- Use existing paved road from 81 Ave and 131 St to BV for bikes
- Don't pave south from 81 Ave and 131 St

- I am somewhat afraid of the damage this could do to the nature around it
- Dislike development in natural areas in general
- Perhaps consider the more natural accessible sand/ clay mix i.e. recycled tires?
- Concerned for speed of wheeled vehicles

Support

- Improves accessibility
- Like paved path for people with disabilities
If you're doing paving, concept 1 is advisable
- Is it to be maintained in the winter?
- I am ok with this
- Ok to pave this trail only
- Would make it easier to bike on
- Bicycles have rights too
- It would reduce the natural setting
- To keep it as natural as possible
- Allows people walking through the park easy passage
- With rumble strips
- Connection?
- Other trails
- Signage needed

Somewhat Not Support

- Don't see a need but like the idea of having a path to connect
- Access is good
- Must remain as off leash and accessible to all users
- Establish trail hierarchy
Keep in mind the aesthetics of the park
- Asphalt is not desirable
- Asphalt is terrible for dogs; Terrible on dog's feet
- Asphalt does not belong in a nature setting
- Need to have asphalt moved to Western perimeter or through residential connecting through to Melton Ravine and onto the pedestrian bridge
- As a user of other SUPS within the city, I have enjoyed and appreciated the asphalt surfacing. That said, it is an impermeable surface in a natural environment. Semi- permeable materials exist and I would strongly encourage its use or I would not support more asphalt.
- Leaving the path as clay or woodchips makes it more natural and softer in the event of a fall.\

-
- "Paving" is nice to walk on and ride bikes on, but it can crack and leave in winter making it a hazard and require lots of maintenance dollars
Natural
 - I'm not really in favor of paving, except where clearly beneficial
 - I would like to see the park stay as natural as possible, but would be ok with 1 trail being paved
 - Keep as natural look as much as possible
 - Bark could be a good option
 - Cost to maintain
Maintain as off leash
 - I wish it could be open to all users to use (off leash, bikes, etc.)
 - Speed of wheeled users
Need speed bumps
Signage and barrier fencing
 - Do not support fencing
- Strongly Not Support**
- Leave it as it is, no need to change
 - I feel this trail is good just as is
 - A trail hierarchy would improve shared trails
 - This is a high use park!! Don't make it busier!!
 - Not needed, waste of money
 - Lots of money
 - Work on putting money towards repaving BV Rd
 - Money better spent with road improvement (maintain its safety)
 - Prefer not paved but compacted version
 - It needs to be graded and graveled, not paved
 - I accept paving for wheelchair access but how would they get to the paved section?
 - Construction to upset the park
 - Construction in the park will disrupt all activity and cause a hazard to dogs and people
 - Maintaining current walkways on a consistent basis would be more effective
 - It is ugly and turns the path into an asphalt loss instead of natural
 - Why not bark or a natural surface?
 - Not a big fan of asphalt at all
 - Do not pave with asphalt, use another surface
 - Asphalt allows for more speed- more dangerous
 - Asphalt increases speed
 - It is already possible for cyclists to ride very quickly through the gravel path. Too fast, given the sightlines and usage, to safely navigate the many other users of the pathway
 - It may increase usage by too many other groups
 - Improving accessibility is great but I am concerned that the capacity of the park to handle new users may be impacted
 - I question the need to have the road paved at all; This is a recreational area/ park, not a commuter highway
 - Asphalt encourages high speed traffic flows that are not compatible with wheeled traffic, foot traffic, and dogs which will ultimately increase accidents
 - I do not necessarily disapprove of asphalt paving but the question asked leaves no room for qualities such as increased seep, danger of collisions with dogs- rumble strips should be added
 - This park should not be all things to all people, do we really need to accommodate roller bladers?
 - There's no way to keep off leash dogs from crossing the path where there are no fences
 - The fences and dog legs go against the natural look
 - Future fencing will result in a loss of access to river
 - Keep as natural as possible
 - Takes away from the natural setting of the park area
 - This is a natural area!
 - Keep the park natural!
 - Grass slows down bicycle traffic
 - Would like to keep nature element (untouched)
 - Paving in natural area
 - Not healthy for my dog as natural pathway roadway
 - Paving the area will increase the number of types of users and make it easier to go faster. IF everyone was respectful, it would be ok but not the case.
 - Keep existing base of clay; Use existing 3m path, no changes needed; Cost savings for you
 - Cyclists will be faster on a paved road, that is a safety issue if you are walking with dogs or children
 - It also allows cyclers to ride at faster speeds which endangers dogs and walkers It is also more expensive to maintain paved
 - This would encourage cyclists to speed in the park
 - Asphalt encourages speed; Speed and dogs don't mix
 - Asphalt encourages cyclists to speed, making the path more dangerous for walkers, kids, elderly
 - Being part of the Trans Canada trail does not mean it has to be surfaced with asphalt

- The asphalt only encourages bikers to speed up and endanger children, elderly, etc.
 - I do not support paving the spine trail
 - It would increase high speeding bikes that could endanger joggers, children, animals
 - Dog running on asphalt is dangerous for their pads It will increase problems with the cyclists (speed)
 - Safer to have a road that slows down traffic (strollers, walkers, runners, people parking in BV and LP)
 - Speed and safety issues
 - Signs for bikes to slow down
 - Success rests on respect
 - Dog gates are a waste of money
 - My support is contingent upon clear, marked and safe crossing areas for pedestrians and dog-walkers. Even then, it will increase bike speed creating safety issue
 - Pathway should still be off leash (concerns about leashing then unleashing dogs)
 - With increased traffic on paved road new traffic solutions will be needed in the near future
 - Current restrictions not favorable
- Not Sure**
- Don't really care if paths converted to asphalt

B. Increase parking capacity along 132 St.: Extending parking along the edges of 132 St. by providing 90 degree parking stalls will increase parking capacity for the off leash area.

B.1. Group Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support modification of existing parking to 90 degree stalls along 132 St.?

33 (43%)	20 (26%)	13 (17%)	2 (3%)	6 (8%)	3 (4%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Twelve groups representing 77 participants responded to this question; three groups did not provide a response.
- The majority of group responses (66 or 86%) support to strongly support modifying existing parking to make 90 degree stalls.
- Only 8 (10%) of group respondents do not support this option, and 3 (4%) were unsure.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about extending parking along 132 St. & modifying parking to 90 degree stalls (Group Responses):

Like

- Good idea
- Support – there are too many cars all over the place
- Make better use of space
- Need sense of order
- Yes to more parking
- Watch spacing and visual for backing up
- 90 degree need to decrease speed, where it might increase
- Doesn't have to be paved
- Parking is getting busier, will need more.
- Can do better than 40 stalls
- Don't overdo the number of parking
- Keep number of stalls small to keep parking for blvd
- People park there anyways
- Reduce parking on grass
- 90 degree won't really affect natural area, as long as it doesn't disturb the nature
- As long as trees don't come down
- Solution that doesn't affect existing trees is good
- Like the areas where parking doesn't infringe on the natural areas
- Reduces tickets for illegal parking
- Increase capacity is more organized
- Will reduce parking on residential area
- City should not use adjacent fields for overflow/ event parking
- Purpose specific sites for large vehicles

Dislike

- No lot
- 132st really uneven (not best place to expand parking)
- Parallel parking is safer than 90 degree stalls (danger to pedestrians)
- Concerns about widening road.
- Wrong side of road- backing out is an issue
- Issue with angled parking; people backing out onto the street
- Increased parking will be a safety hazard. Blind corners?
- Any discussion about enlarging current parking?
- There's already parking at dog park, why increase parking here? It could be extended along road by current parking
- People park here and walk elsewhere; Don't want parking lot for Hawrelak
- Fencing to protect people from cars
- Parking by rowing club- extra green space across trail
- Other parking areas to consider
- Don't want field as permanent- a compromise
- Should use big field for event parking
- Never had an issue finding parking except with events.
- Need emergency vehicle access

B.2. Individual Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support modification of existing parking to 90 degree stalls along 132 St.?

40 (43%)	18 (19%)	13 (14%)	2 (2%)	10 (11%)	3 (3%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Three quarters of individual respondents (66 or 76%) support to strongly support 90 degree parking.
- Only 12 (13%) of individual respondents do not support this option, and 2 (3%) were unsure.
- Eight respondents (9%) skipped this question.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about extending parking along 132 St. & modifying parking to 90 degree stalls (Individual Responses):

Strongly Support

- Okay
- Yes, long overdue
- Like: adds parking with minimal site disturbance
- More parking without taking out trees
- We need more parking or people can't use the park, but trees would have to come down
- But not if parking is on east side and trees have to come down
- Good, identification of area of existing parking
- We need more parking, so that seems good to me
- More parking is a great idea
- Allows for more parking
- Any increase in parking space anywhere would be terrific; on a nice day there is no parking anywhere after 9 am
- Keeps people from parking on the grass
- Good that it doesn't take away from the park; this solution doesn't help with special events
- Parking depends a little on future of Yorath
- Anything that adds parking without taking area away from the park is a good idea
- In terms of this concept, modifying parking in this manner is a great idea to start with
- Parking needed but if you make it not friendly for dog walkers who are major users don't bother! It will be empty like LP that park has lots of parking and is empty
- Need lots of parking in summer
- Definitely need to expand width of area to avoid congestion and difficulty in arriving and leaving
- I support this modification as long as all users have access to this extended parking/modifications
- Also extend parking adjacent to rowing tank
- Help offset parking used by rowers next to the tank

- Will increase accessibility to area
Need speed limits in place to slow down traffic
- Makes better use of space
- Yes, a very good, unobtrusive addition for users
- Event parking? More stalls will increase people to park and walk to Hawrelak for major events that ban or restrict parking in Hawrelak
- Use park and ride from Meadowlark for major events

Somewhat Support

- Like parking enhancement
- This way, fewer people will use the parking lot in front of the rowing tank
- Additional parking capacity- like
- Parking is very limited currently, more is needed
- Will assist in finding more empty stalls in busy times
- I like that it does give more parking for the bulk of the year
- Parking has always been an issue especially on weekends and long weekends
- Yes, while on many days, parking is sufficient, I certainly see particular days (sat+ sun) that are busy and people are parking and clogging up road
- Increased parking is required; I don't like the expanding idea of the off leash existing parking area; I would instead tear the piece of land between the off leash and the rowers club parking and make a big parking lot to the shore
- It does not encourage on off leash space
- No room to open all side doors
- Support because of the need for extra parking if not too disruptive to natural area/ green space.
- Fencing re: barrier for protection would be good (i.e post and rail) and can be opened for even day access
- Increased parking along Laurier Road ok
- Do not make a parking lot
- Parking for BV users is good but not a huge expansion
- Very often (event days at zoo or Hawrelak) too many people who are not there for BV, so maybe some designation?
- There is plenty of space, there are plenty of expansion options

- New stalls are not enough; Other options can be added (location), i.e. space close to the Rowing tank

Support

- Overcrowded existing parking makes people park in the neighborhoods
- Need more parking
- Delineate parking places, i.e. limit access to greenspace
No asphalt, use semi-permeable aggregate
- Would not want to see too intensive use
- Need defined lines; Landscape buffer the defined area
- No comment, not terribly concerned about parking
- Not applicable as I do not access the parks by car

Somewhat Not Support

- Additional parking will attract more people
- There is sufficient parking today
In my opinion, 90 degree stalls are less safe than parallel
- Overkill of natural area is a concern

Strongly Not Support

- I feel that there is sufficient enough parking in the zoo parking lot that needs to be considered
- I think parking access is adequate and we do not need to spend money and maintenance dollars on a parking facility
- People are engaging in athletic types of activities, I don't understand why they cannot walk 100 meters to enjoy the park
- Make the pathway from the parking lot to the use area a nice walk (tree lined, pedestrian friendly)
- Safety issue- it's hard to see when you back out of such parking
- Can expand present parking at the dog park a few stalls
Can expand at lot between zoo and river; Do not need to create other new parking
- 90 degree is dangerous, poor visibility
- It doesn't work! Done already in Spruce grove and Stony Plain; Visibility is poor backing out;
- Cars and pedestrians cannot see around angled parking. Leave parking 'as is' (parallel parking)

C. Expand boat trailer parking: Increasing the boat trailer parking and doubling the size of the boat launch will improve recreational access to the river. These changes are focused on supporting the City of Edmonton’s recreational goals for the river valley.

C.1. Group Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support expansion of the boat trailer parking that is included in all three concepts?

7 (10%)	17 (24%)	7 (10%)	4 (6%)	24 (33%)	13 (18%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Eleven groups representing 72 participants responded to this question, and four groups did not respond to it.
- Responses were fairly evenly split between support to strongly support (31 or 44%) and not support (28 or 39%).
- A further 13 (18%) were not sure.

To what extent do you support or not support doubling the size of the boat launch that is included in all three concepts?

4 (6%)	16 (23%)	6 (9%)	4 (6%)	29 (41%)	12 (17%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Ten groups representing 71 participants responded to this question, and five groups did not respond to it.
- Responses were again fairly evenly split, with slightly more (32 or 47%) not supporting doubling the size of the boat launch, and 26 (38%) supporting it.
- A further 12 (17%) were unsure.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about expanding boat trailer parking and doubling the size of the boat launch (Group Response):

Like

- Advocate use of the river
- If it makes it easier, good.
- Signage for boaters explaining what wakes do to rowing
- Need to have ways for canoes to off load
- Prefer not to have motor boats on river where it will expand. Where will the second ramp go?
- Need to patrol motorized boats
- Would like to see the city invest in Kayaks (or other non- motorized boats) users
- Only 2 boat launches in Edmonton; need more parking and bigger launch
- People won’t have to park boat trailers in car only spots and vice versa
- Not affecting pathway or park

- Support for access to boat launch (cleaner access), but no need for intense changes
- Causes Leveling
- Can make larger, but not double in size.
- Increases boat access
- Need better access to boat launch so they go direct vs. around park

Dislike

- Not support boat trailer launch
- No launch, no jet boats
- Safety, dogs swimming
- Concerns about personalized water craft too close to shore
- Concern around boat traffic (wake) near rowers
- Not all motorized boat users are courteous

- More boat usage impacts other user groups.
- More boat traffic, more issues with rowers
- Disrupts rowing activities
- Concerns about motorized boats being noisy and creating safety issues for rowers
- Encourages more jet boat use (disrupts wildlife, more noise, boats go past dog park)
- No removing trees!
- Jet boats are loud, small crafts are ok on the river
- Heavily used river
- Will generate more traffic, negatively impact the park
- Don't use city money to support motorize boats
- Concerns with safety and multiple users on the river with increased use. Reminders of safety.
- Don't want to see huge parking lot
- Problem is regulation; enforcement
- It's a loss of natural area (small, but it will still be lost)

- Don't want more green space removed
- Not happy about doubling the size
- Less parking is better since there is no enforcement

Neither Like/Dislike

- Indifferent, Don't use.
- If the plan is to have other launches around the city, is an expansion needed here?
- Make the parking larger, not the boat launch
- Suggestion for moving boat launch by Groat Road bridge near parking. No homes in this area.
- Way to limit boats on noise?
- Don't know enough about the issues to comment/ vote. Is there a need?
- Should be a section for 'neutral'
- Increasing motorized boat traffic, will this create other issues? i.e. noise, safety?
- River should be included in this discussion.

C.2. Individual Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support expansion of the boat trailer parking that is included in all three concepts?

8 (9%)	11 (12%)	8 (9%)	8 (9%)	29 (31%)	19 (20%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Slightly more than one third of respondents (37 or 40%) noted that they do not support expansion of boat trailer parking, with 29 (31%) indicating they strongly do not support it.
- Just over one quarter of respondents (27 or 29%) indicated support to strong support for expansion of the boat trailer parking.
- Eleven respondents (12%) skipped this question.

To what extent do you support or not support doubling the size of the boat launch that is included in all three concepts?

5 (5%)	11 (12%)	6 (6%)	7 (7%)	36 (38%)	16 (17%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Somewhat less than half of respondents (43 or 45%) do not support or strongly not support doubling the size of the boat launch.
- Just under one quarter of respondents (22 or 23%) support to strongly support doubling the size of the boat launch, and 16 (17%) are unsure.
- Thirteen respondents (14%) skipped this question.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about expanding boat trailer parking and doubling the size of the boat launch (Individual Responses):

Strongly Support

- Boating on the river is a positive use of this wonderful feature; A great opportunity to use the river as a recreational option
- Gives additional access to the river; We have such a beautiful river valley and such a short season to use it

Somewhat Support

- This is a heavily used river for boating; Boat launches need to be strategically placed along the river
- Would like to see other additional boat launches added along the river besides the existing 3 launches outside of Laurier (besides doubling Laurier)
- How many stalls? Do not impact natural area (use open field)
- Boat launch difficult to use currently, maybe make more user friendly
Launch is ok size, just improve the hill
- Will increase usage so roundabout increases in importance
- I am an avid kayaker, the facilities today to remove a non- motor boat are dismal and muddy. The new facilities would make it significantly easier and more attractive
- I never use this space, and never have been in conflict with anyone so I don't know how important the improvements are or their impact might be on the way I use the park. If it will make people happy, I'm for it
- Raises the level of access to recreational use of river
- Adding more power boats to this part of the river would have detrimental effects on our fellow users, the rowing club
- Because the boat launch is on the Laurier side- add minimal new parking there on the Yorath/ rowing club/ dog off leash side
- Parking would accommodate more trailers
- Just improve what's there - increasing just increases more traffic, more noise and more risk of injury etc.

Support

- I would prefer that not too much park is used for parking
- Don't know anything about its use

Somewhat Not Support

- Not necessary
- There are other opportunities to access the river from other places in the city
- It would increase boat traffic on the river where the rowers are on the river. The wake from the boats can be very dangerous for rowers; Need management of boaters for safety of Edmontonians on water
- Discourage access of motorized watercraft to river
- I do not use the boat launch or trailer parking area so this will not impact me in any way. I do not have the right to vote on something that will not impact me and that I don't care about, but will impact others. If it increases powerboats on river, I will not support this

Strongly Not Support

- Expand it where there are no existing picnic areas or trees; this will lead to increased motorized crafts on the river which leads to increased noise, increased need for rescue services etc.
- I am concerned that sedentary users (those needing calmer water) like the paddlers and rowing club would face difficulties if faced with motor boats with large engines creating wake issues resulting in safety concerns
- I don't feel like we should be encouraging motor boat use on the river. It is largely improperly used, unsafe and uncontrolled; As a member of the rowing community, I have never seen any policing or enforcement of safe boating regulations; Green belt should not have motors on it!
- Increasing the size of parking and size of this area will put more speed boats on the water; Regretfully, this will or certainly could impact the rowers; Power boats and racing rowing shells do not mix
- If you do this, there will be more motorboats on the river which will be a safety issue with the rowers and whitewater paddlers I don't support increasing access to motorboats. Their wake is a major disruption to rowing practice, and the drivers clearly do not care when they blow past us; at the least they should be instructed to slow down when rowing practice is occurring
- Creates issues for the rowing club; Just improve the current access and level it up

- Rowing club rep raised a great point- rowing club is there and the club and motor boats don't mix
 - Dislikes: Expansion of the boat launch needs to come with signs about sharing the waterway. Motorboats generally go by rowers too quickly
 - More motorboats= more noise
More motor boats=- more environmental impacts (shore erosion from waves, fuel spills)
 - Intensive use by motor boats is hazardous for paddlers and rowers
 - Don't want to lose grounds, trees, picnic area
 - Concern that the users do not respect the natural area
 - Need better supervision of power boat users (Life jackets, conflict with rowers)
Need better support at launch area (to deal with trash, Watercrafts)
 - No! additional launch capacity would be a city cost (obstacle) so forget it! (rowers dock is at their cost)
 - More boats mean more traffic, I'm not for this
 - Motor boats- No expansion
Canoe/ kayak rental (City of Edm) with bus service; Motorboats and jet skis personnel are the worst offenders of shared space; Motorized vehicles in green space is contradictory
 - Underused facility
 - Has recently been expanded. Small amount of usage for short period of time during the year
 - Would support ERC and white water club to area of Laurier
 - There are not that many boats that use this site; The budget proposed should be used for purposes that support other concepts; The present launch is simple but effective and there are other launches across the city
 - Will not really impact much because of the size of the boat trailers; You can only add a few spots and there will still be power boat trailers throughout the park parking
 - There should be no motorized use of the river (too noisy, particularly the seadoos)
 - Improved boat launching facility leads to increase power/ jet boat commuting and traffic on the river
 - We don't want to encourage more jet boats on the river
 - Use of power/ jet boats on the N Sask is highly disruptive to wildlife and human activity seeking tranquility and/ or natural environment; the Canadian invention of the canoe allows for launch/ portage in a natural setting without disruption to shorelines
 - Find an alternate access for a better boat launch (Groat Road Park)
 - I dislike the idea of losing green space to a parking lot
 - Quiet picnic area is valued- so not want to accommodate more motorized boats or traffic in this area
 - Do not support more jetboats; Jet boats increase noise and frighten wildlife
 - River is not conducive to power boating; River banks concentrate the noise; Go to the lake
 - See comments in Section B (parking is adequate)
 - We don't want or need more room for ' boat trailers' in the area any more than we want or need ' RV' parking, 'skateboard walls/ paths' or anything like that. Improve the boat launch, sure but do not expand it and doubling the size of it? We have winter 6 months of the year, it's useless
 - Can BV road handle extra traffic without being repaired?
 - Excessive traffic in the Laurier area along BV drive would be cause by increasing boat trailer capacity
- Not Sure**
- Concerned that it may already effect traffic in the area
 - Doesn't impact me
 - Increase vs doubling are maybe 2 different things;
 - Can the park, with the increasing users actually handle anymore?
 - Do not want motorized boats on the water! All other non-motorized boats are ok
 - Do not use, so no opinion
 - No opinion
 - Don't use the boat launch area, so don't have a feeling either way
 - Uncertain as to the impact (i.e. how newly developed launch situated on currently un-developed area)

D. Park Entrance Improvements: The addition of trees and plantings along the main entrance road will help visitors understand they are entering a river valley park. Key elements of the entrance improvements include: additional boulevard trees along Buena Vista Rd., additional natural low shrub and perennial plantings, a park information board and vehicular layby.

D.1. Group Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support the improvements at the park entrance that are included in all three concepts?

37 (49%)	13 (17%)	9 (12%)	7 (9%)	9 (12%)	1 (1%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Eleven groups representing 76 participants provided a response to this question; four groups did not provide a response.
- Over three quarters of group responses support improvements at the park entrance, with almost one half (37 or 49%) indicating strong support.
- Less than one quarter (16 or 21%) indicated they did not support park entrance improvements, and 1 (1%) was not sure.

Please explain what you like or dislike about the entrance improvements (Group Responses):

Like

- Definition to entrance of park is needed
Something that allows the park to be opened and closed would be useful
- Need to create barrier to slow down vehicles
- Roundabout- good idea
- Signage is priority
- Signage would be good (important)
- Would like better signage, no extras beyond that
- Info board only would be great
- An electronic sign or other wise to announce current and future events notification
- Signage more important than trees; if there's money trees are good too!
- "Welcome to park sign" and activities
- A lot of signage there already (don't go overboard- not a billboard size)
- Anything that provides clarity for visitors is good
- Vehicular layby- very important as is park info
- Likes the wide open vista
- Naturalize the entrance (plant to natural state)
- Trees would provide barrier to off leash
- Support lots of trees in blvd would be good
- More trees in blvd coming up and down hill
- More trees that grow bigger
- Go with natural greenery
- Don't make it too manicured/ polished. Keep natural look

- Maybe not a priority- shrubs and planting
- Aesthetic improvements to park is liked
- Slow down and monitor BV
- Right at the end of houses more awareness of street activities
- Parking on BV Rd (too much)
- This is an "extra" if funding is available
- Strong support but could be better
- Doesn't take away from anything
- Currently looks like a wasteland
- Actually looks quite terrible now

Dislike

- No need for planting more trees, don't spend the money
- Landscaping not necessary
- Keep it natural- more money for maintenance
- Don't block visual ability to see
- Too much traffic there already
- Need another entrance
Signage is already clear
- Redundant
- Not a high Priority
- Raising property taxes for this?

Neither Like/Dislike

- Not a top priority
- Cost for beautification and cost effective?

- Care to the existing trees first priority. Better arborist care with what is there already.
- Trees are falling everywhere, please maintain.
- Use indigenous plants
- City work with transportation to handle traffic volume and speeding into path
- How much help do people need?
- Is there congestion?

D.2. Individual Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support the improvements at the park entrance that are included in all three concepts?

27 (29%)	15 (16%)	17 (18%)	3 (3%)	13 (14%)	4 (4%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Almost two thirds of individual respondents (59 or 63%) support park entrance improvements, with almost one third (27 or 29%) indicating strong support.
- Only 16 (17%) of individual respondents did not support this; however, of these 13 (14%) indicated they strongly did not support park entrance improvements.
- A further 4 (4%) indicated they were unsure, and fifteen respondents (16%) skipped this question.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about the entrance improvements (Individual Responses):

Strongly Support

- This is required, Great Idea! (x3)
- Good idea
- Awesome
- Seems fine to me
- Good idea to know when one enters the park
- Beautification is necessary (currently looks like a wasteland)
- The entrance to the parks does not give a visual clue that you are entering a serene natural area; People speeding up and down the road don't get it!
- The open area where the proposed roundabout is going is underutilized due to lack of park like feel
- Would strongly support use of native vegetation
Pave entrance BV and 132st
- Would prefer natural landscaping to signs and high maintenance landscaping
- The entire entrance area to the park and zoo definitely need improvements and showcasing. I thought such improvements were already apart of the zoo master plan?
- Signage is welcome; Plantings, though should be done to make sure it is able to be naturalized
- Signage, signage, signage - There is a serious lack of signage explaining the uses of BV and LP. This needs to be addressed

- Need Signage
- Improved orientation for all users
- Maybe something historical or a national park theme to set up an escape from the city
- Improved signage would probably be helpful for people unfamiliar to the area
- BV Blvd needs more trees at the bottom near the park; many trees have died and the blvd is bare at the bottom; Trees are needed around the pump station (eye sore) and along the bottom of the road as suggested
- Would like to see some nice column trees lining the roadway down to the intersection
- Will improve traffic flow (theoretically)
- Trees/ shrubs create barrier between off leash and road

Somewhat Support

- Layby is ok
- Park information and vehicular layby only
- Strongly encourages increased signage It shouldn't be that ambiguous when you're entering a river valley park
- Not a necessary expense but still a reasonable idea
- Use natural plants, not weed type
- Need to keep it natural, no concrete jungle

- Use of natural planting (i.e. like beside Grant MacEwan)
- BV Rd needs paving bad
- Oppose roundabout as adding cost and confusion for first time visitors
- Visibility is critical and should not be compromised along roadways at an off-leash park; Ok with this along BV but not 132st
- I am in favor for it to some extent
Not too fancy however: not too expensive, keep the chance of vandalism low and keep it 'relatively' self-maintaining

Support

- Improving looks is always good
- Yes, people should know there is a park, that is fair
- Basic, increase, make it appealing and user friendly from a user directional perspective
- Please use indigenous plants only
- But don't take away from the natural "wilderness" feeling of BV park
- I think the park should be left as is in its natural state
- Better signage is really needed
- Signage only
- Accurate info board is crucial
- Park info board is only improvement I would like to see Signage ok; Not the roundabout
- Foliage, nice low on priority list
- Visually appealing
- How far up BV Rd do you want to plant? Ok at 132st/ BV junction
- Trees, shrubs not really needed, but layby and signs are good

Somewhat Not Support

- Signs
Better signage is all required
More attractive entrance would be good
- Planting trees and shrubs is not required; Focus on maintenance of trees that are in this park now;
- More money for maintenance rather than for landscaping
- No need to spend a lot of money on additional roadway and plantings
- Not plants or landscaping, maintain not add

- Maybe roundabout isn't the option, could just be better signage; Low priority- better to put money somewhere else (people like this because it is more natural); Zoo redevelopments might do enough (let them put in trees)
- If money is needed for other improvements in the park nothing is needed more than a little signage

Strongly Not Support

- Need better signage (small simple facts)
- How much help do people need? What would be on the park info board?
- Request for better signage
- Info board only with large text
- Only the park info board is needed (large text, no paragraphs, no need to slow down/ stop to read sign)
- Keep it natural
- No new trees or shrubs
- Arborist care to existing trees instead of planting more
- Fire risk, injury risk?
- Fix and maintain only
- Take care of the trees and shrubs already there (Planting more means more cost to maintain later)
- The view offered by the wide open green area is terrific; don't screen a large greenland
- No vehicular layby
- Waste of money (x4)
- This would be a waste of taxpayers money!
- Don't spend money where it's not needed and then raise my property tax
- This would be a foolish waste of my tax money; What would improve park entrance and access would be to pave road to rowing club!
- What is a vehicular layby? Unless we have lots of extra money, this is redundant

Not Sure

- I like the natural feel of the park, it doesn't need more trees
- Is city paying for this? Initial cost and ongoing upkeep and costs?

E. Park Entrance Roundabout at 132 St. & Buena Vista Rd.: The roundabout at this intersection (shown in Concepts 2 & 3 & Figure 2) provides distinct entrances to both park areas and the zoo, and opportunities for improved signage and additional enhanced entry landscaping.

E.1. Group Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support the improvements and roundabout entrance included in all three concepts?

6 (9%)	13 (19%)	6 (9%)	8 (12%)	34 (51%)	0
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Ten groups representing 67 participants provided a response to this question; five groups did not respond.
- Almost two thirds of group responses (42 or 62%) do not support the roundabout and improvements, with half (34 or 51%) strongly not supporting it.
- One third (25 or 37%) support to strongly support the roundabout.

Please explain what you like or dislike about the roundabout entrance (Group Response):

Like

- Support
- Only with single lane
- Only a small one
- Improve flow of traffic
- Picture looks nice too
- If attractive
- Slows the traffic
- Roundabout would slow down vehicles.
- Need to slow down vehicles as they are coming down the hill (additional concept is needed other than roundabout)
- Makes it pretty safe
- Like that there's a roundabout with trees/ plants in the middle, makes it more inviting entrance
- Better signage is good, allow flow of traffic
- Make signage/ directions clear is a good idea
- Good traffic mover if there is congestion
- Good moving traffic in high volume area

Dislike

- No, Please NO!
- No traffic flow problem there now.
- Not necessary
- Waste of money
- Will create more hassles than help

- Roundabout- is it big enough for trailers with a boat? (especially rowing trailers with 40-60' trailers)
- What about boat trailers? Can they get around?
- Access for large trailers for rowers/ boaters? Would they be able to get around this to access launch?
- Long loads trailers would have trouble with the roundabouts
- Emergency vehicle access issues if roundabout is blocked
- Bottleneck effects of roundabouts
- Increase in traffic accidents
- More signage is better
- If there is signage, what's the point?
- Important to stress important signs, better but don't go overboard (makes it confusing)
- Strategic electronic board placement would help (less signs, more informative)
- Repair BV instead of this
- Making assumption people use roundabouts properly
- People need education on roundabouts
- 4 way stop is better
- Concerns about snow removal
- Busy event and parking
- Only if it comes out of the transportation budget

E.2. Individual Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support the improvements and roundabout entrance included in all three concepts?

15 (16%)	15 (16%)	6 (6%)	6 (6%)	35 (37%)	7 (7%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- About two fifths of respondents (41 or 42%) do not support the improvements and roundabout entrance, with just over one third (35 or 37%) strongly not supporting it.
- Just over one third (36 or 38%) support to strongly support the roundabout and improvements, and 7 (7%) are unsure.
- Ten respondents (11%) skipped this question.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about the roundabout entrance (Individual Responses):

Strongly Support

- Great idea
- Good / Good idea
- Would assist in directing traffic to appropriate parking area (single lane)
- Finally! Now we know which way to go for, what aspects of the two parks, Single lane!
- The current 4 way stop which really isn't one, is confusing since the roads don't live up; A roundabout is a good solution and also makes an entrance statement
- The whole city needs more roundabouts
- Help the flow of traffic and make areas clearer to find
- Defines are of use and direction to visitors
Allows for lockable separation
- Clarifies what direction and separates
- People in Edmonton don't know how to do a roundabout at the best of times; possibility to actually reduce traffic flow

Somewhat Support

- Keep plantings low for good visibility
- How can you teach people to use a roundabout?
- Need to ensure people know how to use them properly
- People in Edmonton don't really seem to understand the roundabout idea although getting rid of stop signs would be helpful for cyclists who ride BV Rd.
- Improves efficiency
- Support as long as trailer for rowing boats can navigate circle

- Would need to make sure the roundabout can allow rowing club truck and trailer which is super long Needs clear signage; Would like the city to acknowledge the rowing club on signage
- Improved signage would be great
- Clear signage might be enough and is essential with/ without a circle
- Keep it maintained with better signage

Support

- Roundabouts make sense and need to be used more often
- I like roundabouts but many people have challenges understanding how to use them
- People cannot drive roundabouts
- Would allow for increased signage and would create a formal entrance

Somewhat Not Support

- Do not require roundabout; Congestion is more likely especially during special events. Access on BV Dr. is already compromised
- Don't care too much about the roundabout vs just turning the corner
What will this do to traffic flow? I'm thinking especially at times when there are large traffic loads (i.e. heritage days)
- Signs Improvement preferred
- For all of the known advantages of roundabouts, it may limit the use of rowing clubs large trailer accessing 132 St; It would limit accessibility of vehicle/ boat trailers, which I support

- The existing entrance is working perfectly as is; Roundabouts are confusing to people and wouldn't improve things at all!
- It seems unnecessary, traffic flows fine and safely now. Just add signs

Strongly Not Support

- Waste of money and space
- Not needed (x 2)
- Is this really needed?
- Not necessary (x 3)
- I don't believe a roundabout is required. Some signage on BV Rd partway down the hill is adequate
- No roundabouts (waste)
- It's not that confusing of an area; More collisions perhaps
- Roundabouts are effective for high volume intersections- I don't believe the intersection had gridlock or volumes to justify this cost
- Traffic volumes do not justify a roundabout
- Motorists do not use roundabout properly
- 75% of drivers in this city have no clue as to how to use a roundabout
- Roundabouts allow drivers to go much faster through the intersection
- On busy days a traffic circle will cause major delays (most people don't know how to use them)
- No roundabout! They are confusing to people and they don't use them properly
- I think this would be a traffic hazard and back up traffic
- The roundabout area is not a good idea, what about snow removal?
Making it more complex, it will bottleneck traffic
- Not good for the boat trailers and the rowing club trailers
- Long loads would not make it around the curve
- Long loads
- The rowing club needs to get on and off of 132 St with long boat trailers; This will cause more traffic problems than an open road (4 way with correct signage)
- Busses and people with boat trailers will not be able to get around the circle
- Directing people will be difficult as the director is not easily seen

- Current road access is fine just put up signs!
- Make it a 4-way stop
Why add more plant life? Why not work on maintaining and preserving current greenery?
- If the access to LP changes, there is no need for this
- There will be 3 exits when travelling east but only 2 coming from north and south to head west
- Put up a sign
- Would support if it will accommodate future increased traffic
- This would increase traffic congestion as the parks use rises
- Controlling traffic during events will be more difficult
- It would be a major nightmare for user groups when they have major events in LP
- If there is clear signage, I don't see the point of this addition
- Enhanced entry landscaping, what a joke! Who needs this! How much money do we need to spend?
Emergency vehicles access is an issue in traffic
- Repave BV road would increase access
Good surface would direct people
- Too much heavy construction required
- Use money to pave and maintain BV road and 132 St and the driveway to the rowing club on a consistent basis
- We paid people to come up with this idea? No wonder my tax dollars are going up
- Not in favor, not as proposed.
- Seems like a waste of money (x4)
- Waste of tax dollars (x 2)

Not Sure

- Not necessary
- Ok if cost is minimal
- If too small, it may be an obstacle for boat trailers used by rowing club
- Is it a one lane roundabout with natural flow?
- I'm not sure that a roundabout is necessary.
Perhaps a 4 way stop with good signage would be sufficient?

- F. Buena Vista hardened surface looping pathways:** 2m wide hardened surface looping pathways through Buena Vista provide improved barrier free access, primarily through off leash areas. The pathway surface is intended to be a material that will blend in with the environment (not asphalt).

F.1. Group Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support hardened surface looping pathways through Buena Vista that are included in all three concepts?

6 (10%)	11 (18%)	13 (22%)	6 (10%)	20 (33%)	4 (7%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Nine groups representing 60 participants responded to this question; six groups did not provide a response.
- Half of group responses (30 or 50%) support to strongly support hardened surface looping pathways.
- Just under half (26 or 43%) do not support hardened surface pathways, with 20 (33%) strongly not supporting this element.
- A further 4 (7%) of group responses are not sure.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about the hardened surface for looping pathways (Group Response):

Like

- Yes. Improves barrier free access
- Like them
- Like the natural aspect
- Should be for pedestrian traffic
- Baby carriage access
- Para Olympic committee has grown tremendously in last 10 yrs, want to enjoy community.
- This would be better than asphalt
- May prevent puddles in the spring
- Good for dogs because there's no mud
- Cleaner (mud-wise in spring)
- At time of the year gets muddy and wet, it would make the paths better year round
- Don't object to "hardened" surface; don't want it looking too "urban" or "manmade"
- Like the idea of a "natural" loop- but don't necessarily like the current loop, maybe could do an extension off the main road.
- Environmentally friendly materials
- Would cut down on all little trails through the trees
- Some upgrading would be fine
- As long as tree roots aren't damaged
- Not more than 2m wide
- 1.8m for hardened trails and 2m for med trail.
- Safety issue

Dislike

- If paving main pathway, then not other areas
- Don't touch, don't make them larger

- Other multiuse and accessible park available in the city therefore would like to see no changes
- Extending the pathway will eradicate natural plant life (blue eyed grass)
- Feels like you are in the forest, over organics in it
- Roots across the paths.
- Concern over may cause slippery
- Detracts from natural aspects of the area (widening of trails would destroy natural flow in the area)
- Want a "natural" experience- not developed
- Concern about losing big meadow because the looping pathway cuts through existing meadow.
- What about coyotes? They need their space/ natural habitat
- Natural pathways preferred
- Crushed rock gets everywhere
- Hard to walk on
- Next step would be paving
- Don't replace with anything, wood chips would be nice
- People already walk there- Why do we need this?
- Harder on dog paws

Neither Like/Dislike

- Is there some substance that wouldn't spread around?
- Based on concept of having looping hardened path but no the locations shown on "all concepts"
- What is the purpose of doing this?

F.2. Individual Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support hardened surface looping pathways through Buena Vista that are included in all three concepts?

8 (9%)	13 (14%)	12 (13%)	11 (12%)	31 (33%)	4 (4%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Just under half of respondents (42 or 45%) do not support hardened surface looping pathways, with 31 (93%) indicating they strongly do not support this option.
- Just over one third of respondents (33 or 36%) indicated they support to strongly support hardened surface looping pathways, and 4 (4%) indicated they were not sure.
- Fifteen respondents (16%) skipped this question.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about the hardened surface for looping pathways (Individual Responses):

Strongly Support

- Improved accessibility
- Allows for accessibility for people with mobility aids, baby strollers
- Could it be used for x-country skiers in winter?
- Prevents muck, good idea for dog walkers
- Support the development of hardened surfaces only if they are accessible to cyclists
- More natural
- Restrict this option, only for the main trail; all secondary trails leave graveled or natural

walkers are not being respected in what seems like a need to use/introduce new, different users)

- Presently, they have a path (not hardened surface); one path or two but not through the middle of the large open area on the west side of the asphalt pathway
- I agree with improved walkways but I worry about the Impact on natural areas and on my dog
- Don't affect natural space; Keep as natural as possible
- Environmentally friendly materials

Somewhat Support

- How will it be maintained in winter? or during spring melt?
- Sounds fine; Improves access
- Barrier free access is ok
Concerned that cyclists or other users may use this as shortcuts
- Definitely needs to feel natural and useable in more seasons
- Makes it clear what areas are accessible to whom
- As long as it is safe when it gets wet
- I walk these trails and most often they are ok; But at some times of the year they are wet/ muddy/ holes that make walking less pleasant
- A hardened pathway in BVP would increase potential conflicts.
- BVP is primarily an off-leash use park with bicycles allowed only on the spine trail
- There are over 400 parks in Edm, only one in BVP
- We've been encouraged to consider other users throughout this development process (off leash

Support

- Good for puddles, wheelchair access, bikes, dogs
- Must maintain it once you change it; That's what is always the problem
- How long will this construction take?
- Enjoy paths of a surface that feels nature focused, dog walks would be nice
- I don't personally require this. I prefer the paths as are but if it increases accessibility for others and remains off leash, I have no problem with this
- Allows accessibility for mobility challenged users, those with strollers, and small children with wheeled transportation. Semi- permeable surface materials are absolutely essential
- No damage to the wads of the trees
- To be plowed in the winter?
- I like the idea of using shale, not pavement

Somewhat Not Support

- Leave natural habitat for coyotes
- Destroys integrity

- Current gravel pathways could be upgraded slightly (especially in muddy areas)
No upgrade at western loop (get it natural)
- Preserve the existing scruffy character
- Not in favor- would rather maintain natural state; If meant altering the landscape then NO
Turning the quiet areas into busy ideas is not good
- An Improved looping path would be great just not as shown
- Some of the proposed trails for this treatment are currently single-track and I don't support widening them. The use of such material on some of the existing longer trails would be nice
- Present situation acceptable
- Depends on material
- Pathways should be softer to accommodate dog paws
- The current trail composition is fine. Harder surfaces are hard on dog's paws
- I don't like asphalt, but I do like man-made natural materials such as clay, grass or wood chips
- If a loop is designed for mobility Impaired, use central north-south path and connect to bridge to create a loop with minimal Impact
- Proposed loop destroys low Impact natural area that is used by less social dogs
- Not as proposed in concept
- You would be destroying habitat, what are you thinking?
- I appreciate the wilderness feel of the park and would like to maintain that (5)
- Would destroy natural beauty
- Keep it natural
- Keep this area natural
- Must be left natural
- Should be allowed to return to natural state
- Existing surface is fine, we go there for a natural experience
- Hardened surfaces are available in LP
- Don't want better access for bikes etc., these off leash areas
- Bikes tend to use natural trails anyway in my experience and I am there every day
- This concept would cause some cyclists to go racing down the path which increases the likelihood of injury to walkers and cyclists.
- It would damage the (lady slippers?) and endangered species
- Would support if it would open trails to bikes
- Strongly support only on path J
Strongly not support if it is on C D or E
- Waste of money
- Increased traffic, increase risk of injury
Speed kills!
- Leave it be, I like the ruggedness
- Less is more
- There are hundreds of KM of trails in this city. Keep BV natural, if you do this it must be clearly no-biking

Strongly Not Support

- Do not support looping trail
- Keep it as naturalized as possible
- No need to develop a loop- there already exist many loops
- No need
- Leave this alone
- Leave as is
- There is no point to this Improvement; costly and no gain to dog walkers
- Users like the variety of widths existing
- No! I love the paths as they are different sizes
- I do not like the idea of clay (might make the dogs dirtier?), but prefer that to paving
- Trails work very well as they are, no need to Improve
- Some of the beauty of the park is its nature I would hate to see this to the pathways
- If it is done, then it should be extended to McKinnon Ravine; On to the pathway that goes from pedestrian bridge up to Melton Ravine
- Absolutely opposed to new looping, pathway proposed

Not Sure

- Must maintain if you are going to put a hardened surface
- Don't have a stake here

G. Additional Washroom Facilities: Three additional washroom facilities are included in all concepts. A four-season washroom facility will be integrated into the Yorath House site. Basic washrooms are also proposed near the boat launch and at the north end of 131 St. for the off leash community.

G.1. Group Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support additional washroom facilities and their identified locations in the three concepts?

19 (35%)	10 (18%)	9 (16%)	6 (11%)	7 (13%)	4 (7%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Eight groups representing 55 participants provided a response to this question. Seven groups did not respond to it.
- The majority of group responses (38 or 69%) indicated support to strongly support for additional washrooms.
- About one quarter of group responses did not support additional washroom facilities, and 4 (7%) were unsure.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about the additional washroom facilities (Group Responses):

Like

- Support
- It is a good idea to add washrooms
- City needs more public washrooms everywhere.
- Plan to maintain
- Like plans to use Yorath house
- Keep washrooms close to the trail system
- No major concerns
- Plumbing would be needed- want usable/ portable
- What about washing stations for dogs?
- Need outside tap to wash dogs/ fill water bottles
- Compost/ not plumbing
- A 4 season washroom is a good idea, like it in the Yorath house
- Trail has to have bathrooms
- Put bathrooms in parking lots
- No issue with it being located in/ by the parking lot, not in the middle of the park
- Bathrooms further way from the parking lots discourage vandalism
- Access to washrooms needs to be improved
- Big enough to accommodate those with mobility issues
- Small washroom because there's a big one by Fox Drive.
- Small fits into environment
- Not a \$2M facility

- Size matters
- Not too big that would encourage graffiti or damage or unsafe conditions for women.
- Need one by the boat launch, downfall is it will go on greenspace
- Washrooms should be in public/ well lit areas
- Why are there no washroom facilities at north end of BV?
- Like the look/ design of natural park washrooms
- Use wood
- Spreads out costs of current port-a-potty

Dislike

- The washrooms that are there are good enough, some people don't use the existing washrooms
- Accessibility/ security is an issue (kids/ homeless)
- Concerns about costs and sustainability
- Major upgrades would cost more money
- Additional staff and costs to secure and clean additional washrooms would be required
- Maintenance issues

Neither Like / Dislike

- What would the design be? - size, location
- Info centre up there but no washroom?

G.2. Individual Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support additional washroom facilities and their identified locations in the three concepts?

30 (32%)	14 (15%)	21 (22%)	7 (7%)	6 (6%)	5 (5%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Almost three quarters of individual respondents (65 or 73%) support to strongly support additional washrooms and their locations, with almost one third (30 or 32%) indicating strong support.
- Just over ten percent (13 or 13%) somewhat or strongly do not support additional washrooms, and 5 (5%) are not sure.
- Eleven respondents (12%) skipped this question.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about the additional washroom facilities (Individual Responses):

Strongly Support

- Please build bathrooms
- Should be created so that it is easy to use by dog walkers, walkers and bicyclists etc., close to the universal trail system
- Keep them on the universal trail
- Yes to bathrooms but put them closer to fence/ bike path so it can be accessible to dog walkers and cyclists
- Move to have near trail for bikes and walking
- Yes two needed, keep close to paths for servicing
- Yes, finally some recognition that we need washroom facilities
- There is a single porta potty for way too many people
- Should have a 4 season by dog walker parking lot
- Yes but maintain them well
- We need more washroom facilities for the summer and all weather for the winter
- Need access for four-season use
- Not an issue for me personally but park usage is large enough to warrant four-season facilities
- I live at the bottom of BV Rd and people will knock at my door to use washroom, phone, or call for help.
- Currently in BVP, the only washroom available is a single porta potty in the off leash parking lot
- Better quality, more visually pleasing washrooms (that fit the natural park setting) i.e. that it be constructed out of wood products with a rustic look
- Would prefer small buildings
- Traffic in the park will increase over time

- Must consider safety! No vagrants sleeping in them, risk to female safety
Need to be well lit
- It's a good idea BUT: needs security, supervision, and to be protected against vandalism and misuse; Without 24/7 'on site' security, this is probably Impossible

Somewhat Support

- Sure, why not
- Johnny-on-the-Spots in the park
Separate cement building at Yorath House for safety (fire/arson concerns)
- We need washrooms; How else can people spend extended time enjoying the river valley?
- Need to have facilities; This is an increasing general expectation in today's societies Facilities need to be low maintenance, environmentally friendly and affordable to build
- Would be nice but porta potty works just fine
- Small, not intrusive
- Washrooms at Yorath House would be a good central point
- Security would be a problem
- If plumbing is involved then it should have a tap to provide water for dogs (
- Need washroom on north side

Support

- Proper maintenance is required
- If it's kept clean and safe
- Don't overdo it, have it blend in

- Locate it close to parking lot and not near the big meadow
 - Absolutely, need to blend in with environment
 - But it seems to double up to put washrooms at Yorath House and at the off leash; Open it all up to all users and allow off leash
 - Some, but make it less accessible to parking area as it attracts vandalism
 - I don't really need to use the facilities (I live close) but I understand the desire for more than just a porta potty
 - Running water would be good for many reasons
 - Again, I find current washrooms in Laurier Park and porta potties in BV sufficient
 - Again, to increase accessibility to the users, I have no problem with this
 - A somewhat necessary amenity
 - Strive to avoid a repetition of the \$1 mil each, 4 season washroom facilities in Sylvan Lake Prov. Park
 - Boat launch yes
Entrance yes
 - Does this assume that Yorath will be retained? Do not support Yorath House
- Somewhat Not Support**
- I support the Yorath bathroom and a Johnny-on-the-Spot! N end of 131 St
- Four-season facility at 131 St would be graffitied, not clean, magnet for crime, not safe or clean
 - More washrooms yes but not in Yorath. Keep that as is
 - Do not plumb the facilities, but make them composting
 - Don't need on for off leash
 - Not needed
 - Go to the bathroom before leaving the house
 - I think 3 additional washroom sites are overkill
 - Too much! Just one main major site is required
- Strongly Not Support**
- Porta potty is ok / porta potties only
 - Will detract from natural beauty
 - Waste of money
 - I think this creates the opportunity for undesirable hangouts
- Not Sure**
- One washroom facility should be sufficient
 - Basic washrooms e.g., porta potties are effective year round
 - I use park year round and find it not necessary to use money to put in four- season facility
 - Does this mean a three year construction project like the one off of Fox Drive?

H. Yorath House: Concept 1 (Figure 4) illustrates the demolition and removal of Yorath House and reclaiming the site. Concept 2 (Figure 5) shows Yorath House remaining, with interior and exterior upgrades to provide a multi-use facility. This option would also include additional parking and minimal site improvements. Concept 3 (Figure 8) shows Yorath House remaining, with interior and exterior upgrades to provide a multi-use facility. Significant site improvements would be included.

H.1. Group Response Summary:

Which concept do you most support?

21 (40%)	12 (23%)	13 (25%)	7 (13%)
Concept 1	Concept 2	Concept 3	Not Sure

- Nine groups representing 53 participants provided a response to this question; six groups did not respond to it.
- There were mixed views regarding the three concepts and treatment of Yorath House and Grounds, with almost half of the groups who responded indicating support for either Concept 2 or 3 (25 or 48%).
- Concept 1 was noted most frequently (21 or 40%), with concerns most related to costs to upgrade and regarding ongoing maintenance and operations.

Please explain what you particularly like about your preferred concept (Group Responses):

Like (Maintain Yorath House)

- Would like to see it used for retreats, receptions and conferences
- Agree strongly with no demolition of Yorath House
- Want Yorath House history inspected
- Respect the house and use it (it has history)
- Good for events (weddings), it's a much needed facility
- Will take legal action to keep Yorath House- part of history of the city
- Wants to see it preserved and used rather than being neglected
- Would like to keep facility with some improvements
- Some heritage value
- As long as it's something useful.
- Careful not to impact natural area
- Keep as natural as possible
- Set it up like the John Janzen Nature Centre
- Use site for boy scouts/ girl guides (kids). Support natural activities; reconnect with nature
- Coffee shop/ washrooms might work
- Coffee shop idea

Dislike (Not Maintain Yorath House)

- Concern that it has been neglected

- Rowing club looked into expanding into Yorath House but couldn't due to neglect Too expensive to improve
- Stay away from weddings/ parties in the house
- Expenditures and ongoing maintenance and operation
- Demolish- no purpose, too much money
- It is in a terrible location

Neither Like / Dislike

- None of these are agreeable
- Need more info Not enough info to make an informed decision
- Keep it simple, or remove it.
- It is a heritage site
- What is the historical value?
- Historical interpretation option?
- What is multi-use facility?
- Do we need more multi-use facilities?
- Is there a need for private places to rent?
- Architectural elements that need preservation?
- Other option - companion animal hospital/ palliative care (not for profit)
- Concept 3 is worst concept for dog park
- None of the above, impacts access for dog walkers negatively

H.2. Individual Response Summary:

Which concept do you most support?

31 (33%)	11 (12%)	16 (17%)	15 (16%)
Concept 1	Concept 2	Concept 3	Not Sure

- One third of individual respondents (31 or 33%) most support Concept 1.
- This was followed by Concept 3 (16 or 17%) and Concept (11 or 12%); however, a similar number (15 or 16%) were not sure.
- Twenty-one respondents (22%) skipped this question.

Please explain what you particularly like about your preferred concept (Individual Responses):

Concept 1

- Strongly; Reclaiming the site is positive for maintaining natural character of the park; No clue why this should be a historic building of any value
- No need to have this house, or use tax dollars to fix it up
- I prefer Concept 1, overall but do not support the unknown possibility of building something new there in terms of the Yorath site

- The house was originally built under very circumspect circumstances; The family is not a recognizable name in cities history; The house is a dump and should be torn down to return to a more natural state
 - Spend the money on the overall park, not a specific small property
 - Do not want to see it become a restaurant
 - Keep! Quit dilly dallying, 20 yrs of it is enough
 - Cost of maintaining such a facility is difficult to justify in the absence of a clear purpose
 - It would be too expensive to repair at this point
 - If there was a way to keep the Yorath House, upgrade it to something neat like a restaurant or museum Open it to the public, I would be 100% in favor of keeping it. Because it has allowed to be run down and locked to the public, I cannot see the city "saving it" for less than 2-4M\$ and I would have to say demolish it.
 - As much as I love architecture of this house, it's been neglected for too long. Without any clear vision for it all these years, it's likely not worth the cost of trying to save it
 - Interest has been brought forward by rowing club to take this over to turn into workout room or coffee shop; Rowing club would like land even if we must rebuild; Concept 3- number 1 priority; Concept 1- number 2 priority
 - It is not used; The space could be better used as returned to natural area
 - Wonderful quiet area to walk dogs; Don't make it busy and full of chaos
 - There are so many requests for developing site..
 - Adds ongoing costs for maintenance, staff, support, security
 - Should the city/ prov/ feds. pay for all this indefinitely? And what about the service trucks parking for events etc.; If it is used for summer events especially, the extra parking use would be horrendous!
 - More development= more traffic and more people
 - Removal of Yorath House, it's too expensive to upgrade
 - Knock down house/ demolish it (x3)
 - Demolish and reclaim land; Do not build anything, landscape in an attractive manner
 - More natural is better
 - Save for future use
- Concept 2**
- Selected 2 and 3; Keep the house! Heritage house
 - I want Yorath House to stay (chose 2 and 3)
- I would support use and total renos to Yorath to facilitate receptions and meetings;
 - Keep remaining building (more fiscally responsible); ANY of these options would be better than current;
 - Could be great support for main washrooms
 - Remove trees growing along rock wall and garden. Maintain the hedges Only as it related to Yorath
 - No changes to off leash area except to formally recognize this north end area!
 - Do not demolish; Use as special event area (weddings, receptions etc.); Include a tea house open daily;
 - Include info/ history on the Yorath and the family
 - Concept 1 there will be legal proceedings to stop destruction of the Yorath House; Concept 2 and 3 are generally ok
 - I support keeping Yorath House, and providing it with its own parking
 - I don't support expansion of the boat launch, which both Concept 2 and 3 for Yorath seems to be tied to
 - Washroom may be indicated?
 - The house could be a natural facility; Minimal site Improvements would be more likely to retain the naturalness of the area
 - I enjoy visiting Yorath House for picnics with my dogs and friends; I love that it is natural and not developed; I already use it for these purposes daily
 - None of them; Throw out concept 1; Concept 3 is over the top, too much, BUDGET!; I like Concept 2 better for the house except why lose all the dog access to the beach? Concept 2 if beach access not restricted with Figure 6 is ok
 - City paid a lot of money for the house and land, keep it
 - Not for profit/ community use/ educational on heritage/ guide dog
- Concept 3**
- Just use it; Something like the John Janzen nature centre
 - Preserve as historical site
 - Again, not a huge stake for me; If the building is there, we may as well use it
 - Coffee/ tea house good idea
 - Coffee house?
 - Would like option for cafe
 - The city has let the house deteriorate and it would be great to have the house refurbished with possibly a small coffee shop
 - Concept 1- NO! not enough information; Retain, use for four-seasons facility

- I think it would be a shame to destroy Yorath; Parking on the lawn in front South Yorath is not preferred, the natural beauty would be compromised; If upgrades are going to happen, even some landscaping Improvements around the house
 - Upgrade building and rock gardens
Make coffee house and washrooms
 - Stop destroying Edmonton’s heritage
 - Honor the history
- Not Sure**
- None of the above
 - Don’t care (x2)
- The house is beyond the point of no return, mice and mold have taken over
 - Doesn’t seem that special
 - Hospice for dogs
 - Citizen proposal for a palliative care hospice for animals
 - Animal hospice and palliative care centre
 - Restore for use as hospice with companion animals
 - See citizen proposal re: hospice/ palliative care w/ companion animals- would support this
 - It would be too expensive to do anything else
 - Depends on intended use of facility
 - No opinion

I. Pathways / off leash interface and definition: Included in all concepts, install sections of post and rail fence and strategic plantings to provide improved separation and definition between the off leash area and the shared use pathway. At crossing points provide fence ‘dog legs’ and rumble strips, keeping sightlines open.

I.1. Group Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support changes to the pathways / off leash interface?

12 (17%)	12 (17%)	6 (9%)	9 (13%)	22 (32%)	8 (12%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Nine groups representing 69 participants provided a response to this question; six groups did not respond to this question.
- Group responses were evenly divided between support to strongly support (30 or 43%) and somewhat not support to strongly not support (31 or 45%).
- A further 8 (12%) were not sure.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about changes to the pathways / off leash interface (Group Responses):

Like

- Like these concepts
- If it will actually stop the dog
- Could have signage to alert people
- Need signage at cross points
- Rumble strips for bikes at cross
- Some concerns about barriers, would prefer signage
- Need separation
- Full fence excessive (just where these intersections/ path cross)
- Issue is sightlines so cyclists can see dog and dog walkers can see cyclists etc.

- Surfacing (non- asphalt)
- Safety concerns

Dislike

- Don’t see a point
- Waste of money
- Compartmentalize park unnecessarily
- Unnecessary expenses because people won’t pay as much attention when they are biking, false sense of security
- Want a free area with no fences, current open area is wonderful
- Vote against fence/ rumble strips
- Dogs can go under fences, also it is not as natural

- If it doesn't help cyclists, no point
 - Little dogs could get under, need a lower bar (same with big dogs, they could go over)
 - If it won't stop a dog, then concerns about wildlife movement?
 - Separates people; not going to change behaviour; less open; No chains
 - Would have to be looked at carefully in terms of wildlife movement (also restricting access for wildlife)
 - More natural use without, leave as is because it already works well
 - Potential for abuse
- Neither Like / Dislike**
- Would fence be on both sides?
- If better distinguish between on/off leash is made, conflicts would decrease = decrease need for this.
 - Don't want whole meadow fenced in
 - Physical barriers- not sure where these go?
 - Who has the right of way at the intersection?
 - Purpose of rumble strips?
 - Recommendation- rumble strips should slow down cyclists.
 - Would like a stronger bylaw presence in area
 - Can't provide appropriate comments, need more consultation/ definition
 - Not clear where these are proposed
 - Need clarification on specific locations Bottom of hill is most dangerous (bottom of Melton Ravine) and bicycle riders is not addressed in this plan

I.2. Individual Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support changes to the pathways / off leash interface?

26 (28%)	12 (13%)	8 (9%)	7 (7%)	24 (26%)	2 (2%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Half of individual respondents (46 or 50%) indicate support to strongly support for the suggested pathway and off leash interface changes, with slightly more than one quarter (26 or 28%) indicating strong support.
- One third of individual respondents (31 or 33%) do not support the changes, with one quarter (24 or 26%) indicating they strongly do not support.
- Two (2%) were unsure, and fifteen respondents (16%) skipped this question.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about changes to the pathways / off leash interface (Individual Responses):

Strongly Support

- Excellent idea
- Great idea
- Good idea
- Great idea for safety
- The interface between the off leash and on leash needs a great deal of Improvement; The current one pathetic sign as the trail enters the Mackenzie natural area is pathetic and completely ignored by dog walkers
- Dog users abuse their off leash privileges consistently everywhere an off-leash area exists in Edmonton;
- Keeping bikes and dogs separate helps to reduce conflict
- I have been on my bike and run down several times
- Increase cycling, reduce conflict
- I've almost hit a dog while biking on many occasions
- Rumble strips I think are a good idea to let the bikers become more aware of others
- Would slow bicycles
- Fine; Educate the public, dog owners during peak rowing club use (i.e park rangers); Use dog leg across pathway but no fencing
- Fence a waste of time and money
- Definition of on an off leash areas will minimize conflicts between different types of users
- I think the key element is separation of use. Clearly defined and marked

- The need for additional separation between the off leash area and those that use the trails for sporting activities is of significant importance
- Many incidents are caused due to a lack of separation and neither group is cognizant of the others needs/wants
- Critical to understand where we should and can be without various purposes in the park
- Currently there are no interfaces. The pathways are currently part of the off leash area which creates conflict
- Post and rail may not work
- Shrub use encouraged
- Melton Ravine is not considered in any of these, this is a speedway!
Need to establish where fence will be placed
- I also support the re-alignment of the multiuse trail closer to the river to separate the dog walk area
- I think this would improve the appearance of the park

Somewhat Support

- As long as large off leash areas are not fenced
- General idea sounds good; Would really love to see some models and views on the look and feel; I think it can look really sharp if it's designed properly and easy to maintain
- This would probably help minimize conflict between cyclists and dogs and dog owners
- I would like to not worry about my dog running in front of a bike
- Not enough info to conclusively support; I somewhat support strategic separation i.e. Off leash and SUP;
- Definitions need to be provided
- Not bad idea for separation so it would increase cooperation
- I would need more info re: the efficacy of this in other cities/ parks to fully support
Good to improve safety for all users
- Difficult to tell my dog to keep on the trail and use the recommended crossing

Support

- Safety concerns
- Fencing is good for safety; Low 3' better for deer; good for separation of property; doglegs not helpful for dogs; the only fencing should be around leased sites; should be non-intrusive;
- More fencing will affect natural habitat/ wildlife
- How will a post and rail fence slow down small dogs?

- In certain areas, especially around rowing club, but I would like to see trails open and less directed
- Rumble strips are good to keep the speed of cyclists down
- The ones that will be merely speed bumps to bikes
- Rumble strips are a great idea for bikes to keep alert
- Maybe natural barriers instead of railing
Chain link
- No chain link
- Info signs entering park for dog and walker etiquette
- I support the idea of reducing potential conflict points, but I don't want obtrusive construction that takes away from the natural appearance
- Just at intersection
- Really non-issue

Somewhat Not Support

- Pedestrian row; Serious rumble strips
- Dog legs- ("ess" turn to slow down) stopping cyclists at either end of the off leash with clear signs that dogs and pedestrians have the right of way
- The fences and dog legs are adding a larger complexity of barriers between users, it's like separating users because we're enemies and dangerous to each other; We were all getting along fine before this whole process started, why can't courtesy and respect work?
- Dislikes: need signs at ERC boathouses about leashing dogs and keeping dogs off the dog when rowers are using it. Loose dogs on the boathouse site are dangerous for rowers and dogs
- Need more info on where barriers and gates would be! Clarity
- Fences and hurdles to slow down dogs is a good idea to prevent collisions with cyclists; but these fences won't slow down small dogs that go under or just over
- Larger dogs will easily jump over and smaller dogs will walk under

Strongly Not Support

- Think it will be ineffective; Waste of money
- Don't use doggie language! Make them very rumbley, therefore the paths shouldn't be paved at all
- Useless when applied to dogs; Slows people not dogs
- Highly support low key fencing around leased areas (such as white water paddlers)

- Absolutely not; Only fencing should be around the specific lease sites boundary only
 - No fences
 - Potential for abuse i.e. too much fencing
 - Fences are an eyesore and waste of money
 - Wasted money
 - Rumble strips for bike on main path for bikes and slow down near intersections
 - No rumble strips
 - Absolutely not, I propose that it is a multi-use path with off leash, biking, walking, all sharing the privilege
 - Shared use pathway should remain off leash
 - This is very ill-defined
 - Restricts off leash
 - Makes difficult to cross through Wildlife corridors- did you consider that?
 - I am concerned about the Impact on wildlife corridors, this has strong potential to disrupt movement
 - Wildlife will be affected
 - Free area is so valuable for wildlife, humans, dogs I'm also unsure as to whether this would be needed given the better distinction between on and off leash areas
 - Dogs like running through trees and coming back
 - Conflicts are few and may be cleared up with good signage
 - Ill defined
- Not Sure**
- You are creating opportunities for conflict between users
 - Not enough info

J. Off Leash boundary adjustments: All three concepts recognize off leash use & formalize expansion of the off leash area boundary on the north side, extending north of the Hawrelak Park pedestrian bridge (see Figure 3). Shoreline / river access will be maintained through existing areas, with an adjustment between on leash and off leash areas. Alternative alignments of the shared use pathway in this area are identified in the three concepts. Modifications to the SE boundaries along the river edge, intended to improve interactions between user groups, vary between the three concepts.

Concept 1 proposes a small reduction in the SE around the boating sites.

Concept 2 identifies the most extensive reduction in the SE portion of the off leash area.

Concept 3 identifies a moderate reduction in the SE.

J.1. Group Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support the formalization and expansion of the north end of the off leash area?

64 (89%)	4 (6%)	3 (4%)	1 (1%)	0	0
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Ten groups representing 72 participants provided a response to this question; five groups did not respond to it.
- There was overwhelming support for formalizing and expanding the north end of the off leash area (71 or 99%), with 64 (89%) indicating they strongly support it.
- Only one participant indicated they somewhat did not support it.

To what extent do you support or not support the Concept 1 off leash boundary adjustment?

25 (35%)	20 (28%)	9 (13%)	5 (7%)	7 (10%)	6 (8%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Ten groups representing 72 participants provided a response to this question; five groups did not respond to it.
- Three quarters of group responses support to strongly support Concept 1 (54 or 76%), with 25 (35%) indicating strong support.
- A further 12 (17%) of respondents did not support Concept 1, and 6 (8%) were unsure.

To what extent do you support or not support the Concept 2 off leash boundary adjustment?

1 (1%)	2 (3%)	1 (1%)	5 (7%)	59 (87%)	0
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Ten groups representing 68 participants provided a response to this question; five groups did not respond to it.
- The majority of group responses (64 or 94%) indicated they did not support Concept 2, with 59 (87%) indicating they strongly did not support this.
- Only 4 (5%) indicated support to strongly support.

To what extent do you support or not support the Concept 3 off leash boundary adjustment?

0	3 (4%)	2 (3%)	4 (6%)	53 (76%)	8 (11%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Ten groups representing 70 participants provided a response to this question; five groups did not respond to it.
- The majority of group responses indicated (57 or 82%) indicated they did not support Concept 3, with three quarters (53 or 76%) indicating they strongly did not support this option.
- Only 5 (7%) indicated they support or somewhat support this Concept, and 8 (11%) were unsure.

Please explain what you particularly like about your preferred concept (Group Responses):

Like

- Expansion on N needs to go further
- Like extension to north, why not all the way to north boundary?
- Would like more off leash access; especially to the north of the park
- Designation of specific areas is important
- Would like it to stay the same
- Understand needs of rowing club
- Understand dogs not getting in way of rowing club
- Support not cutting through the rowing club
- When you go by club put the dogs on a leash
- Dogs should be on leash in parking areas
- Signs in the off leash too
- Fence near the high traffic areas, the boat launch/ rowing clubs
- Put steps in to provide access to the river

- Permanent fence adjacent to boating areas
- Park rangers to help educate dog walkers and rowers
- 90% of people who walk pathways are dog walkers
- Others who are met enjoy seeing dogs
- We've never seen any paddlers- doesn't seem to be a problem
- Paddlers are paying for space, so need to respect

Concept 1

- Dogs like the river- concept 1 is the best concern with river access being limited.

Concept 2

- Has selected Support
- But not good enough, more off leash!
- Trails should be available to off-leash

- With modification extend further north. remove on leash from trail
- Areas wet in spring.

Concept 3

- Like that main trails is in on leash
- Reduce on leash around clubs
- Needs to be controls or barrier to protect clubs

Dislike

- Concerns that there are no options to expand the off leash area. It seems that the only changes are to decrease the off leash area.
- Whitewater paddlers - never see them?
- Seasonal use of river; dog walking all year (May-Oct)
- Access to river on off-leash areas is restricted

Concept 1

- Concept 1 makes no sense
- Don't like taking away off leash dog areas

Concept 2

- No major concerns from non dog users whereas NO from dog users
- Too much block on off leash for dog
- Too small for river access for dogs

- Do not support on leash area on trail. Ineffective and asking for conflict
- Should not be on leash

Concept 3

- Support on leash in parking lot
- Depends on Yorath House

Neither Like / Dislike

- Would like to know what percentage of each group uses the park- ratio of designated areas needs to be representative of users
- What are the benefits of concept 2?
- What is the issue they are trying to solve?
- Found info vague re: costs
- Small reduction at boat site: already rules; how do you change behaviour?
- Signage is atrocious
- "Dogs are not allowed" sign faces river
- Provide signage to cyclists for dogs and vice versa
- Told that signs are limited
- Education and courtesy needed on both sides
- Mutual responsibility for all
- Can't enforce people on or off leash
- Creating a problem trying to define areas and enforce
- Concerned about access to the bridge

J.2. Individual Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support the formalization and expansion of the north end of the off leash area?

57 (61%)	8 (9%)	7 (7%)	0	5 (5%)	3 (3%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Over three quarters of individual respondents noted support to strong support formalization and expansion of the north end of the off leash area, with almost two thirds (57 or 61%) indicating strong support for this.
- Only 5 (5%) indicated they strongly did not support this, and 3 (3%) indicated they were unsure.
- Fourteen respondents (15%) skipped this question.

To what extent do you support or not support the Concept 1 off leash boundary adjustment?

29 (31%)	23 (25%)	5 (5%)	5 (5%)	11 (12%)	6 (6%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Almost two thirds of individual respondents (57 or 61%) support to strongly support the Concept 1 off leash boundary adjustment, with close to one third (29 or 31%) indicating strong support.
- Less than one fifth of individual respondents (16 or 17%) did not support this option, with 11 (12%) indicating they strongly do not support it.
- A further 6 (6%) were unsure, and 15 respondents (16%) skipped this question.

To what extent do you support or not support the Concept 2 off leash boundary adjustment?

4 (4%)	2 (2%)	4 (4%)	6 (6%)	60 (64%)	3 (3%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Over two thirds of individual respondents (66 or 70%) do not support the Concept 2 off leash area, with 60 (64%) indicating they strongly do not support it.
- Support for this option was limited, with 10 (10%) individuals indicating support to strong support for it, and 3 (3%) were unsure.
- Fifteen respondents (16%) skipped this question.

To what extent do you support or not support the Concept 3 off leash boundary adjustment?

4 (4%)	3 (3%)	5 (5%)	8 (9%)	54 (57%)	4 (4%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Two thirds of individual respondents (62 or 66%) do not support the Concept 3 off leash boundary adjustment, with 54 (57%) indicating they strongly do not support it.
- Support for this option was also limited, with 12 (12%) indicating support to strongly support for it, and 4 (4%) were not sure.
- Sixteen respondents (17%) skipped this question.

Please explain what you particularly like about your preferred concept (Individual Responses):

Off Leash Boundary Adjustments

Expansion

- Strongly support expansion of northern boundary to recognize current usage
- Should be further expanded as off leash north to Mackenzie Ravine. 95% of users are people with dogs along that trail
- My preference would be to expand the off leash area up to Mackenzie Ravine, this is what people have been saying
- Would strongly support the formalization and expansion of off leash further north than existing boundary
- Would like to see the off leash area expanded to the north "bushy areas"
Why are we not allowed into the 'preservation area' north and west of the current park boundary?
We have been walking in that area for at least 30

years. The boundary seems to be arbitrary. There needs to be a real justification for this boundary

- Off leash needs to be bigger. The demand is increasing and we have limited other areas to go.
- With an extension of continued off leash along the main shared use trail. It is not enforceable
- The off leash area should be extended- off leash users use the park and pathways all year long unlike most other users; The off leash area needs to extend the northern boundary from the north end of Valleyview Dr.; There must not be any reduction to off leash
- I support expansion of north boundary but not reduction of existing off leash areas
- Extension of off leash to north is strongly supported
- Leave the current off leash area alone or increase it
- Most dog walkers use it already
- I like the north off leash access

- Any increase in off leash is approved, Any decrease is opposed
- Not sure about the north end requirements; Is there enough dog off leash already?
- Off leash is big enough as is
- Do not support any increase of off leash area
- All parking lots should be on leash
- Bike trail through the trees is a great idea
- Again, accurate signage is crucial; Also, signage that directs wheeled users to yield to pedestrians, including those with 4 feet!
- I think dog walkers (off-leash) have taken over the park to the detriment of other use; Dogs (off leash) need to be contained

Shared Use Pathway

- Remove on leash main trail.
- Shared pathway should be designated off leash
- Walking and cycling would be safer for everyone if dogs were on a leash around the main walking path. I'm a senior and I can't walk this park because I've been lunged at twice; Laurier park has been sadly neglected for 40 years
- I'm fine with anything if conflict with me, shared use trail can be effectively mitigated
- I do not support main walking path being on leash; I wish we could all use all paths cooperatively
- On leash area in the north by the path is silly and how will that be policed?
- On leash area on the trail is not effective

River Access / Rowing & Paddling Area

- Whitewater paddlers have not used river access for years
- I like the off leash river access
Any stopped access to river is opposed
- Very much appreciate the addition of more on leash areas around the rowing and paddling areas I will continue to walk off leash through side paths through the rowing club. I keep my dogs away from boat launch area with verbal commands
- I am all for expanding boundaries considered off leash; Access to the river is Important outside the boundaries leased by the water craft groups
- Dogs need more area, not less; Dogs really shouldn't be near boating sites
- Likes: ERC boathouse an on leash area; Dislike- Need city signs to mark these areas

Other

- If formalization means fencing and paving, then no!
- Fence around leased areas are acceptable (3')
- I don't support Yorath House area being on leash, I love sitting with my dogs in that beautiful place
Increase signage
- Improve signage re Dogs/ cyclists. Forget about on-leash strips, not enforceable

Concept 1

- Concept 1 formalizes how the park is used; Multi use trail should be on leash; Why build a new road?
- Concept 1 is the closest to how I currently use the park (as a dog walker)
- Keep park as is, don't change
- Best use as close to as is
- I would vote for Concept 1 because it seems to be the most dog friendly concept with the least fiddling and modification to existing area.
- I prefer most of concept 1 which leaves things similar to the way they are
- Concept '0' is preferable, however concept 1 is good in that it extends off leash to around the pedestrian bridge
- Concept 1: somewhat support with these changes: 1) Yorath House and rowing club tank should be off leash 2) main pathway should be off leash 3) on leash area should include but should end at the paddlers building 4) off leash should expand further north

Off Leash

- Great but not enough; Should be extended even further, up to Mackenzie Ravine
- Should be expanded north for dogs to Mackenzie and increase river access for dogs (gives some for boarders ok and some for dock ok)
- Go all the way to the northern border; I don't support the change to making the main path on-leash only, given that I don't support it being paved. I do tend to avoid that path any how right now, but like that, especially in the winter, I can use it
- Concept 1/ mod. specifically to the north end extension: remove off leash requirement north
- I prefer Concept 1 but would like it expanded to include trail that goes north into the trees. Dog walkers use the area more than any other group even in rainy and severe and sub-zero weather
- Would like to see more off leash allowed to the north
- Expansion north- concepts 1 and 3 best

- I strongly support further expansion beyond the Concept 1 boundary to the north. I would estimate 90% of BV users are dog walkers. Why not make the entire North end off-leash? Why is off-leash expansion not an option??!!

Shared Use Pathway

- Use concept 1, but forget about on-leash for the SUP where it goes through off-leash areas
- Concept 1- Shared use path should be off leash. Silly to have a on leash path cutting right through the middle of the park
- Forget about on leash areas
- It makes no sense to have a multiuse trail adjacent to the dog meadow, dogs chase bikes, bikes hit dogs
- Dogleg access only for no bike access

Fenced Area

- The field adjacent to BV Rd should be fenced with chain link for a safe area for dogs to play ball if they are not perfectly behaved
- Support fencing around leased areas for Kayaks and rowing club but not expansion beyond lease boundaries

Signage

- We must Improve signage so people are clear what is off and on leash and where bike access is prohibited
People don't pay attention to signs, so no safe usage

River Access / Rowing & Paddling Area

- All concepts- off leash for boat areas is respectful and great
- On leash should only be designated between boathouses and river bank, it is too large in concept 1 drawings
- The river trail could be moved around the rowing club lands

- Concept 1- good for rowing/paddling club. Would move main path by shore west of boat houses to help keep dog walkers and pedestrians out of area

Concept 2

- No support for deduction of off leash areas (Concepts 2 and 3)
- Suggest we focus on integration of all user groups instead of segregation via fencing/ approval/ rights/ etc. (Concepts 2 and 3)
- I appreciate the respect shown in Concept 2 for the main trail going through the on-leash area; however, this severely restricts beach access (off-leash)
- Concept 2- Takes too much shoreline for dog walkers (same with concept 3)
- The removal of off leash from rivers edge is not acceptable. The big appeal of the park for the dogs is the access to the river and not just at the passenger bridge to Hawrelak
- Horrible Idea for dogs
- If Yorath House is developed, area around it would potentially benefit from on leash especially if Yorath serves food
- Concepts 2 and 3 increase the off leash area, that is an improvement
- I like park as is, as a wild area and have reservations about changes/ paving/ fences and hard paths
- It will be difficult to enforce and respect Concept 2

Concept 3

- Concept 3 seems to be the most moderate view for all groups; Also, provides the most amount of water access for dogs yet still provides a good balance
- Concept 3, nice loop for beach access
- Dogs should be on leash in and near parking lots so I support south part of concept 3
- Takes from dogs for boats
- Concept 2 and 3- don't support

1. ROUND 1: CONCEPT 1 - SPECIFIC ELEMENTS

1.1. Shared Use Path: Concept 1 (Figure 4) encourages a cooperative use environment by providing an asphalt shared use pathway that follows the existing major pathway alignment, with post and rail fencing along the section of the pathway that is directly adjacent to the off leash area.

1.1.1. Group Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support the use of fencing between the pathway and off leash area?

4 (14%)	6 (21%)	1 (3%)	3 (10%)	9 (31%)	6 (21%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Five groups representing 29 participants provided a response to this question; ten groups did not respond to it.
- Group responses were evenly divided between support to strongly support (11 or 38%) and somewhat not support to strongly not support (12 or 41%), with the strongly not support having the highest number of responses (9 or 31%).
- A further 6 (21%) of responses were unsure.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about the use of fencing between the pathway and off leash area (Group Responses):

Like

- Like that this would discourage bikes in the off leash area, discourages conflict
- Don't like barriers, but see value in having fencing.
- Aesthetics are nice

- Do not want asphalt
- No asphalt spent, it's not natural
- Support the hard surface (other than asphalt), not a fence
- No support for asphalt or fence
- Post and rail is not effective.

Dislike

- Fencing won't stop dogs
- Won't look natural
- Dividing users to this extent only keeps people separated rather than encouraging them to cooperate

Neither Like / Dislike

- These options are based on the assumption of the asphalt pathway

1.1.2. Individual Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support the use of fencing between the pathway and off leash area?

17 (18%)	11 (12%)	6 (6%)	7 (7%)	25 (27%)	4 (4%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Individual responses were evenly divided between support to strongly support (34 or 36%) and somewhat not support to strongly not support (32 or 34%), with the strongly not support having the highest number of responses (25 or 27%).
- Four (4%) of individual respondents were unsure, and 24 (26%) skipped this question.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about the use of fencing between the pathway and off leash area (Individual Responses):

Strongly Support

- Least changes to the park
- Provides access for all users
- Very good idea to use simple physical barriers to separate users (dogs, bikes, people) where they may conflict (high usage areas)
- I like the idea of separating bikes and dogs
- Reduce conflict with cyclists
- Less tense for walkers and cyclists without dogs able to rush them
- I would like to not have to worry that my dog will run in front of a bike
- Fence provides visible guideline; Enhances safety for all
- Chain link; Post and rail will not keep dogs from running onto path. How can you expect dogs to run into the field and stop at park?
- Yes, but absolutely no chain link
- Would like to see additional sections of fence at inappropriate access points all along the SUP
- I think shale instead of pavement

Somewhat Support

- Will separate on/off leash and hopefully improve safety
- The fence in the picture would be useful in letting both cyclists and dog walkers know the boundaries
- I do like that it slows down dogs running across trail and will keep other users on trail; It can also guide users, helping them understand
- Concern: with a fence, those people walking dogs on the trail will have to have dogs contained in the path corridor. Right now most dogs are off trail a good distance along there and respectful walkers keep their dogs away
- Post and rail- wildlife crossing? Baby deer, can they get under? A natural barrier i.e. bushes etc., might be safer
- Can wildlife get over it? Can a baby deer fit under the bottom rail?
- Will not keep small dogs off the path
- As long as it is only a linear one-sided fence
Have never been keen on fences
- No fencing but shared use asphalt pathway
- Do not support asphalt, maybe recycled tires?
- No asphalt! (x2)
- I would guess that there's more asphalt in Edm than all of Scandinavia

- I support "Dog legs" delineation to minimize out group encounters

Support

- Perhaps dog users will pay more attention to their boundaries
- Keeping dogs and bikes apart is a good idea
- It makes people more aware of the boundaries between on and off leash areas
- Not asphalt- other hard surface
Fencing not helpful

Somewhat Not Support

- Not required except where the paths intersect; Not along the entire area
- Fences are not going to help
- Dislike fences everywhere
- How do you avoid over building? Fences don't necessarily make good neighbors!

Strongly Not Support

- Do not like hard barriers separating user groups
- Path should not be paved; This would increase speed and risk/ danger related to this path
- Path should not be paved in the first place
- No asphalt
A hard surface will be acceptable but no asphalt
- It's Impractical to split the park up; Adding an additional path on the W boundary is Impractical when improving the existing central path is needed
- This is not a shared use path, but a high speed wheeled path
- Very poorly thought out concept; Asphalt paving will increase wheeled use at higher speeds and increase multiuse conflicts
- This does not encourage cooperative use; Asphalt will encourage bikers to speed up endangering families, elderly and dogs would walk on those paths.
- The asphalt pathway should not be accessible to off leash use: Too much conflict with commuter use
- Creates conflict
- The fencing may be ok but I'd have to see it first
- Fencing will not effectively restrict dog traffic unless it is so restrictive as to remove all access to river

- Fencing is an unnecessary development and ongoing cost item for maintenance
 - No fencing
 - Don't ruin the park by fencing everything off
 - A post and rail fence will not contain dogs
 - Extra pavement not needed, fences not needed
 - Puts wildlife corridor in jeopardy
 - Leave as much as it is, saves tax payers money
 - Maintain existing pathway
 - I dislike the disruption to wildlife corridors; I think that if this is considered, an environmental Impact assessment should be done
 - Does nothing to encourage cooperative use
 - Safety and security
- Not Sure**
- Would like more specific info as to materials used and post and rail info

1.2. Parking: Concept 1 (Figure 4) provides for expansion of the existing off leash parking lot, as well as expansion of the parking lot near the Rowing Tank. The shared use pathway separates Rowing Club parking from general public parking.

1.2.1. Group Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support this option:

3 (19%)	8 (50%)	0	0	5 (31%)	0
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Three groups representing 16 participants responded to this question; twelve groups did not provide a response.
- Just over one third of group responses (11 or 69%) somewhat or strongly support expansion of the off leash and Rowing Club parking lots, separated by the shared use pathway.
- One third of group responses (5 or 31%) strongly do not support this option.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about expansion of the off leash and Rowing Club parking lots, separated by the shared use pathway (Group Responses):

Like

- Parking by rowing tank should be just for rowers (or majority designation)
- Need more parking
- Doesn't need to be paved parking

- Rowing club would like to maintain priority parking during peak rowing hours
- Make clear who should park where

Dislike

- Allow a second parking lot adjacent to the trail

1.2.2. Individual Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support this option:

13 (14%)	19 (20%)	10 (11%)	4 (4%)	9 (10%)	6 (6%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Almost half of individual respondents (42 or 45%) indicated support to strong support for this parking option.
- A further 13 (14%) respondents did support this option, and 6 (6%) were not sure
- Thirty-three respondents (35%) did not reply to this question.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about expansion of the off leash and Rowing Club parking lots, separated by the shared use pathway (Individual Responses):

Strongly Support

- More parking is needed
- More parking is SO needed
- No opposition to increased parking
- The off leash parking lot needs more green space around it to encourage people to move their dogs out of the parking areas and reduce potential for being run over
- Pathway a distinct way to say you are entering ERC/ Paddle club area
- Dog legs would be necessary at this and stop signs
- I support expansion of these to existing lots but I do not support new parking along 131 St
- Clear separation as to which is which area

Somewhat Support

- Extra parking is required
A little bit of extra parking is good
- At times, more parking would be useful
- Allows more access to users
- Please try to limit additional paving in green space
- Losing space
- All conditional depending on number and allocation
- Reserved parking for rowing would be nice
- Good idea to separate rowing parking from general parking
- Will the rowing club stalls be seasonal as they are now?
- Designated seasonal parking for rowers
- Can dog walkers use it in the off season and outside their hours?
- Designated other parking
- Off leash expansion is good for rowing area, use concept 3 instead
- Do not extend to include Yorath House

- Again, no asphalt; There are semi-permeables available

Support

- Ok, some additional parking is needed
- Modest increase in parking
- Rowing club extension for parking is ok
- Small expansion of parking lot
- Least invasive of all parking plans

Somewhat Not Support

- Dislikes: security of ERC tank: could we discourage casual use of this lot with speed bumps?
- Make better use of existing parking space, do not unnecessarily entice more vehicles
- Most sensible near the rowing club

Strongly Not Support

- Too many stalls for rowing club
- Will it be plowed in winter for public use?
- Too little information
- If shared use= asphalt paving then I disagree
- More traffic, more bodies, more risk of injury;
- Keep it with as much natural space as possible
- Plenty of parking at the zoo
- Direct traffic overflow to existing zoo / Laurier Parking
- Offer handicapped parking sites closer for inclusive use of BV
- I think parking is sufficient

Not Sure

- Existing off leash parking not, not sure, need more info
- Not applicable, I don't use parking
- Why separate them?

1.3. Concept 1 Additional Comments: Please provide any additional comments you may have regarding what you like or dislike about the options identified in Concept 1:

1.3.1. Group Response Summary:

Concept 1 – Like

- Generally, concept 1 is the "best" with indicated modifications

- Don't demolish the Yorath House, some people would like to see it demolished

- Depending on what is done with Yorath; should be off leash unless it's refurbished for multi-use; Its ok to be on-leash because of different people using the facility; 2m wide strip, no pavement; doesn't make sense to be on leash for 2m wide strip
- Like the pond idea, use natural/ indigenous plant (use it as a way to clean the water)
- Tie in with the zoo's water management system.
- Where on leash by rowing club (east edge), dog legs should be installed to keep dogs from flying into rowing club

Concept 1 - Dislike

- Post and rail is ineffective, something else should be used to control dogs
- City of Edmonton should focus on cooperation and not providing barriers
- No hot air balloon in the off leash park portion (move to Hawrelak park)

Other

- Need signage near Yorath House
- Larger access to river for dogs
- Extended off leash area
- Parking

1.3.2. Individual Response Summary:

Like

- Concept 1 is the best of the 3
- Concept one has my vote with noted variations
- Is least invasive plan and therefore most agreeable on plans presented.
- I would prefer park to remain as a natural/ low maintenance wooded area.
- I like the fact that it seems to involve the least modification of anything as compared to concepts 2 and 3
- Really want to see the entrance defined and the roundabout is a great idea

Pathways

- Make sure that SUP separate users path are easily enforceable and definable
- Don't like the lack of physical barriers from off leash to multi use path
- No provision for enhanced signs on blocking access of bikes from off leash park (this is a big problem)
- This is the only park in Edm that restricts users to some trails to pedestrians. This creates ongoing conflict as users of other parks are confused but this inconsistency which is unnecessary
- Looping plan is poorly considered and destroys area of unique habitat.
- For the improved surface loop, use hard pack surface on existing principal path to join with bridge trail. Why put asphalt to ruin nature?
- Avoid asphalt at all cost

Off Leash

- Why not include fenced off-leash training/ barrier-free area in this concept as well?
- Would like the entire BV area left as shared

- Two additional ideas: recognizing that BV is the premier dog park in Edm and one of the best in the world (and I've travelled abroad) Why not build upon that rather than diminish it? Therefore: 1) expand off-leash to the north (and in an ideal world, to McKinnon Ravine); 2) Restrict and enforce no bikes through the off-leash (except the main through trail)
- Expand off leash further north
- You have reduced the size of the dog park
- Formalize dog areas
Increase signage for bike and dog owners but leave the rest as is.

Parking

- More parking
- Aside from rowing events, there are FAR more off-leash users parking rather than rowers; rowers should have less parking, perhaps delegated stalls?

River Access / Rowing & Paddling Area

- Second beach access identified in Fig. 2 is very important for older dogs; is extremely important!
- It's too hard for a 13 yr old dog to walk to the beach by the bridge for water!
- The proposed expansion of the on leash around the rowing and canoe clubs seems to be much larger than necessary. I support the expansion, but not quite as large. Should also consider using dog legs or other visual/ physical barriers to remind people it's time to leash their dogs.
- Do not expand boat launch/ parking

Yorath House

- Do not demolish the Yorath House

- Retain Yorath and create a multiuse facility.
- I'm not crazy about the demolition of the Yorath House, but I don't see any way to save it without it costing 3-5M \$ of taxpayers money
- Other**
- Conduct usage studies to determine focus for park
- Strive to achieve user integration, not by function
- Recognize that you cannot be all things to people
- You have a limited budget to work with
- Focus on primary users for buck of capital improvements
- Designate an area in Hawrelak Park for launching hot air balloons

ROUND 2: CONCEPT 2

2. ROUND 2: CONCEPT 2 – SPECIFIC ELEMENTS

Note: half of the tables started at the beginning of questions for this section and the other half started at the end to ensure that responses were obtained regarding all questions.

2.1. Pathways: Concept 2 (Figure 5) identifies re-aligning the main shared use pathway to run through the existing small “meadows” providing separation between it and the off leash area (requires some tree clearing), and to run in front of the Rowing Tank. The abandoned section of the shared use pathway would be used as part of an off leash looping pathway, marking the boundary of the off leash area. Other off leash loops would also be provided.

2.1.1. Group Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support this pathway option?

9 (20%)	4 (9%)	8 (17%)	0	22 (48%)	3 (7%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Seven groups representing 46 participants provided responses to this question; eight groups did not respond to it.
- Group responses were evenly divided between support to strongly support (21 or 46%) and somewhat not support to strongly not support 212 or 48%), with the strongly not support having the highest number of responses (22 or 48%).
- A further 3 (7%) of group responses were unsure.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about this pathway option:

Like

- Five in group like this
- Three in group support moving trail
- Like the idea of moving trail more east so as not to cut park in half
- Positive benefit- eliminates conflicting use
- Help cyclists/ dog conflict

- Good way to separate biking and dog walking area to avoid conflict
- Getting rid of fences; natural boundary; better pathway option than concept 1 (concerns with changing structure of landscape)

Dislike

- Would like the dog path to be by the river.

- Do not think Caragana is a big deal, like them
- Do not change existing access
- Four in group don't see a point
- Don't over organize; looping is not necessary
- More development leads to a less natural feeling
- Users enjoy the naturalized trails
- Nice getting away and feeling you're in nature
- Would really change the way the area is shaped, not a good way to avoid disturbance of natural habitat
- Once trees are gone, gone forever; limit the widening of the path
- Better signage would be better than putting in hard boundaries and impacting the nature
- If they build a new path, they would lose more trees
- Bike use mostly for getting through space, not use space; give good safe road, but don't lose enjoyment for those that use the park.
- Why spend more money to relocate a pathway?
- How are dogs going to get across meadow?
- Still no to the asphalt; too much to maintain
- Suggest shale
- Will exclude some older and less mobile dogs
- Will push conflict into Hawrelak area- safety issues
- Concerns about construction during creation of new path
- Take park out of service in order to get this done

Neither Like / Dislike

- Confusion on this question and concept!
- The use of the park is increasing as the city grows= increasing interactions
- Want to cut down conflicts between bikes and dogs is the way to do it but would result in losing park of the area we love.
- Not an easy problem to solve

2.1.1 Individual Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support this pathway option?

8 (9%)	7 (7%)	9 (10%)	2 (2%)	35 (37%)	7 (7%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Just over two-thirds of individual respondents (35 or 39%) do not support this pathway options, with 35 (37%) strongly not supporting it.
- One quarter of individual respondents (24 or 26%) support to strongly support the option, and 7 (7%) are not sure.
- Twenty-six respondents (28%) skipped this question

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about this pathway option:

Strongly Support

- I like the separation of pathway and dog park
Great idea and separates bikes from dog area
- Great idea to separate bikes and dogs
- Clear definition and protection from off leash dogs is important
- Don't like the off leash path to dog beach being taken away; Bikes are always there and they shouldn't be
- Sign the path as "not off leash" This would provide a clear separation of field and bike path
Want the off leash area of Concept 1

Somewhat Support

- Don't over organize the trails, leave things mainly as they are
- Separating bikes and dogs would alleviate conflicts and remove some of the Caragana invasion
- Moving the main commuting trail away from the largest/busiest sections of the off leash area makes sense
- Necessity of fences
Enlarge off-leash area

Support

- Separation of SUP and Off-leash is a great idea to decrease conflict and Improve safety

- Reduce conflict between cyclists and other users (at the same time, fencing could also achieve this)
- The natural forest buffer is a lot better than the post and rail fencing
- If it stays off leash

Somewhat Not Support

- Don't understand why we need looping trails, all the trails interchange with each other

Strongly Not Support

- Do not change existing off leash area!
- Do not want off leash area to be smaller
- Reduces off leash area
- Don't expand off leash area
- No tree clearing
- Too much removal of wooded areas, even though parts of it are Caragana bushes
- Leave current paths- the Caragana has been there 60 yrs it is not taking over!
- Not necessary to construct a new multiuse trail; Off leash walkers will continue to use all of the park regardless
- Issue is dogs chasing bikes
- Perfectly good road; Why would you move it
- No need to realign the pathways
- Do not put in a new trail
- Do not rehabilitate existing small trails
- Very expensive to move main trail; Move off leash boundary area and path instead or use fencing to separate conflicting areas
- Don't spend any money relocating paths;
- Expensive proposition with seeming low return benefit to users
- I really enjoy the dirt single track trail on the east side of the park (trail C and D)
I do not want to see (trail C and D) developed in any way

- Sometimes the distance between the pathways is too close; Too much on/off leashing; Bad loop/restricts dog area
- Do not want to limit access to river for off leash
- A very long walk (especially for older dogs) to the river
- Dogs have no access to river, no thanks
- It pushes dog users further away from the river;
- Leave as is
- Other elements could be used to separate users at the rowing tank ie post/ rail fence
- I am very worried about the disruption to wildlife
- Animals use the vegetation; This option kills too many trees and vegetation
- Negative to off leash users
- Too much lost
- Over design!
- Trouble
- Too much work/money for too few benefits
- Waste of money relocating trail with no resulting value realized
- Waste of money
- Too costly! Why? What's the point?
- More expensive, more heavy equipment and longer time to construct
- The wording on this question is not clear and is misleading; Changing the trail makes it on leash from parking lot to main field, NO! not supported. Why don't you make that clear in the question?

Not Sure

- Good idea to separate users
- Seems unlikely that dog walkers would all respect the on leash requirement near the river
- Refer to dog walkers, what works best with them
- Don't understand the proposed change

2.2. Fenced Off Leash Area: Concept 2 & 3 (Figures 5 & 7) identify a small fenced and gated off leash area for service dog training and for barrier-free access for elderly and mobility impaired dog walkers. The area would include benches and a looping asphalt pathway.

2.2.1. Group Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support this option?

17 (30%)	11 (19%)	11 (19%)	2 (4%)	11 (19%)	5 (9%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Nine groups representing 57 participants provided a response to this question; six groups did not respond to it.
- Two thirds of group responses (39 or 68%) support to strongly support providing a small fenced off leash area.
- Less than one quarter (13 or 23%) do not support this option, with 11 (19%) strongly not supporting it.
- A further 5 (9%) were unsure.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about a fenced off leash area:

Like

- Concept is good
- Like it
- Would be good for training new dogs (young ones)
- Ok with fenced area
- Fenced area ok but not in main area
- Want to see accessible to all users.
- If only restricted to certain user groups then no support
- Removable if it doesn't work
- Safe area for small dogs
- Currently being improperly used; like this improvement
- Intermediate stop
- "field of happiness"
- Don't remove trees in that area
- Use more natural looking fence, not a chain one

- There are other places you can take dogs for training
- Against in current location, why cut into meadows?
- If putting in a fenced area, it should be in field by BV Rd
- Location is unacceptable
- The location being considered is wrong
- Prefer no trees to be taken down
- This park is not Terwillegar. It should stay natural
- Just for them (small or service dogs)? no good!
- Fenced area is not important in the grand scheme of the master plan and how to spend the budget. There's other things it could be used for
- Too big of an area
- People will use it for bad dogs
- Why a special place- people may not understand use?

Dislike

- Against it

2.2.2. Individual Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support this option?

16 (17%)	15 (16%)	17 (18%)	4 (4%)	17 (18%)	6 (6%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Just over half of individual respondents (48 or 51%) support to strongly support a small fenced off leash area.
- Less than one quarter of individual respondents (21 or 22%) do not support this option, with 17 (18%) strongly not supporting it.
- Six respondents (6%) are not sure, and 19 respondents (20%) skipped this question.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about a fenced off leash area (Individual Responses):

Strongly Support

- We need to use one of the larger fields to fence off area for big dogs who don't have great recall; They need somewhere to play but not with wheelchair access
- Support having a training area but should be open to the public not exclusive
- So long as the fencing is unobstructive and it is not exclusive so that when they are not in use by this group other dog users with old or injured dogs could use it
- Refer to section I
- Progress in Edm; accessibility for all
- Awesome Idea; Training my new dog to be off leash could be done in a controlled way
- Great for small dogs
- A good added service for dog training and the mobility impaired
- Make fencing look non-institutional or use colored (black or green) chain link
- Where it is proposed, is not used a ton, this would be a nice option

Somewhat Support

- The idea is good; Location is not user friendly (closer to parking)
- Reservation about exact location
I support the concept and do think the location is good
- If there is certain demand
- Appreciate the opportunity for a secured area
- Like the idea of a fenced area for training/other reasons
- Great; Concerns over type of fencing (like the look of Whitemud-Equine? Shrub?); Should not be exclusive
- Low fencing with shrubs/ trees; not exclusive use to identified groups in the question
- Sounds like a good idea! No chain link, use alternative
- Yes, I support this, but less institutional (mesh) fencing; More of a farm/ country post and rod rails type of construction
- Non institutional fence
- More natural looking fence, not an ugly chain like fence
- Not chained fencing

Support

- Why not
- No comment
- If everyone can use
- As long as everyone has access
- Only if accessible to anyone (i.e., elderly, puppies, mobility impaired)
Strong NO if access only allowed to organizations such as dogs with wings
- Good for little dogs!
- Fair and reasonable to accommodate all needs; Location would be better served adjacent to BV Rd. or in the field there
- Provides and intermediate step for training dogs, between facility and "open public"; for individuals with dogs, between home/ yard and "open public"
- Would be good for very senior dogs
- Fenced area is a good idea
Asphalt is not a good idea

Somewhat Not Support

- If sure of lots of use, then maybe
- Concept good but location not good (have it at Terwillegar)
- Don't restrict this certain user group
- Don't really care, don't think it's needed but access to all not just dogs with wings
- Dogs with wings guy is a special interest, singular group; I'm offended that he would be provided stakeholder status; My elderly/ mobility impaired parents use Laurier to walk their dogs on leash

Strongly Not Support

- I don't believe it's necessary but have no issue if it gets done
- This should be in the field beside BV Rd. That area is currently underused
- Need better location
- Put a fenced off leash off of BV Rd and 132 St
- Put fenced area beside BV Rd. in field next to parking
- Move fenced in area to field being bordered by BV Rd and 132 St
- More accessible with new parking spaces along 132 St
- Don't cut up area being strongly used by humans and wildlife already
- No to fenced area

- Move to another park
- I would like to see the park remain as natural as possible; Fenced and gated training areas are available throughout the city
- May not be necessary considering the amount of money available
- Restrictions in any form is a bad idea
- Service dogs already have training facilities and would do well to be in a realistic environment, suddenly it becomes not a public park
- Maybe you could have some data on how many people this type of use is supporting; Why do they get special areas when the overwhelming majority, the 1000's of dog walkers are just getting space taken away; A very small interest group getting a large representation

2.3. Parking: Concept 2 (Figures 5 & 6) creates a larger parking lot to expand/replace the Rowing Club parking lot, providing designated stalls for Rowing Club use. A separate parking lot with a roundabout would be created near Yorath House, with an optional connection to Laurier Park loop road. The existing Laurier Park parking lot near the entrance would be expanded and planting provided to screen it from the roadway.

2.3.1. Group Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support this option?

12 (21%)	16 (28%)	10 (17%)	8 (14%)	11 (19%)	1 (2%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Nine groups representing 58 participants provided responses to this question: six groups did not respond to it.
- Two thirds of group respondents (38 or 66%) support to strongly support this parking option, while one third (19 or 33%) somewhat or strongly do not support it.
- One response was unsure.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about this parking option (Group Responses):

Like

- Whole table Supports
- Still want to maximize parking use
- There is a need for parking
- Support for Figure 6
- Like this but not the other aspects of Concept 2
- Looks like a "free for all", need better signage and or make 2 separate parking lots
- See map for design
- Support expansion of existing but not the developed part of new.
- Support added parking without roundabout
- Yorath House, if keeping, need parking for events

Dislike

- Traffic flow concerns
- Speed is concern down BV Road

- However, people let dogs run through parking lots; this takes away field which is currently used as a place for dogs during loading and off loading of dogs.
- Should do one or the other
- Don't loop the roadway/ parking (optional link to Laurier- don't include)
- Connection to Laurier loop not supported
- If expanding parking in other areas, why does this area need to be expanded as well?
- Working with existing parking space to expand it, be smart with how you spend the budget.
- There's not many people who row, don't need 120 spots just for them.
- Rowing park lot is big/ unnecessary to be that big.
- Give a couple rows to the rowing club, closest to the rowing tank; Other than that, general parking

- Why do rowers have preferential parking? (should be open to everyone)
- Favoured rowing club gets more parking
- Don't put all parking near the Yorath House
- This concept destroys the front lawn of the Yorath House
- Against Yorath
- Enforcement of designated parking stalls
- "Designated" signs ignored
- Use zoo parking
- What is the purpose of expanding parking?
- Concern- encourage more parking for offsite special events (Hawrelak park)
- Have they done a parking survey?

2.3.2. Individual Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support this option?

6 (6%)	22 (23%)	10 (11%)	11 (12%)	19 (20%)	6 (6%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- More than one third of individual respondents (38 or 40%) support to strongly support this parking option.
- Just under one third (30 or 32%) do not support this option, with 19 (20%) strongly not supporting it.
- Six (6%) of respondents are not sure, and 20 respondents (21%) skipped this question.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about this parking option (Individual Responses):

Strongly Support

- Parking is needed
- Increased parking is a good idea
- More parking= great
- Ok with expansion of existing parking lot; This question is worded incorrectly, too many questions How many stalls will be allocated to rowing club vs. others
- Separation of Yorath parking is a good idea
- Don't like the parking in front of Yorath
- The roundabout is not needed
- I like the roundabout at Yorath

Somewhat Support

- More parking would be useful at times
- Paved handicap parking stalls please
- Don't overdo parking
- More parking is good; Doesn't need to be connected
- No good reason to link to LP Rd.
- Don't use a roundabout here, it will just encourage road cruising
- Skip the roundabout
- The multiple roads for parking might make things confusing, people walk when they get to park,

- maybe try one main road and parking turnoffs (with signs) and people can walk to destinations
- Don't loop, creates more "drive through cruising"
- Designated RC stalls with designated times are acceptable
- Am down with designated rowing parking
- Definitely reserved ERC stalls
- Do support extending parking in grass field in front of rowing tank
- Dislike: concerns re: ERC tank security; Could we add speed bumps to ERC lot?
- Do not support extending dog park parking lot
- Likes: more parking; designated, separate parking for Yorath
- Not sure about Yorath parking
- But not in front of Yorath House
- Too much of an expansion again with the elimination of green space near Yorath

Support

- More parking is needed to keep Rowing parking and dog park separate so to reduce conflict
- Parking in front of rowing club

- Concern re: rowers and what is "their" parking; perhaps designated lots, seasonal parking indicators and a loading/ unloading zone for rowers
- More parking is a great idea; Would prefer to see the extra parking in areas where trees do not have to be removed
- Good: lots of parking; Bad: more traffic to/ from the parking; Bad: dogs running around the parking area; Bad: really do need to have a grassy area near but outside of parking to help encourage owners to get their dogs out of the way quickly
- Parking on main lot
- Parking in front of Yorath
- Not for Yorath House parking expansion
- More parking but no roundabout

Somewhat Not Support

- Major parking expansion should be at periphery of the park
- Don't overdo paving
- Alternative: extend existing parking lots
- Just make better use of existing space
- Prefer parking increases to be along 132 St in the big field (then walk to the boats, Yorath, etc.)
- Support least invasive parking concept (don't destroy the meadow/ field directly west of Yorath, keep it green)
- Use zoo parking for capacity
- Maybe allow a curved lane from Yorath Dr. to the house curving away to meet parking lot in from of rowing tank. This lane could be used for wedding vehicles, catering trucks etc.
- Do not loop the roads to parking lots with road system
- No loop road

- Do not support realignment of shared use path
- Do not support continuation of Yorath House
- No parking for Yorath needed; Destroys green space

Strongly Not Support

- Dogs and parking don't mix
- Underutilized parking at Laurier and Zoo
- There are tons of parking options available at the zoo
- No more parking inside the green space; Use existing LP and Zoo Parking
- All this increased parking space decreases the green space available
- Other than on 132 St, little parking better
- Too many additional parking- 60 degree stalls?
- Increase physical activity and decrease convenient use of vehicles
- People need to get off their butts and walk
- The pathways should be designed to make the walk enjoyable
- How can we agree to parking for Yorath if we do not support retaining it
- Support some component, not event place, you have Laurier Park; Reclaim Yorath to natural green
- This would only encourage parking for Hawrelak events rather off site
- Creates parking for Hawrelak events not dog walkers
- Rowing club: even with more stalls should not be exclusive to them
- Would the rowing club stalls be seasonal?
- More traffic, more access, more safety risk to dogs, more bikes

2.4. Boat Launch Area: Concept 2 (Figures 5 & 6): Design the boat launch area to include a view point and wooden boardwalk ramp down to the water and dock (a low key design).

2.4.1. Group Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support this option?

5 (8%)	19 (29%)	17 (26%)	0	22 (33%)	3 (5%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Nine groups representing 66 participants provided responses to this question: five groups did not respond to it.

- Almost two thirds of group responses (41 or 63%) support to strongly support designing the boat launch area to include a viewpoint and boardwalk ramp and a dock (low key design).
- One third of group responses (22 or 33%) strongly do not support this option, and 3 (5%) are not sure.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about this boat launch area option (Group Responses):

Like

- Dock for non-motorized boats or people with mobility issues to get into boats
- One person selected strongly not support (thought it was for motor boats and changed mind when found out it was low impact); Rest of table selected support
- Nice to have viewpoint
- Outlook is a good idea
- Agree to have an area for viewing, but would not like this area used for motor boats
- Boardwalk yes
- People want to go to river, kids want to get in it.
- Good idea
- Shallow water
- Floating raft or remove it in the winter
- Design dock similar to Edmonton Queen River Boat

- Solid access to river- steps

- Helps canoes
- Would not like any intense improvements; don't mind clearing it up
- More options take pressure off of the dock

Dislike

- Why do you need another facility when the boat launch is right there?
- Concern about behaviour of motorized boat operators
- One person says that maintenance will be difficult, damage to the dock and replaced every year.
- Dock no (safety concerns and maintenance)
- Would like to see this boat launch in another area
- Suggestion to move it to Groat Rd. bridge area
- Right now quiet/ peaceful spot; Not low key

2.4.2. Individual Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support this boat launch area option?

6 (6%)	11 (12%)	22 (23%)	6 (6%)	26 (28%)	8 (9%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Over one third of individual respondents (39 or 41%) support to strongly support this boat launch area option.
- One third (32 or 34%) of respondents do not support this option, with 26 (28%) strongly not in support of it.
- Eight (9%) of respondents are not sure, and 15 (16%) skipped this question.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about this boat launch area option (Individual Responses):

Strongly Support

- Good idea
- Concentrate on canoes and kayaks, not power boats
- Again, hard to fully support an issue without a design

Somewhat Support

- Good
- Good idea
- Don't encourage more use
- Do not agree with boat dock addition
Viewing platform would be a good addition

- Needs to be removal for winter or will be damaged
- Like that it's a place for canoes/ kayaks (non-motorized) boats to get in and out; Would prefer it not allow motorized boats except to allow accessibility as necessary; The concern is that it will fill up quickly with motorized boats
- Ok way increase use of area to detriment of the rowers
- Only if this is closed to power boat motors. If it is only an observation area only, then great

Support

- Support Concept 2 as it's less invasive and allows more natural area around the manmade structure
- Would look nice but should not come out of this budget
- I am worried about boat traffic and rowing: This section of the river is the only place that rowers row:
- Would prefer if only for non-motorized boats and disabled to motorboats only
- Motorized boats greatly disturb water and risk/impede on rower safety
- The large boat launch area is a threat to the current use of out Rowing club/ paddlers use; This will cause conflicts for both of these groups; We've been told to respect fellow users, this does not respect either current user group; Is there another area in a park elsewhere in the City park system that would not threaten ERC/ WWP's?
- Concern re: motorized boat behavior
- I don't see lots of use but perhaps people will use it more with a nice facility
- Improved accessibility

Somewhat Not Support

- Good as is, leave alone!
- Not to receptive of having more people use the boat launch, because of their effect on rowers

Strongly Not Support

- Keep it natural
- Keep rustic
- It is beautiful the way it is, natural and peaceful

- Viewpoint but not dock
- Too much noise for neighborhood!
- Jet boat, noise, safety, kids
- Intrusive and invasive
- I don't want motor boats on the river
- Not a good place for power boats
- Power boats should not be in park area
- This option creates too much large traffic in the area
- It will increase the truck/trailer traffic in the park and overall parking area Put into Laurier
- Not a good place for this
- Different location for the boat launch (Groat Bridge?)
- Put it in Laurier by the boat launch
- Increased traffic
- Dislike: any expansion of boat launch= disruption of existing park: noise, conflicts, environmental impacts
- Very expensive to maintain a dock in the river that changes in flow and height as must as the N. Sask; Will increase park operating costs
- Parking per person use is too much
- Will cause issues with the Rowing club to the north; High powered speed boats unregulated speed may cause injury and unsafe environment to rowers
- I like the idea of a wooden dock but not near the rowing club (This would bring many motorized boats to where the self-powered boats currently are using)
- I would not like to see the rowing club infringed upon; It's a good idea but too close to the rowing club
- Too costly
- What does "low key" design mean?

Not Sure

- Not sure
- I want the main input from the "boat people" as it has no impact on me as a "dog person" and I have no knowledge of pros and cons
- No power boats please, we go down to BV for quiet and nature

2.5. Event Areas: Concept 2 (Figures 5 & 6) identifies two separate event areas – one adjacent to the boat launch and one adjacent to Yorath House. Yorath House would remain in this concept.

2.5.1. Group Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support this option?

2 (5%)	9 (20%)	12 (27%)	4 (9%)	13 (30%)	4 (9%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Seven groups representing 44 participants provided responses to this question; eight groups did not respond to it.
- Just over half of group responses (23 or 52%) support to strongly support two separate event areas.
- Just over one third (17 or 39%) somewhat or strongly do not support this option, with 13 (30%) strongly not supporting it.
- A further 4 (9%) are not sure.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about providing two separate event areas (Group Responses):

Like

- Two separate areas would accommodate more events, good for charity events concern re: parking
- Support (Whole table)
- Support in Laurier only
- Share water facilities for dog watering places
- Emphasize nature- environmental/ educational/ interpretative area
- Important to reconnect with nature
- Yorath House would give facility to use

Dislike

- Is this really necessary?
- Prefer only one event area- in LP, not Yorath
- Would not like to see any changes to the existing areas
- Additional clearing area not needed
- Concern about dogs wandering into event area at Yorath

- Like road alignment in concept 3 is better
- Reservations that it would become too heavily used like Hawrelak Park
- Concern- attracts more people, more events
- People would use event area
- Rowers may use it for social event

Neither Like / Dislike

- Need capacity limit on event spaces
- Wonder what type of event would be there?
- What type of events?
- Need clarification on what is an 'event' and what happens when no event is booked
- Would get more use if properly developed
- Power and water will encourage users
- Need to be booked through parks and rec.
- Consider signage when events in progress
- Do not support the Yorath House

2.5.2. Individual Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support this option?

6 (6%)	11 (12%)	16 (17%)	7 (7%)	20 (21%)	7 (7%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- One third of individual respondents (33 or 35%) support to strongly support providing two separate event areas.
- Just over one quarter of individual respondents do not support this option, with 20 (21%) indicating they strongly do not support it.
- Seven (7%) respondents were not sure, and 27 (29%) did not reply to this question.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about providing two separate event areas (Individual Responses):

Strongly Support

- Great idea, creates a strong focal point
- Good idea
- For Laurier
- Not sure for Yorath House

Somewhat Support

- Generally good idea
- Good idea
- Good idea to have event areas delineated as such
- I prefer only Yorath House area
- Yorath House should remain
- Yorath yes, boat launch no
- I have problems liking the boat launch area if it facilitates motorboats use

Support

- Not top priority
- I only support the event areas, not the rest of the figures
- I like connection of event areas (c3), allows for more walkability
- Water and electrical supply sounds good, would work best if on-leash
- Proper signage when an event is going on, in the Yorath event lawn
- If proper landscaping is implemented it would lead to enhanced use for garden function and receptions
- But only in relation to the house, not paths by the shore to the north
- Dislike the road alignment, parking for Yorath location
- Keep Yorath House! and keep the lawn as is
- Use of Yorath House as cafe/ service station

- Support Yorath event area but depends on what kind
- Would also benefit if Yorath House was developed to support event areas
One event space at Laurier and not at Yorath House
- I fall into the tear down Yoraths camp, so don't support that event area at all
- But remove Yorath House
- Not sure Re: Laurier event area
- Ripping out trees as in Concept 3 will destroy the natural environment
- Putting paved walkways and orchard as in Concept 3 means more money and more maintenance
- Current walkways/ driveways/ greenery etc., are not maintained now, why add to that?
- I strongly support the boat launch event areas in LP
- Good use as another user group

Somewhat Not Support

- Good as is, leave alone
- Yorath House is not functional; Event area not preferred in that location
- There seems to be significant use of the park as it is. Increasing this park for more events will obviously increase use of the park; I don't think the concepts, especially parking areas, in this master plan will accommodate for this extra usage

Strongly Not Support

- Make it a nature area
- Make the park a nature area
- Limited space already; Events will destroy natural flow for users

- It's a wilderness area for the most part
If you keep expanding these areas, the natural forest like feeling in the middle of the city will be distinguished Keep it in Hawrelak and Laurier
 - Too much parking required, will spill over into natural area
 - Use Hawrelak or Laurier, this could result in too much traffic
 - Existing Laurier Park areas are alright
 - LP already serves this fantastically well
 - I think there is sufficient green space for events in LP. More is not needed
 - Staging area already exists in Laurier
 - Formalize it and keep it in Laurier
 - There are lots of other (privately funded) places for events plus group picnic areas at Laurier
 - Do not understand why Yorath House needs to be park of this space
 - Ok with event space
 - What kind of events? more traffic?
 - Parking??
 - More parking needs?
 - Parking is available for attendees at the zoo
 - One event area- not two
 - Non -essential given the existing, local amenities
- Not Sure**
- Sure use Yorath House for support
 - Like road alignment in Concept 3
 - Two separate event areas: more clarification is needed
 - What happens when not booked for any event?
 - Park will get more use if developed properly
 - More financial info needed esp. re: Yorath House
 - Can increase number of events and therefore number of users
 - Nice to have a shelter for indecent weather for events
Event areas quite separate from off-leash area which is definitely necessary and appreciated

2.6. Concept 2 additional comments: Please provide any additional comments you may have regarding what you like or dislike about the options identified in Concept 2:

2.6.1. Group Response Summary:

Like

- More covered areas especially if Yorath goes
- Support/ event area only at Yorath House
- Need marketing plan.

- Would need to be marketed to be used

Dislike

- This process is not representational!

2.6.2. Individual Response Summary:

Like

- Only thing I really like about Concept 2 is the fenced barrier for training and the increased parking
- Other than the small fenced area at the south end, delete all sections of this option
- Boardwalk is a wonderful idea
- Good for canoe/ kayak access as well
- Enhance the natural side

Dislike

- Concept 2 radically diminishes the natural qualities of BV park
- This concept is a terrible idea! Please don't ruin our park we like it (Particularly BV) as it is now!
- This is the worst of the 3 proposed!
- Do not like this concept at all
- Do not like the restriction of off leash for river access
- Fairly significant restriction of beach access for off-leash users
- Unbelievable, that river access would be restricted

- I do not like Concepts 2's off leash space and access to the river that is severely diminished
 - The off leash boundary is not acceptable in Concept 2
 - Decreases off-leash, the main use of the park
 - Not a workable solution; Creates issues for old dogs and people
 - Not sure if this could possibly be a proper concept, thanks for wasting our time
Please abandon the terrible looping concept
 - Very clearly this concept was designed to be sacrificed
 - Event areas that are only useful in the summer months will create year-round operating costs that will have to be funded by my property taxes.
 - Typical North American intrusive and invasive planning; Thinking that structurizing and road building improves a natural setting; Instead an artificial and pretentious setting is created, glorifying planners and politicians all at the expense of wildlife and natural environments
 - Limit development to increasing bathrooms and safety phones
- Other**
- Integrate storm water management for both the zoo and park areas;
 - Zoo storm water management plan is excellent, it should integrate with needs arising from roads/ paths in park area!
 - Need clear signage
Multiple kiosks

ROUND 3 – CONCEPT 3

3. ROUND 3: CONCEPT 3 – SPECIFIC ELEMENTS

Note: half of the tables started at the beginning of questions for this section and the other half started at the end to ensure that responses were obtained regarding all questions.

3.1. Pathways & Off Leash Area: Concept 3* (Figures 7 & 8) identifies re-aligning the main shared use pathway to run through the existing small “meadows” separating it and the off leash area (requires some tree clearing), and to run in front of the Rowing Tank. The abandoned section of the shared use pathway would become part of an off leash looping pathway, marking the boundary for only a portion of the off leash area.

3.1.1. Group Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support this option?

2 (4%)	9 (18%)	6 (12%)	2 (4%)	27 (55%)	3 (6%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Seven groups representing 49 participants provided responses to this question; eight groups did not respond to it.
- Just over half of group responses (29 or 59%) somewhat or strongly do not support this pathways option, with 27 or 55% strongly not in support.
- One third of group responses (17 or 34%) support to strongly support this option, and 3 (6%) are not sure.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about this pathway option (Group Responses):

Like

- Support moving path out of off leash, would this just move the problem?
- Doesn't take away as much from the off leash area
- Like that this would separate the user groups
- Dogs on small trails in woods; don't like it being closer to the river but like separation from off-leash.
- May need to still fence
- Opens up a bit of wooded area
- Pathway would be more hidden like current path.
- Like having a safe route, visibility issues
- One participant doesn't see the issue with putting a trail through the trees

- Like the idea of main shared pathway incorporated into all 3 concepts
- Marginally better than concept 2
- Takes away the issue of bikes crossing the road
- Cyclists be aware of rowers crossing

Dislike

- Less expensive to leave where it is.
- Waste of money. Don't change existing
- Selected somewhat not support; If not necessary, don't want to see the trail moved
- If possible relocate the trail near the parking lot
- 'Foot traffic freeway?'
- Party central
- See comments re: Concept 2 (Question 2.1)

3.1.2. Individual Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support this option?

4 (4%)	8 (9%)	9 (10%)	7 (7%)	36 (38%)	4 (4%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Almost one half of individual respondents (43 or 45%) do not support this pathway option, with 36 (38%) strongly not in support of it.
- Just under one quarter of individual respondents (21 or 23%) indicated support to strong support for the option, and 4 (4%) were unsure.
- Twenty-six respondents (28%) skipped this question.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about this pathway option (Individual Responses):

Strongly Support

- Good idea again to separate users (bikes and dogs)
- Same as Concept 2- more separation is better

Somewhat Support

- Sounds good
- Appreciate separation of SUP and off-leash area
- Want off leash area of concept
Put bike trail in trees
- Concern re: fiscal responsibility vs. return on investment when moving the trail

Support

- Like that this does move the main commuter trail away from the busiest off leash area

- It reduces the area between main path and the river path for running around. I tend to like to keep my dogs on the west side of the river path because I can't see them in the river (couldn't rescue them if in need of help)
- Don't take too much existing park space
- Parking

Somewhat Not Support

- I much prefer off leash area of Concept 1
- I like the idea of moving the shared use pathway through the meadows and separating cyclists and dog walkers
- Prefer to avoid cutting trees but nice to separate users, I'm conflicted

- Important for non off leash traffic
- Not in support of paving in general, takes away from natural environment

Strongly Not Support

- Concept 1 shows best off leash expansion
- Concepts 2 and 3 seem very similar
- I'm surprised that there are no concept plans related to Laurier and the 2 pieces near the zoo
- Realign the whole area including zoo parking
- Do not clear more trees
- No tree hugging allowed
- Leave the meadow as is please!
- Removes some of the best parts from the off leash area
- As in Concept 2, an expensive, intrusive, invasive artificial and pretentious exercise furthering the typical North American degradation of environment. Leave it alone
- I do not want to see pathway C and D on the east side of the park developed in any way (I want this to remain as a single track trail)
- No support for realignment
- Terrible use of funding creating new alignment
- No new path
- Unnecessary to add additional pathways
- Why move- expensive over kill

- See Concept 2 (Don't spend any money relocating paths)
- All concepts showing possible new routes seem impractical and a waste of money except for access to river
- Proposed pathway move impacts "lady slipper lane" zone uses so conflict does not occur
- Any more development near the river bank will put nesting area for waterfront at risk
- Would reduce a buffer for erosion by getting rid of large number of trees on the banks
- New multiuse is not required (x2)
- Too much emphasis on off leash area and too little on other
- Too much on leash
- Why not open up Laurier beach area for boats?
- Leave BV beach area to dogs
- Shared boat (south)/ dog (north) access?
- Waste of money (x 2)
- Waste of money compared to Concept 2
- Waste of time
- How would this improve anything? Why?
- Do not support

Not Sure

- Not enough time to consider this
- Whatever helps people management, ease for dog walkers

3.2. Parking: (Concept 3, Figures 7 & 8) identifies that the existing roadway would be opened into the off leash area with a turn around, and provide parallel parking along the road. Gated access to Whitewater Paddlers would be retained. A larger parking lot to expand/replace the Rowing Club lot and to provide parking for Yorath House would be created, with part of the lot designated for Rowing Club use.

3.2.1. Group Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support this parking option?

7 (15%)	1 (2%)	4 (9%)	7 (15%)	27 (59%)	0
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Seven groups representing 46 participants provided responses to this question; eight groups did not respond to it.
- Three quarters of group responses (34 or 74%) somewhat or strongly do not support this parking option, with 27 (59%) indicating they strongly do not support it.
- One quarter of group responses (12 or 26%) indicate support to strong support, with 7 (15%) indicating they strongly support it.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about the parking option (Group Responses):

Like

- Justified
- Understand that improved parking is needed
- Need it for events
- Take places closest to road for parking
- Expand parking in field @ access
- Separation between lots is better for different activities/ uses
- Larger parking lot to expand/ replace rowing club (5 in group said somewhat support and 1 said strongly support)
- Extend existing parking from rowing club
- Rowing club parking should be separate from Yorath House (should be voted separate)
- Connect proposed consolidated parking with existing off leash parking
- Consolidate parking- one location (expanded if required) expand larger parking lot West
- Like the parallel parking
- Like increased parking at rowing club
- Preferred parking concept in Concept 2- Concept 3 has cars going further into the parking.
- Like Concept 2 better
- Like the roadway better in Laurier Concept 3

- Like expansion of Yorath House in Concept 3 but not the Yorath event lawn space

Dislike

- Too much parking
- Don't put parking in most heavily used part of the dog park
- Parking lots- will this lead to other things? (chip away at what exists?)
- What is proposed for parking (in front of rowing club) is more than needed
- Make sure that the rowing club knows that the parking is not just for them.
- Yorath House parking not needed
- Concern attracting more people (with events)
- Would rather have Caragana than fluff from poplars
- Concerns are to maintain the grounds and maintain park for the off leash
- Turn around and L shaped parking (7 in group said strongly not support)

Neither Like / Dislike

- Question: What will you do about stone structure gates, and the significance to these?
- Bus for events?
- What about bus access?

3.2.2. Individual Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support this parking option?

4 (4%)	11 (12%)	9 (10%)	9 (10%)	34 (36%)	3 (3%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Almost one half of individual respondents (43 or 46%) do not support this pathway option, with 34 (36%) strongly not in support of it.
- One quarter of individual respondents (24 or 26%) indicated support to strong support for the option, and 3 (3%) were unsure.
- Twenty-four respondents (26%) skipped this question.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about the parking option (Individual Responses):

Strongly Support

- More parking is good
- Increases availability to users
- Parallel parking is a safer option near the dog park

Somewhat Support

- Don't overdo parking
- More parking is required
Please avoid taking trees down

Support

- Yes to parking lot expand/ replace RC lot
- Support additional parking
- Balance parking, don't over attract cars
- Viewpoints should have seating, garbage cans etc
- Do not support Yorath
- Can you maintain it enough with added usage?

Somewhat Not Support

- I prefer parking option for Concept 2; I do not like how concept 3 shows cars going further in the park
- More parking is needed
- Parking lots should be separate
- No to existing roadway being opened into off leash area
- There is lots of parking already; People just want to park as close to their chosen activity Designated rowing club parking- in line with memberships; shared with public- will it be cleaned in winter?
- Large number of parking stalls (12) would only be needed if events are included
- Too aggressive, avoid Yorath

Strongly Not Support

- Prefer Concept 2
- Not appropriate to remove space in a natural environment
- This would really cut into the green space
- I'm curious to know why green space would be abolished to add more parking, rather than changing some of the now parking areas to parking areas?
- There are better options for parking
- Create parking along 132 Ave, west of current rowing club and north of current rowing club
- Why not some parking further north on 142 St for the off leash area
- More parking is better
- I feel more parking areas brings more congestion and safety issues, absolutely not
- The existing parking on the Laurier Spaces is good enough; Direct walkers from there (Laurier) to path that leads in front of Yorath House
- Parallel parking is ok
- Like parallel parking with turn around
- Prefer separate Yorath/ rowing lot from Concept 2
- 200 + stalls will take trees out
- Don't need 170 stalls at Yorath
- Don't link rowing club parking with Yorath parking

- Don't need parking for Yorath, some expansion for Rowing club
- Need a separate parking lot if Yorath House is rehabilitated
- Don't support retention of Yorath
- Don't want Yorath House to be an event area; if they don't, we don't support increased parking at Yorath
- Why are we discussing parking for Yorath House?
- Extending parking into the off leash area is dangerous
- Vehicular traffic in the off-leash area is a terrible idea
- Dogs and vehicles don't mix
- Very dangerous as this opens traffic to bushes, pedestrians, cars
- Don't like the aspect of bringing roadway through off leash area
- This would bring vehicles very close to the off leash area
- Bring cars too close to the main field- safety for dogs
- Puts cars, lost drivers, right in the route you're supposed to use for cycling if you enter the park from 81st Ave
- Keep gated area where it is (do not expand the parking into the offleash area)
- Dogs entering and exiting cars are off leash and can bolt, some inattentive drivers and some driving too fast
- Increases traffic
- Safety/ construction for walking/ cycling along main path (for both dogs and people)
- How do you access the large open area during construction?
- Dog off leash, majority can walk a little to the park
- Paddlers really should have the stamina to be able to walk back and forth
- Encourage walking and physical activity and discourage convenient use of vehicles
- We need more foot traffic and less cars
- Don't support roundabout
- Same as 2.3

Not Sure

- This is 3 questions!
- Too much traffic on BV Rd.
- Not applicable or Important

3.3. Riverside pathway improvements and viewpoints: Concept 2 and 3 (Figures 5 & 6) provide viewpoints along the riverside pathway in Laurier Park as well as minor improvements to stabilization and surfacing.

3.3.1. Group Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support this pathway and viewpoint option?

10 (20%)	11 (22%)	10 (20%)	3 (6%)	12 (24%)	4 (8%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Eight groups representing 50 participants provided responses to this question; seven groups did not respond to it.
- Almost two thirds of group responses (31 or 62%) support to strongly support riverside pathway improvements and viewpoints.
- Just under one third of group responses (15 or 30%) do not support it, with 12 (24%) indicating they strongly do not support.
- A further 4 (8%) are not sure.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about providing viewpoints along the riverside pathway (Group Responses):

Like

- Makes a lot of sense
- Good for safety
- Whole table selected strongly support
- Would like to see 2 view points
- Strong support for viewpoints
- Would like to see the preservation of as many trees as possible but support construction of viewpoints.
- Sounds ok if viewpoints don't impact natural open
- Keep as simple as possible
- Keep viewpoints simple
- Viewpoints- simple a little supported area for bench (1 or 2 at most)
- Viewpoint- peaceful, not busy place
- Ok for memorial benches
- Nice idea in Laurier Park- Doesn't disturb BV
- Increase capacity of river; people can see it.
- Like that this would allow river use
- Enable people to see river
- Bring trail closer to the river
- How accessible to accommodate people with disabilities?
- Can everyone enjoy it?
- Eliminate erosion

- Bank stabilization instead of grade improvements
- Would prefer minor improvements; grading changes would be more significant and not preferred
- Minor improvements to stabilization (water levels could impact?)
- "Channeling of access" as opposed to leaving as is but no need in stubbing a losing battle

Dislike

- Not needed
- Ok as it is
- Already been done
- Not extravagant, don't overdo it
- Limit to one access point
- Doesn't include river access, which will increase over time
- Lots of points already, designing anything impacts the natural habitat.
- How much more disturbance to riverside areas?
- Cost?
- Costs associated?
- Too open? partying and greater access to water

3.3.2. Individual Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support this option?

17 (18%)	12 (13%)	16 (17%)	7 (7%)	14 (15%)	4 (4%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Almost half of individual respondents (45 of 48%) indicated support to strong support for providing viewpoints along the riverside pathway.
- Just under one quarter of individual respondents (21 or 22%) indicated they did not support this option, with 14 (15%) strongly not in support of it.
- Four (4%) of respondents were unsure, and 24 (26%) skipped this question.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about providing viewpoints along the riverside pathway (Individual Responses):

Strongly Support

- Great!
- Good idea!
- Forget grade Improvements, do bank stabilization
- Safer with stabilization
- Stabilization good idea, adds to event area
- Add a few viewpoints with seating
- Viewpoints awesome
- Ok to increase usability and visibility

Somewhat Support

- In favor of stabilizing banks
- Do not do grade leveling, stabilize the bank; Cut back some trees occasionally for viewpoints
- No major grading which removes vegetation or widens the path
- Small viewpoint areas
- Viewpoints are nice, don't regrade
- Should have purpose for viewpoints (bench);
- Concerns about the designs of the viewpoints
- The sponsored benches are a good idea
- No realignment of pathway (no point, too much work)
- Excellent! The river is underutilized and should be featured more in various elements
- Gives families safe access to view the river
- I would love to see the river more
- Would like pathway
- Supportive only in Laurier park not anywhere else
- So long as the changes are minor

Support

- Keep it simple but maintained
- Need to stabilize and surface

- Viewpoints make the trip nicer; Love this idea and this could be included in all concepts
- Like the idea of adding viewpoints, as long as it does not infringe on the off leash area
- Small viewpoint in Laurier Park; Not on River path between LP and Bridge to Hawrelak
- Needs to stay off leash where it is currently off leash
- Okay no grade changes required, some bank stabilization
- Support if only minor and includes a bench
- A couple of benches along the river trail may be nice, but minor Improvements is the key phrase

Somewhat Not Support

- Too many manicured areas will lead to maintenance costs, interest
- No interface between river and Laurier park user
- Adds too many people crossing ERC boat launch
- As long as you leave the riverside pathway alone in BV Park!
- As usage increases, stabilization is definitely required
- Viewpoints not really necessary, view from the path is fantastic
- Viewpoints not required

Strongly Not Support

- Leave as is!
- Leave in natural state. We do not need to structure and manicure all natural areas
- Feel natural now
- Creation of viewpoints represents a disturbance to natural areas

- The pathway allows viewpoints; Where have you been? Leave it alone
 - There are plenty of viewpoints already in existence
 - Human Improvements are intrusions and invasions regardless of how minor. Leave it alone
 - Bank stabilization- yes
 - Do not remove bushes and trees between path and river
- Not Sure**
- Support minor Improvements to surfacing (what type of surfacing?)
 - As for viewpoints, undecided, no opinion either way
 - Not enough info- is this for Laurier or BV for sure?
 - Support minor stabilization
 - Depends on size of viewpoints
 - Do not need larger than can accommodate a bench

3.4. Boat launch area: Concept 3 (Figures 7 & 8). Design the boat launch area to include a viewpoint and ramped walkway down to the water and dock (a higher level of detail and a more refined design than Concept 2).

3.4.1. Group Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support this boat launch area option?

9 (15%)	1 (2%)	3 (5%)	12 (20%)	33 (55%)	2 (3%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Nine groups representing 60 participants provided responses to this question; six groups did not respond to it.
- Three quarters of group responses (45 or 75%) do not support this boat launch area option, with 33 (55%) indicating they strongly do not support it.
- Just under one quarter of group responses (13 or 22%) indicated support to strong support for this option, and 2 (3%) were not sure.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about this boat launch option (Group Responses):

Like

- Not bad with the viewpoint
- Good to deter people from using rowing dock
- Good idea to draw people to area
- Don't overdo it
- Keep it simple
- Leave as natural as possible
- What they have is simple and works, just refine that
- See the dock reduced. Extend to waters edge but not into water
- Signage for boats i.e. wakes etc. needs to be displayed

Dislike

- Would not like motorboat use in this area.
- This is beautiful the way it is
- Not that many boats right now, don't see it as a wise use of funds to expand access. They already have what they need.
- Don't know if would meet the needs of many people
- Attracting more boat traffic will impact the charm of BV (ie. quiet now but more boats= more noise)
- What about flooding?
- Risk for people and for the infrastructure
- See concept 2 comments

3.4.2. Individual Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support this boat launch area option?

7 (7%)	6 (6%)	10 (11%)	14 (15%)	28 (30%)	6 (6%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Almost half of individual respondents (42 or 45%) indicated they do not support this boat launch option, with 28 (30%) indicating they strongly do not support it.
- One quarter of individual respondents (23 or 24%) indicate support to strong support for this option, and 6 (6%) indicated they were not sure.
- Twenty-three respondents (25%) skipped this question.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about this boat launch option (Individual Responses):

Strongly Support

- Very nice
- Improve boat launch in Laurier
- Remove Yorath
- Sounds good! I like it better than the once in Concept 2

Somewhat Support

- Again, a good idea as long as it's built with various water levels in mind
- As long as this does not become too large of an area that will cause congestion and conflict
- Keep it more rustic/ natural
- Like more of a natural look
- Viewing area ok
- Too much speed on river- not safe
- Too much noise in the river valley
- Please do not add more power boats because parking area required per person use is not adequately centered. Boat trailers still parked all over the place
- Present use of this section of the river is canoes/kayak/ rowing/ stand up surfing. Power boats are not compatible with these vessels Trucks with trailers can handle a little further
- Hard to fully support a concept without seeing a design

Support

- Don't overdo it!
- Remember the yearly flooding, how much money would go into refurbishing it every year?
- I don't want an influx of power boats mixed with self-powered boats

- I do not like the improved viewpoint access with a boardwalk
- Allows for more users- good idea!
- More clarification in terms of upstream/ downstream development, etc.

Somewhat Not Support

- Viewpoint is ok
- Do include a shore based viewpoint overlooking the boat launch
- Rustic, not urban; Keep as natural as possible
- Docks are Impractical
- More, high powered boats and people watching them (trouble, competition)
- Don't put in bigger boat launch
- Do not include any floating dock or permanent dock element
- Do we really want more boat traffic in the area?
- See 2.4
- More expense
- Too intrusive for rowers?

Strongly Not Support

- Support Concept 2
- This area is beautiful and simple, perfect the way it is
- Leave as is - natural
- Less design and chance is my preference
- Basic boat launch and viewpoint is fine; Don't need to blow this up and make it more than it needs to be
- Too much money and development to support too few people
- Budget

- Waste of money
 - Maintenance issues
 - Please don't expand the boat launch; Don't expand it without some signs about appropriate motor boat use on river
 - No Power boats
 - Would increase motorboat usage
 - Motor boats are not appropriate in this setting
 - Jet boat/ noise/ safety
 - Dock will have to go in water in spring, come out in fall- increased operating costs therefore opposed
 - Intrusive, invasive, artificial, and pretentious
 - Overkill
 - Please don't refine/ design
 - Don't bring in events
 - See comments on Concept 2 (No power boats please)
- Not Sure**
- Put event area in Laurier, 2 not needed

3.5. Event Areas: Concept 3 (Figures 7 & 8) identifies two separate, but linked, event areas – one adjacent to the boat launch and one adjacent to Yorath House, and provides a connection between the two areas. Yorath House would remain in this concept.

3.5.1. Group Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support this option?

3 (6%)	3 (6%)	4 (9%)	7 (14%)	29 (62%)	1 (2%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Seven groups representing 47 participants provided responses to this question; eight groups did not respond to it.
- Three quarters of group responses (36 or 76%) do not support this event area option, with 29 (62%) indicating they strongly do not support it.
- Just under one quarter of group responses (10 or 21%) indicated support to strong support for this option, and 1 (2%) was not sure.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about the option for the event areas (Group Responses):

Like

- Increases walkability
- Better access to house
- Want both playgrounds
- Have event space flowing with (rockery?)

Dislike

- One group strongly against it
- Table did not see value in orchard
- Don't want to see both event spaces, unnecessary
- A linkage between event areas would increase traffic noise and disrupt the natural integrity of the area; this would have a negative impact.
- Instead of improving what exists, you're building something new
- Optimize what's there instead of creating something new, not best use of funds

- More development= more loss of natural space
- Why add more human infrastructure to park?
- Want it to be a natural area for people to visit.
- Should have native trees/ shrubs along river
- Don't break up the meadow
- Want to keep natural
- Respect wildlife, "let the bushes grow", keep natural
- Majority of users are there for the natural setting
- Not supposed to be for organized "events"
- Don't like the idea of larger event areas- goes against what users are there for
- There are other event areas in the city (Hawrelak)
- Existing area is fine for what gatherings there are
- Don't like the doughnut
- These ideas are more appropriate for more developed parks (i.e. Terwilligar)

Neither Like / Dislike

- Reservations re: "event areas"
- What are these "events" going to be? - What ecological/ environmental issues?
- What events would be held?
- Specifics on "uses" and limitations and hours of Yorath House events and stage (no big concerts)
- No support of Yorath House remaining
- Constant revisiting of engineering report
- What are we losing to create the pathway? What do we have to give up?
- Couldn't educational space be added to John Jantzen instead?

3.5.2. Individual Response Summary:

To what extent do you support or not support this option?

6 (6%)	8 (9%)	1 (1%)	12 (13%)	31 (33%)	5 (5%)
Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Support	Somewhat Not Support	Strongly Not Support	Not Sure

- Almost half of individual respondents (43 or 46%) indicated they did not support this option for two separate, but linked, event areas, with 31 (33%) indicating they strongly did not support it.
- Only 15 (16%) of respondents indicated support to strong support for this option, and 5 (5%) were not sure.
- Thirty-one (33%) respondents skipped this question.

Please explain what you particularly like or dislike about the option for the event areas (Individual Responses):

Strongly Support

- Linked great idea, it would help to serve bigger events
- Add in playground, keeps wandering kids safe with removal of traffic
- Seems to make sense as long as not too many trees cut down, don't clear cut
- Make sure parking is available for the size of events that are booked/ considered

Somewhat Support

- If parking can be regulated so as to protect Off leash, ERC and WWP's who have a definite state in the area north of this proposal
- As long as it does not impact parking for other user groups
- I would like to see these event areas to get more people outside
- If parking doesn't infringe on the folks who are invested in the rowing club and off leash dog areas
Need better signage "Preferred parking"

Support

- Like the road alignment of this concept; Could be designed in a way to make this 2 distinct but connected event areas

Somewhat Not Support

- BV is a natural, wilderness area let's keep it that way
- Will increase operating costs
- Does this master plan offer parking for this extra use? It doesn't seem to
- Not sure, need more time to think about it
- Scale of events to be limited (smaller) and house restricted
- Presence for separate event areas to cater to more (volume) user groups

Strongly Not Support

- Would decrease the naturalness of the whole area
- Decreases natural environment
- I have big concerns on the loss of natural space
- Try and understand what natural means
- Orchard not needed, originally only a handful of apple trees (3 or 4)

- Orchards? really? the city wants to make apple jelly?
- Extra money to rip out trees, adding walkway
- Extra construction
- Extra maintenance of walkway which will not be kept up (i.e. who will pick the fruit from orchard and keep from rotting?)
- Use Hawrelak and Laurier
- Don't support linked
- It is inappropriate to ask the same question twice, don't understand the fine line difference between this question and other similar question
- Yorath left too abandoned for too long
- Do not feel Yorath needs to remain Use Yorath only as a secondary event area
- Don't like the road being moved (waste of money, environment)
- Concerns over the need for event areas
- These depend on the future of Yorath
- No need identified
- This is not the place for events
- Would increase traffic
- Too much development
- Not wanting 2 event areas
- Do not want Yorath to be less available to hanging out peacefully
- Waste of money
- Party central- let's keep the river valley quiet
- Destroys ease of movement through the park
- Not controllable
- Artificial and pretentious
- Unnecessary given already existing amenities
- Other parks have event areas. We already hold events like weddings, funerals, receptions there and that's nice. Anything bigger would be inappropriate and distasteful
- Events can be hosted in a variety of other areas
- Don't add event areas!
- Don't add more, leave what is and just make it work (i.e. keep natural, revert to nature here)

Not Sure

- No opinion on Yorath
- I don't like the idea of larger event areas
- There isn't enough financial info
- The best part of BV is its natural atmosphere

3.6. Concept 3 additional comments: Please provide any additional comments you may have regarding what you like or dislike about the options identified in Concept 3:

3.6.1. Group Response Summary:

Like

- "Great trails"- Some want to see maintenance; some didn't
- Want access to river for dogs, but not a big event area.
- Dogs love water/ people like being there, safer area for dogs to be in water makes sense

Dislike

- Two washrooms in close proximity.. is that necessary?

- Is road really required for parking and washrooms only?
- Concerns about a decrease in off leash area - Whole park is a busy dog park/ walking
- Spend money on improvements in other parks; not developing this one

Other

- Where is the maintenance budget? Who is paying for ongoing maintenance?

3.6.2. Individual Response Summary:

Like

- Like Improvements to Laurier
- Improve playground in Laurier for family picnics
- Love the nature playground idea

- This concept handles way- finding and separation (vehicular) better than the other two
- Interesting idea to revert traffic to LP but will it work?

Dislike

- Poor design
- Please don't take the path along the riverside from the dogs.
- Too much change
- Too much concrete
- I don't believe there is enough funding for this
- I believe it will be too disruptive (too much construction)
- Do not like to have shared path changed
- I do not like the diminished off leash area
- Decreases the off-leash area, the main use of the park
- I prefer concept 1 for off leash space and river access
- Dislike the reduction of off leash along the river path of the canoe club
- Too much off leash dog park taken away north of boat clubs
- Dislike it because it decreases off leash area

- I do not like the reduced off leash access along the river
- I do not like the parking along the south side of the off leash field
- Option 3 changes/ adds too many unnatural spaces rather than builds on nature
- Don't create barriers through "event" spaces
- Create a natural playground within a natural environment?? Can none of you see that it already exists?
- You'd propose to improve it thought intrusion to create a natural playground? How obtuse and arrogant
- This is the worst concept
- No support in any form!!

Other

- Do not touch the memorial cairn by river!
- What about maintenance? (taxation Implications?)

4. **All concepts – overall comments:** If you have any additional comments about any of the common elements included in all of the Concepts, or about the options included in any of the three concepts, please provide them here.

4.1.1. Group Response Summary:

Like

- Want to see improvements
- Linkage
- More X country ski trails

Dislike

- Making people put what they like vs. not like skews the data
- Some still wonder why anything has to change
- People would prefer to keep the park as it is.
- Don't want change
- Don't fix what is not broken!
- Changing the character of the park will change the quality of life to residents who use the park.
- Leave as is but more parking.
- Taking away the park
- Taking away dog walker access; It's the only off leash dog park
- Bikes and dogs- fence not going to work

Other

- Wish that we could all get along
- Bike trails/ better signage- maps do not show off leash areas. Creates confusion for cyclists.
- Struggle to understand how 2.6M budget will do all of this. For ex. building a dock would use whole budget.
- Note: there was at one time a path to where the rowing club is, can it please be put back?
- Issue- canoe club and white water paddlers- this is very small to no use. This should be included in consideration for use.
- "Great meadow" is turning into a forest. Maintenance issue to keep it as a meadow.
- Deterioration concern
- Neglect in Laurier
- Consider another park entrance with parking (north end)
- Dog attacks near rowing club

4.1.2. Individual Response Summary:

Like

- Modest increase in parking is great
- Still like the roundabout for access with closure to park gates.
- Roundabout is great
- Leave BV as a natural area
- Off leash in concept 1 should be used for any concept
- Option 1A: increase off-leash area beyond anything shown here, as far north as McKinnon Ravine.
- I'm really glad there's a paved multiuse
- I think that the fence, dog legs, and rumble strips (or speed bump, or yield sign) would go a long way to reducing conflict
- The bike route from the Hawrelak bridge straight west up the neighborhood needs to be better signed, even if it remains unpaved
- Ok with addition of two supplemental access points to BV river
- Prefer the parking layout of Concept 2
- Support additional parking
- Structured parking
- I like additional parking
- I like event areas
- I like storm water wetland/ pond
- Like and want Yorath to be redeveloped to a focal point!

Dislike

- Keep as natural as possible
- Do not manicure off-leash area
- Limit development of the great trails
- Save your money- develop parks like Terwillegar which are most developed already
- Everything about Concept 2 is offensive
- All of these concepts sound fairly expensive when all I have heard at the last 2 workshops is "leave BV as is!". I don't truly support any change!
- Dog boundaries- SUP going through dog park not making sense to be on-leash
- Natural, open spaces are hard to find in the city, and it feels like dog walkers are constantly being pushed out of open areas as usage increases. We should protect certain areas for this group of users as strongly as we protect other users with accessibility issues
- Several items (docks, Yorath House, event areas) will create significant annual operating costs. Just got my property tax bill.... please minimize operating costs!

- LP needs updates and city investments

Other

- No changes are needed
- Leave BV as is, it is well used 12 months out of the year
- Keep BV natural
- Need to refine concepts and show clear separation of each concept
- It really seems like the questions are keep as is or entirely redevelop
- No hot air balloon launching!
- Make this a nature preserve
- Focus on signage in support of tolerance between user groups for entire BV area. Consider pathway improvements that encourages multi-use at low/moderate speeds
- Concerns re: what happens to park and users during redevelopment?
- The Yorath property was not given to the city, the city paid \$900,910.00
- Abandon and remove Yorath

Process / Policy

- The city's process is not satisfactory: The reason seems to be increased use but the city does not seem to know what users are making the increased use nor enough knowledge of the access points; Public input determined too late
- I agree a Master Plan is required within the context of mainstream North American and Canadian governance models. Being that a Management Plan was lacking for BVLP was interesting, so this exercise is necessary. The process to date is appropriate
- The city has set precedent with its river valley green spaces in that only Concept 1 could be agreed for. The other concepts have to be against.

Boat Launch

- Wouldn't it make more sense to create separation between motorized and non-motorized use of the river? Why not schedule some other spot on the river for a major motorized boat launch?
- The plans to upgrade and expand the boat launch conflicts with the use of the river with the ERC. The ERC is a springboard for olympic level rowing athletes (only one in Edm)

- I personally have no interest in boating; I am more interested in maintaining the area "as is" with the least amount of modification possible; I can't support expansion of the boating area or changes in access to the river from what currently exists

Access and Accessibility

- The only reasonable access to all this park is BV Rd.
- The speeding, noise, late night activities, drug deals, cars doing doughnuts in the parking lots late into the night has had a huge impact on living on the park boundary; We do not feel safe or secure in our home
- Re: paving BV Rd, it's like a third world road with patch on patch on patch, embarrassing to take visitors to the zoo

- The traffic could be split somewhat with parking down 81 Ave
The residents on BV have all traffic to cope with.
- Allow for improved mobility access via better hard surface, but not asphalt on main BV North-South path connecting to bridge
- Accessibility: more walking and gathering areas
- Do not pave any portions of BV as it will lead to greater separation of diverse user groups

Separate BV & LP

- City should formally separate BV and LP and develop separate master plans. The two parks can and should be developed differently
- BV and LP are NOT the same, different uses, different user groups.
- Separation of concepts is Important