

# **OLESKIW**

## **RIVER VALLEY PARK**

### **MASTER PLAN**

---

**What You Said**  
**Phase 3: Concept Options**  
**March 2018**



# What You Said

The following report provides a detailed summary of raw data in the form of comments that we received during the third phase of engagement (Concept Options) for the Oleskiw River Valley Park Master Plan. Comments are presented from the following engagement opportunities:

---

**79**  
open house  
attendees

**14**  
external stakeholder  
participants

**308**  
online survey  
participants

**22**  
city staff  
attendees

**625**  
vision  
preferences

**48**  
spatially-mapped  
comments

**4,779**  
park element  
preferences

The following comments accompany the What We Heard report that provides a more visual summary of the information listed here. The report can be found on the website at [edmonton.ca/oleskiwparkmasterplan](http://edmonton.ca/oleskiwparkmasterplan)

This What You Said report documents the individual comments we received during the Phase 3 engagement activities at the open house, external stakeholder session and online. The comments are presented according to engagement activity.

**1,599**

**in person + online  
comments**

# Open House

**November 7, 2017**  
**Westridge Wolf Willow Country Club Community League,**  
**4-8pm**  
**79 Attendees**

At the open house, participants were presented with information on the project process and two concept options. After signing in, they were given a handout that provided an agenda for the evening and instructions for how to participate in the activities. The handout also provided information about next steps and directed visitors to the website.

Four engagement stations were set up to encourage discussion and feedback, with facilitators at each station. A series of highly visual information panels offered further details on the project and the concept options presented.

Engagement stations provided participants with the opportunity to review the concept plans using conceptual images and maps that explored both the big ideas and theme-based initiatives of each concept option.

Forty-one of the attendees came from adjacent neighbourhoods; the remainder of attendees came from across the city.

**Comments were made using sticky notes on the open house presentation boards in response to the informational panels as well as four specific activities. Verbatim comments from the Open House Feedback Forms are also included in this section.**



## Open House Presentation Boards

### Concept 1 Board

- » On leash!
- » Love the level of emphasis on ecological rehab & conservation. Warming huts a great idea
- » All plantings shall be native plants, please
- » Picnic tables & natural seating a nice feature
- » How about accessibility for limited mobility persons in west end?
- » build washrooms please
- » pave trail downhill from Woodward Crescent (loose gravel is hazardous)
- » Sandbar is a bird nesting site & should be preserved. Most of time is actually an island x 10-15th of water on shore x side x

### Concept 2 Board

- » Off leash area along river trails, on leash on main paved area
- » Connecting to Terwillegar
- » On leash!
- » Leave park as is [arrow pointing to image 2: outdoor classroom, grass amphitheater] Just don't plow all of path in winter
- » 1/2 closed path would allow for sledding + cross country skiing;
- » relocate picnic area to near Ft. Edm. Bridge. Terwillegar close enough.
- » more protect. Needed for river forest. Control/manage mountain bikes
- » All plantings should be x Native Plants. See Ed. Native Plant Soc.
- » Wildlife lookout useless & intrusive. Deer don't stand around to be watched, birds are in the trees, don't need a lookout
- » I love concept 2 but with a physical structure. Amphitheatre of concept 1
- » if educational how will groups come to the space if has limited site access from west side 'walking that far school groups ...
- » concerned that open field could be co-opted as dog off-leash area
- » could have diff paths - ie signage that the path closer to river (more sensitive x area) is for foot traffic only, then the paved path highlight for bikes to stay x
- » I prefer restoration of native forest as in concept 1
- » does educational mean placards or programs
- » I like both [comment on the above]
- » like the concept of educating & importance in nature for user groups

- » please monitor + count species before + after so it can be monitored in the future
- » promote water flow out of adjacent ravine [arrow pointing at stream in golf course ravine at west edge of park]
- » trail (junction) here makes LOTS of sense for amenities [arrow pointing at junction Ft. Ed. FB trail and north-south main trail]

### Station A: What do you think about the vision statements?

- » x-country skiing; or only plow trail half width
- » as natural as possible
- » would love machine-tracked x-country skiing trails
- » very strongly support concept 1 - limits of acceptable change (xx) should be established at the onset and set the parameters for concept 2 which is legitimate and could be comfortable
- » am highly in favor of the concept plan as developed for vision concept 1
- » snowshoe & cross country ski trails
- » how about concept 1 + amphitheater
- » leave space for the coyotes
- » keep it simple! Keep it clean! Keep it natural!
- » reforest & same type of warm-up building, maybe with washrooms, groomed XL ski trails
- » x-country ski trails (groomed) fro the T. Parking lot
- » please keep it as natural as possible and simple
- » education for youth/children to appreciate natural environment
- » I support this only if it includes removal of invasive + introduction of native species w/ lots of education opportunities, not just becoming a 'stomping ground'

### Station B: What do you think about the concept options?

#### Park Use + Amenities

- » North end makes more sense for bathroom facility - trail junction w end ob Ft. Ed. Footbridge would be ideal
- » More education
- » Oleskiw or Terwillegar needs permanent 4-season bathroom facility
- » Love the washroom
- » More art installations
- » Limit development at south end - benches only
- » Please keep it simple and natural
- » More art installations please
- » Add another covered shelter further north. It gets hot down there? Trees?

- » If art installations proposed, place @ entrance and not in middle of natural park setting
- » Least amenities - keep as natural as possible
- » Large dog fenced area and small dog fenced area both concepts
- » interpretation of geomorphology of the area
- » Demonstrate natural process + its evolution from disturbed state to natural state (\_\_\_\_\_ Dad)
- » Indigenous use of the land vs. modern day uses of landscape over time ie. protective clothing
- » Telling stories of how people used the working landscapes as an educational factor for the park (signage)
- » Working landscapes as a international term - sub category ribbon of green lived in + working
- » If it includes more re-forestation
- » more natural plant introduction include invasive removal as part of education
- » No need for a wildlife lookout the entire park is good for watching

#### Access + Circulation

- » Please clearly define what a natural trail looks like
- » Need parking lot 50% of population cannot access seniors etc
- » Too many trail markers only needed at intersections
- » this [arrow pointing to above comment]
- » trail loop times/distance on loops. Adjust trails for x width XCSkiing to cut trails
- » No groomed trails for XC Skiing. No mountain bikes
- » Prevent erosion of forest soils by bikes
- » Trails must be managed & maintained from erosion caused by biking
- » Maintain natural trails and no new trails
- » Create parking lot w/ area at trailhead
- » Love the new natural trail connection. Single-track
- » This is a great opportunity to do a before + after study to educate also re-introduce native species + restoration
- » No bicycles off asphalt trail. Keep x trail in the 'forest' for foot passage only please
- » On leash!!
- » Public access is an issue - not enough
- » What is the purpose of the dual E-W new granular trail
- » XC Skiing (2)
- » Ski trails groomed
- » allow for small "intensive" sustainable agriculture x which will integrate native species stewardship. I want to start it! \_\_\_\_\_@gmail.com
- » Groomed X-country ski trails
- » Don't need both "historic golf hole" trails. Only need single connection
- » XC skiing [two check marks added]
- » Groomed X-C ski trails

- » Stairs to Terwillegar bridge [arrow pointing at Terwillegar Park]

#### Natural Asset Management

- » Can east-west connections be restored in/winter through forest?
- » Use area as research loc for X restoration of forest/ grassland
- » Need a permanent shelter
- » Concept 2 provides good balance b/w forest & field
- » Like it very beautiful unique ambiance + wildlife habitat as is [arrow pointing at maintained field on concept 2 plan]
- » less open field. I like the different ecology ideas . . .only if they're done properly & thoughtfully
- » like concept #2 best with a variety, long-term strategy with native prairie. =Just less open field area

#### Atmosphere + Identity

- » limitation on forest disturbance

### Station C: Compare the two concept options

#### Concept 1

- » No comments

#### Concept 2

- » like the open field - relatively unique in river valley

#### Combination

- » forest restoration + gathering space + trails + outdoor learning centre
- » Wooded E-W wildlife area from ravine W of park to riparian woodland great element - easily done in both concepts
- » both seem somewhat similar. Regardless; I strongly support nature species introduction + invasive removal + education

#### General Comments

- » use Ft. Edm.. Parking lot + shuttle school groups to walking bridge
- » Winter warming hut. Art installation nice ideas! I Like the variable habitat, too!

### Station D: What specific park elements do you prefer?

#### Access + Circulation / Park Use + Amenities

- » need washroom! [two additional dots on post-it]
- » use green space next streets for education
- » demonstrate various stages + interpretation
- » interpretation on use of native plants eg. Ford Rod Hill on Van. Island

- » education/interpretation of several stages naturally vs human intervention
- » running trails please
- » washroom please
- » against because of parking access. Bus etc.

#### **Natural Asset Management / Atmosphere + Identity**

- » consider bicycle access
- » consider maint. requirements for winter installations
- » make use of volunteer time + energy for restoration
- » 4 season building with restrooms
- » winter installations could be all season
- » not too many look out points
- » y-c skiing trail should be key winter element
- » naturalize - do not mow except path area. Naturalizing will lesson noxious weed over time
- » Like what it is. Leave natural please
- » Leave some snow on paved paths for ski sled - snowshoe
- » only if there is education about the invasiveness/non nativeness of the X historical info of X the grass is there

# External Stakeholder Workshop

**November 4, 2017**  
**Edmonton Tower, 12:30-2pm**  
**14 Participants**

Stakeholders were invited to attend a 1.5-hour session run in conjunction with the Ribbon of Green (2018) external stakeholder workshop to discuss the proposed park concept options. Stakeholders were provided with an in-depth walk-through of the vision statements and concept options and time for small group discussions throughout the session. Stakeholders also provided input in individual surveys.

**Written comments were collected using sticky notes on the presentation boards and through the event feedback form.**

Represented organizations:

- › Alberta Association of Landscape Architects
- › Canadian Hard of Hearing Association – Edmonton Branch
- › Ceyana Canoe Club
- › Canadian Federation of University Women - Environment Group
- › Dogs Off Leash Ambassador
- › Edmonton & Area Land Trust
- › Edmonton Bicycle Commuters
- › Edmonton Food Council
- › Edmonton Heritage Council
- › Edmonton Mountain Bike Alliance
- › Edmonton Native Plant Group
- › Edmonton River Valley Coalition
- › Edmonton Rowing Club
- › Edmonton Tourism
- › North Saskatchewan River Valley Conservation Society
- › River Valley Alliance
- › Sierra Club Canada
- › The Ridge Community League
- › Twin Brooks Community League
- › University of Alberta Student's Union
- › Wedgewood Ravine Community League
- › Wild Rose Ramblers





## Station A: What do you think about the vision statements?

- » Brome - something different native grasses suggestions.
- » N/A
- » N/A
- » add to Concept 1 “The Oleskiw River Valley Park provides an immersive experience into the natural landscape.
- » education should be via programming not infrastructure. Elements of both are good.
- » “ORVP: [added - a Breathing Space]  
Vision statement 1: [‘refuge’ crossed out]  
Vision statement 2: [‘educating’ crossed out] With opportunity for visitors to learn. [‘passive’ (recreation) crossed out]. [‘narratives’ replaced with opportunities.”
- » Why can it not stay “as is” - as a 3rd option.
- » Focus on natural values but with opportunities for interpretation and education. Like the idea of some intervention (concept 2) to create nature park.
- » ecological diversity connectivity
- » Like the idea of educating the visitors. Plants and animals should be indigenous.
- » education, recreation.
- » Too similar.
- » Ecological connectivity, essential habitat.
- » education opportunities.
- » Focusing on the visitor experience with the park.
- » Diversity - enhanced ecological connectivity, restoration of ecological systems - natural and cultural heritage. - more active orientation of Concept 2. The idea of “let it be”
- » Leaving it natural, letting nature take its course.
- » Passive recreation would be related to hiking and skiing. Cycling only on main trail and trail-unnecessarily - along mow. Picnic area and triplets at south end.
- » move 2nd paragraph of concept 2 to concept 1. move 1st paragraph of concept 2 into concept 1.
- » new narratives for future generations.
- » Too fluffy + not clear.
- » Use more tangible description - create a real vision. - combine concepts in both.
- » Need to acknowledge that this park is a major human powered connector. This park has the highest usage of the trails in the city.
- » “Vision 1: leave totally natural habitat. Handout [map] instead of signs. John Janzen nature centre. Diversity of people? (accessible).”
- » “Vision 2: proximity to Fort Edmonton Park. Culture vs Nature. Learning ‘new narrative’? New understandings, memory and experience. References people.”
- » “Vision 1: like the 1st sentence - essential habitat + connectivity concerned with the word ‘enhanced’ - may mean development. Favours less infrastructure stronger - like ‘irreplaceable link’ move .2 to concept 1 + vice versa - prefer ‘can learn about’ instead of ‘experience’”
- » “Vision 2: passive recreation ok infrastructure not needed - could be in Terwillegar less amenities - not that big of a space likes ‘immersive experience’ - requires having habitat (from concept 1) - too many amenities could ruin benches are so important - resting spaces to be immersed there are already ‘educational nodes’ in the city ie. Hermitage Park more ‘immerse’ to concept 1 ‘refuge from the city’ - move to concept 1 - LIKE”
- » “Vision 1: not inspiration. Language weird like concept 1 more Breathing space before going into Terwillegar - more active ; mix or RV jargon park provides a setting for breathing room - didn’t like refuge, it’s part of city”
- » “new narratives - clarify language excited for people to have a new place to go jargon opportunities for visitors to learn (more simple language)”
- » “Vision 1: major human-powered transportation trail through Oleskiw plus to adjacent attached to wildlife species that are there recreational connectivity Can’t support all outdoor rec. here = think of recreation as a system”
- » built natural features to protect animals from human use = management
- » “Vision 1: Brome - use something else. Native grasses - native plant groups - brome is difficult for other species to compete with”
- » “Vision 2: native plant + prairie restoration much bigger. Ask arborist groups - Edm Native Plant Last - new narrative - clarify”

- » Misses people. Don't agree with methodology [Charles]. No 'natural' prairie to restore [Charles]
- » \$7 million
- » "Keep as natural as possible  
low impact from development  
[comment in can't decide box: mix some of both]"
- » I liked first paragraph (Concept 1)
- » I liked first paragraph (Concept 1)
- » Concept 1 2nd paragraph makes me nervous about "the landscape changes" is that by human hands or naturally?  
Concept 2 2nd paragraph - don't like "creating new narratives for Edmonton's future generations" will we lose "keep it natural"
- » "beach gets extensive use - acknowledge the beach, access through construction pile  
site visit with stakeholders with a diversity of stakeholders  
no boat launch - pull over spot"
- » "smaller  
washroom @ picnic area - adjacent"
- » Because it shows mountain biking in the wildlife corridor. Mountain biking can be very destructive. Snow shoeing should be held in the open areas not the treed areas (or cross-country skiing).

### Access + Circulation

- » no need to put another trail through the center of the park.
- » good north - south routes
- » Want mountain bikes trails completely removed. They do not belong in this relatively untouched forest.
- » creates loop trails - important to keep multi-use - don't exclude users.
- » There are great circuits and access here already.
- » New trails fragment landscape - goes against the principle of "providing essential habitat".
- » Nothing new. Allow grass, roots growth
- » I like the new natural trail connection. I also don't like the golf hole outline.
- » Access to river. Please don't make Terwillegar into a bigger parking lot.
- » Both are same access
- » off roading opportunities. Bonavista / Terwillegar: less speed. Granular [trail] for pedestrians. Don't understand 'Golf Walk'.
- » "no trail in forest  
trail markers - maybe too many  
connection through the River Valley - good  
not very supportive of granular trail - make process to get feedback if people want it - cuts up habitat  
trail loop around golf hole could be interesting"
- » "access points along river - don't want vegetation disturbed but like the viewpoints  
active area @ south due to Terwillegar  
field is closer + more central, but Terwillegar is closer to the park  
granular - don't want them to be close together - supportive overall, as long as it's wide  
new natural trail connection more appealing than granular  
why isn't granular natural?  
[comment in boxes: concept 1: natural trails; can't decide: no preference]"

## Station B: What do you think about the concept options?

### Park Use + Amenities

- » This park is (3km)? long how many amenities do you need!
- » Picnic area need washroom if you love picnic facility.
- » Like the emphasis of education & exposure for learning.
- » like southern end play area + picnic area
- » like the learning circle more natural - less permanent. One washroom is good.
- » yes - wildlife viewing structure. Yes - south picnic area.  
No - education nature play area. Note: you have Country skiing marked on multi-use paved trail. Country ski tracks don't survive where there is hiking and biking. This is a transportation corridor and needs clearing. Note: Always have washroom by picnic area - this is physiology. When we eat we got to go!
- » less is more - skip the picnic tables, way signs on trails, and skip cutting new trails. Garbage cans okay. Occasional interpretive sign (keep to minimum) toilet okay.
- » Too much. Create a process for future needs. Don't guess.
- » Blend of features from both
- » "a lot of development for 2km - more benches + signs - don't need all the stuff  
don't need another play area  
picnic and cars - goes w car access  
pit toilet - good  
garbage cans good"
- » "couldn't decide, seem similar, either is going to work + have challenges  
like winter warming shelter if nice looking structure - x +  
like shelter if rains  
like viewing + enhanced view points  
is there evidence that there would be use of learning amphitheatre  
[comment in box: both are fine, too similar]"

- » “keep natural trail as is disturbance distance during trail planning problem for park don’t like natural trails replaced - city doesn’t maintain granular trail groups are there to maintain natural trails”
- » “no new natural trails - too destructive to x env MNT BIKE TRAILS REMOVED connector comment above gathering space - N-C-2 too many trails C-1 - overlaid x C-2 space”
- » Too cluttered. Will you need all those trail markers? Would the new trail be for walkers? The paved trail is for cyclists? It would be good to separate the trails. Please do not allow mountain biking or cycling in the wildlife corridor.

### Natural Asset Management

- » Need to control weeds. Brome should be gradually replaced by Kentucky bluegrass or natural graminoides
- » Gives broad overview of nature and (?)
- » openness
- » No. 1 for the natural regrowth. No 2 Prairie area
- » Like the new forest restoration.
- » diversity of nature to experience.
- » “think about no trail in forest bridge could be outlook - outlook is disturbing nature + costly interpretive plaque on bridge”
- » “use of park is determined by how far ppl are willing to walk [notes in boxes: concept 2: openness, breathing room, open field]”
- » don’t like learning opportunities unless material they are sturdy
- » “back to used to be - like C-2 education like grow back - like native plant gardens”
- » I liked both not cluttered. Just a note when we were on the Ft. Edmonton Bridge (looking north) we saw 4 or 5 deer cross the river. It was icy and get on the sand bar and then enter the woods. It was awesome.

### Atmosphere + Identity

- » Some of concept 2 are also suitable need to combine components of both to get a plan concept with the best of both.
- » more keep the connects and trails limited to one - by golf hole instead of having tones.
- » More educational in nature, combine both nature and (?)
- » openness is good, provides a gradient of 3 levels of use.

- » natural atmosphere - has John Jansen center been engaged as to how they could incorporate education activities there. Good parking at ET ed. Create education walks from John Jansen?
- » Shaped/directed experience with nature will better protect areas natural assets.
- » Going for wild.
- » Less of all the infrastructure + trails. Toilet (pit) one trail.
- » It would be an active asset available to residents in the S.West ( a growing area). I like the additional open space for safety and play.
- » Like it as is - no need to “enhance”
- » “there’s already a lot in Terwillegar better left untouched interpretive programming - no infra. Safety - maintain that there is risk in parks educate people of the risks of parks”
- » “passing through park - no gathering needed - nothing to see, place to linger on bridge access for emergency services difficult to service people to linger winter too - just for movement benches x at sign”
- » “C-2. 3 connector to main - too many - could be just 1 - just too many smaller picnic area - keep more natural - keep as natural as possible like openness of park - forest to walk through - open area still x to x to walk”
- » Both have picnic area or resting points at the south end of Oleskiw Park - that is a pretty area. I like the idea of a wildlife lookout (a bench). Will we need an outdoor classroom + amphitheatre (maybe later)?

### Station C: Compare the two concept options

#### Concept 1 - What I like

- » minimal development, maintaining ecological integrity
- » Brings area back to the natural or original condition.
- » north-south trails
- » granular trail, washroom, natural trail, natural gathering area, signs.
- » Focus on future process + engagement not pitching developed concepts.

#### Concept 1 - What could be improved

- » take out extra trails
- » scrap the whole things. Let it be. It would be way cheaper and nicer.

- » Eliminates granular trail for concept. This would seem to contradict the vision of natural re-emergence? There is already an existing natural trail.

### Concept 2 - What I like

- » too much development of amenities
- » Gives the visitor more information - better for educating all visitors.
- » openness, focus on education.

### Concept 2 - What could be improved

- » take out extra trails
- » Need to have trails open for both cyclists and walkers and another loop for walkers only. Dogs should not be allowed in this park.

### What could be combined?

- » yes, move paragraph 1 of concept 2 to concept 1. move paragraph 2 of concept 1 to concept 2.
- » Trails on 1. Open field on 2. Amenities on 2 (focus on south end).
- » the only strongly support. Reason stated by each on previous page.

### General Comments

- » Whose needs & priorities?
- » There is a need to have some trails for walking only. Cyclists tend to ride too fast and can injure walkers so there should be provision for both.
- » Like pieces of both - want a merger of elements.
- » Keeping it more natural - users would need to walk there or ride there. Less permanent structures - more natural presence.
- » Simplicity. Concept 1 + structures that deter overuse of river bank + small scale nature interpretation.
- » Too much infrastructure to lack of bottom up
- » both concepts have elements that are preferred.
- » "blend best elements from the 2 master plan = not prescriptive 'what could be' vs 'what should be'!  
Other design does this work [arrow pointing at statement above]"
- » "combo of both  
[comments on Concept 2 box: with x, trails C1]"

## Station D: What specific park elements do you prefer?

### Access + Circulation

#### New Natural Trail (Concept 1)

- » No new trails!
- » Prefer concept1 with removal of New Natural Trail
- » Mountain bike trails should be totally removed.
- » For accessibility. Roll annually to take out unevenness (from roots) [Charles]
- » Not too dense to limit disturbance

#### Granular Trail Loop (Concept 2)

- » Support 1 granular/natural trail traversing meadow + connecting to ravine.
- » could be good interpretation area.
- » Concept 2 too many connected trails.
- » Overkill - breaks up natural area unnecessarily.
- » Please build a small pond from golf course creek into park

#### Resting Points (Concept 1)

- » No large groups in riverine area, which is currently only area with natural vegetation
- » natural spots to stop for education.
- » Only if of significance in a historical or cultural way.
- » Afraid it will be used by large older groups and lead to much destruction.
- » love this - keep it simple.
- » ok
- » resting point/shelter + picnic, play area

#### Granular Trail (North-South) (Both Concepts)

- » An existing hard-patch natural exists - it is adequate. Could be reviewed in future.
- » not necessary. 2 trail in 3km park are enough.
- » Prefer Concept 1.
- » helps walkers get away from cyclists on multi-use - even if the trails aren't designated for cyclists or walkers - some separation will happen.
- » put down lower on priority list.
- » Leave existing natural trail.
- » New granular trail for hikers, paved for cyclist

### Park Use + Amenities

#### Picnic and Play Area (Concept 1)

- » Place in south end, to encourage access from Terwilligar, Washroom important. Could add interpretive sign (history of are, culture, animal life).

- » Terwillegar Park MP has parks development picnic tables and playgrounds.
- » Too formalized.
- » There are many parks where we can have a nature experience and stop at a playground. I love those, lets keep this park a little more simple and natural.
- » Likely not used enough, high maintenance; playground is the natural area.
- » Expensive, not called for.
- » Will Terwillegar have a small washroom (like the one in Whitemud Park near the Equine Centre? Is sewage disposal expensive? If Terwillegar has the nice washroom maybe you could have a small pit one here.

#### **Smaller Picnic Area (Concept 2)**

- » Because lacks washroom.
- » Add washroom. Simple and natural as possible
- » I'd like to see another rest area here. Needs washroom.
- » impact on environment too high.
- » IF solar + low impact.
- » Why a manicured lawn? picnic tables and shelter would be enough

#### **Learning Circle (Concept 1)**

- » As long as it is a natural learning circle.
- » like this. Keep as natural as possible.
- » No not needed.
- » if natural
- » Would be nice to have an overhead shelter - keep off the rain

#### **Outdoor Education Area (Concept 2)**

- » Unnecessary intrusion.
- » level natural. Formalize
- » No, just one multi purpose solar gazebo. Put in electric bike charging stations.
- » Cost looks high

#### **Natural Asset Management**

##### **Wildlife Lookout (Concept 2)**

- » Good viewing from the foot bridge. Also benches along trail allow for wildlife viewing.
- » Limit connected trails to one trail.
- » Use the foot bridge
- » 1 or 2 benches

##### **Restored Prairie (Concept 2)**

- » "Installed" Prairie
- » Allow to restore naturally.
- » "constructed" prairie
- » Only if native plant group want.

- » "depends on the specific species = keep well established species  
'start w/ the wildlife'"
- » Why so costly?

#### **Restored Forest (Both)**

- » But need to develop a natural under-story. Need restoration, reclamation, intervention.
- » Some - some field is good contrast.
- » let the forest restore itself naturally.
- » Let forest just go by succession.
- » Take time to plant trees - spread the costs

#### **Open Field (Both)**

- » Do not mow brome. Remove brome in a phased-in process. Use only single cross trail from multi-use trail to river
- » don't mow.
- » concept 2

#### **Atmosphere & Identity**

##### **Winter Installations**

- » Install warming hut & include interpretive panel, e.g. how animals & plants survive winter. Maybe bulletin board for nature sightings.
- » We're becoming more of a winter city. Cool/low impact low-cost - exciting destination.
- » people will dress appropriately for weather.
- » Only if a group comes forward to do this free.
- » May be a good idea? Dress warmly

##### **Community Activations**

- » No comments

##### **Gathering Space (Concept 2)**

- » Unnecessary intrusion.
- » simple + inviting
- » small park, gather instead in Terwillegar.

##### **River Lookouts (Both)**

- » No more than 2 access points to river. Current access requires rehabilitation.
- » Too many lookouts in this plan.
- » Would prefer a look out model/handrail to deter people from cutting new paths to the river.
- » Look out from bridges.
- » not best use of money But one focal point may okay

##### **General Comments**

- » My biggest concern is use of existing single-track trails by cyclists. I believe all trails within the reverine forest should be closed off to cyclists and allowed to rehabilitate, Cyclists

can use the multi-use (asphalt) trail and the trail (not necessarily (granular)) around the meadow. This should be implemented immediately!

Whether concept 1 or 2, attempts should be made to gradually remove brome, plus the 2 major exits (boiner-saxifage & yellow lady's bedstraw

X should be made of the X of the X X sedge (Carex X ) along the riverside trail.

- » not prescriptive. Master plans are not a blueprint
- » too many

### **Park Naming Strategy**

- » This requires though and some serious researching. Who owned this property first?
- » Is there a suitable local indigenous name?
- » Not unless Oleskiw was a politician.
- » [replace 'park' in name with 'reserve'] Oleskiw is already known as such
- » Its is a natural flood plain and the natural landscape.
- » The past history of the River Valley has many naming opportunities.
- » not needed to name after political figures.
- » Does not matter as long as it is not political.
- » Natural area - Aspen poplar natural area?
- » I see this as a natural park deserving a natural name.
- » This is a nature - focused park.
- » inspire people to learn more about the natural world.
- » Part of Education
- » Important but always debatable
- » Needed public education
- » Stay away from people who are alive or political unless they made significant contributions.
- » Why not keep existing name?? "Oleskiw Lands"



# Online Survey

November 6 to November 26, 2017

289 survey respondents

<https://www.edmonton.ca/oleswkiwparkmasterplan>

To provide an opportunity for citizens to provide feedback at their convenience, a version of the open-house information and activities was available online for two weeks. The survey was advertised through the City's social media, outreach materials (such as mailed flyers) and in-person events. In addition to being available on the project website ([edmonton.ca/oleskiwparkmasterplan](http://edmonton.ca/oleskiwparkmasterplan)), the survey was distributed through Edmonton's Insight Community.

As part of this survey, an online map tool was developed to capture spatial feedback from participants. The interface allowed the public to provide detailed comments about areas in each concept option they liked or would like to see improved.

**The online survey invited participants to answer multiple choice questions and leave written comments, presenting the same information that was available at the open house and external stakeholder session. The following comments were made in addition to the tallies and summaries of comments presented in the What We Heard Report.**

## City of Edmonton Surveys



YOUR PROGRESS



There are four parts to this survey. Approximate times for each section are indicated below. Please select the sections you are interested in providing feedback on:

*Please select all that apply.*

- Vision statements (5 minutes)
- Compare the two draft concept options (10 minutes)
- Park element preferences (10 minutes)
- Online map tool to post your comments spatially on the draft concept options (10 minutes)

[Previous](#) [Next](#)





## Vision Statements

### What is your level of support for vision statement 1 on a scale of 1-5? (1 being do not support and 5 being strongly support)

- » I agree fully with the first sentence but I see no need for the idea of “experience how the landscape changes over time ..... It is enough that it provides a refuge from the city. It, much like Terwilligar Park, can be used for occasional events as well.
- » I strongly believe in safe guarding the environment up to a point. The cost can't get out of hand.
- » Keeping it as is will reduce maintenance costs and protect the environment. There are adequate parks which provide educational programs and nature intepretations.
- » People want parks and green space as they serve as an escape from concrete and an opportunity to enjoy nature. This part of the vision I agree with. Hallmarking it as an “experience” where on can see landscape changes seems like it's pushing the boundaries of what the focus should be and promoting an idea that probably won't get much traction or attention.
- » Strong and positive focus on the park's natural features and potential as ecological habitat. Also like that it is in a way an experiment in restoration after a variety of man-made uses over nearly a century. Some sensitive recreational opportunities should be part of the vision.
- » going back to nature is important in Edmonton, we tend to like changing things, having natural respites in the city is important.
- » I support natural restoration, but I do not support educational programs and nature interpretation there. It is 2 questions with one answer. Not a good question.
- » Too complicated to understand completely.
- » It lets people know what the park is about and how they can contribute to getting the park to it's goals wether its conservation, encouraging people to be more active, or just providing a nice green area for relaxation.
- » It is important to provide spaces that support nature that are not impacted by human actions.
- » Either one is good because they emphasize preservation and natural habitat, not disruptive recreation.
- » strongly support nature interpretation
- » Edmontonians needs to be changed to Edmontonians and visitors to the city. The park.....
- » there are existing parks, facilities that should be enhanced before new projects. IE: Jackie Parker spray park. 1 washroom with 1 toilet for the entire facility. No change rooms. I took my grand daughters there, 2 and 4 years old, and we had to wait 20 minutes to use the bathroom because of the line up. Children were using the toilet stall as a change room.
- » I feel we need to learn there are certain areas that should be left alone. Look at what is happening to Banff and Jasper National Parks. They are both now a long way from their original concept and that is what we are going to do to the river valley,
- » 3, leave it as is, don't spend any money on it.
- » More protective of the land as it is unique away from the public
- » I believe the park should focus on habitat, restoring the ecological systems with a little development as possible.
- » It gives more of a message of retaining and restoring the natural habitat and...hopefully...protecting it.
- » That is what a real park is about
- » nature interpretation programs sound good but the City has yet to really do that well anywhere. It is an element best left off the vision statement.
- » The vision speaks to visitors experiencing a refuge from the city and how the landscape changes over time but doesn't speak to recreational use (hikes, fun day with the family, etc). Maybe it's implied, but I don't see it reflected in the vision statement from my perspective.
- » Sounds like the park would be kept natural
- » We can learn much from our natural environments, but only if we allow them to be natural
- » I think it is a good statement, but I am more supportive of the second one. You loose me when you say, “as a refuge from the city”. I don't use our park areas as a refuge from the city. I use them to enhance my city life.
- » Additional parks are always welcome, especially those that have a restoration of ecological systems as part of the plan.
- » I support the enhancement of ecological connectivity, and the opportunity to learn about ecological succession and restoration.
- » In theory the vision statement is a plan I support (natural habitat and a refuge), the implementation may be to overdevelop the park, which I do not support.
- » I like the focus on the ecological aspects of the park.
- » We need to keep our park areas as natural as us possible for both humans and wild animals to interact.
- » I like the idea of keeping it natural and only enhancing the natural beauty. I think some basic amenities would be good like bathrooms and benches but otherwise preserve the natural area and maybe out up some interesting aboriginal signage and culturally informative pieces.
- » Not keen on the idea of programs, but nature interpretation is OK.
- » I like the reference to “restoration of ecological systems” . . . “nature interpretation”.

- » Restoration of ecological systems is fine by me as long as it doesn't involve dismantling mountain bike trails.
- » It is indeed a refuge from the city.
- » Vision Statement 1 emphasizes nature and ecological restoration. There is an overabundance of river valley parks that have human leisure conveniences, so I don't believe that every park needs to duplicate these.
- » It misses the cultural history of the area! I think it should be a place for natural preservation - but also for experiencing and learning about the cultural heritage of Edmonton and area
- » I looked through the plans provided - it doesn't seem to do a very good job of what you say it is supposed to do. It's a good theory, the execution is muddled.
- » It makes sense.
- » Focus on habitat, restoration and preservation
- » I support the environmental protection themes of this statement.
- » With the current paved MUT & perhaps developing a series of unpaved paths, allowing nature to gradually reclaim the area would be the least intrusive & least costly option while still providing good access for visitors.
- » I feel that this area is ideal for an ongoing process of restoration and for education about the process.
- » To keep development out and access for the residents is important for the people of Edmonton and the wildlife and plant life. It is a place for a nice getaway and yet close to home.
- » Not a huge fan of the phrase "refuge from the city". Makes the city sound like a place that needs escaping from.
- » If there is no parking, it will be a refuge for the rich people in the southwest who are close enough to walk or bike there. How about we agree to limited parking if you agree to build a homeless shelter in your neighbourhood first. People with addiction issues could then enjoy the rustic nature and inaccessibility to heal themselves.
- » Most Edmontonians are ignorant to the ecological diversity provided by the river valley and using this park as a way to restore ecological systems and inform the public through educational programs is ideal.
- » not much of a plan here
- » This describes as to what the Park is all about. For Edmontonians who do not or are unable to go camping this would be the next best thing for them.
- » I enjoy nature within the urban landscape. We are very fortunate to have a river valley that is easily accessible for most people.
- » too long but better than the lower one
- » Overly-Ambiguous.
- » I believe it is critical to provide essential habitat to a diversity of plants and animals.
- » Like emphasis on essential habitat for plants and animals with people use second
- » The preservation or restoration of the ecology is given undue weight, out-blancing the recreational use of a park.
- » Like the word & image of refuge. Implies peaceful, calm, natural environment. Less focus on manmade
- » Restoration of habitat is key.
- » I feel that there is too much emphasis on restoration of ecological systems that just change with the way the river runs
- » This tends to leave things in a more natural and less intensively used state
- » It's important to recognize the importance of maintaining habitats of plants and animals in all areas of the river valley.
- » I like that the focus is to restore the ecological systems. Need natural landscapes, don't need things in a park, just green space.
- » This statement gives me hope that the city values our natural habitat.
- » We don't need to develop all parks in the city. Keep this as natural as possible. I love seeing deer and coyotes wandering through the river valley
- » I like the fact that the environmental consideration is the first thing that is mentioned.
- » The land and its health is the #1 priority.
- » It's a large area in a flood plain and as such provides a different habitat than the ravines and forested areas of much of the rest of the river valley.
- » Fundamentally agree with this but I do not believe it covers everything
- » The current rate of development is depleting the amount of natural area. This is important to many eco systems and should be encouraged. We should leave our foot prints on everything.
- » The message is good, the overuse of complicated words, and the statement needs to be shorter.
- » I especially appreciate the focus on how the "landscape changes over time." I think understanding nature can be a challenge to those living in the city and more truly natural areas are required.
- » I don't just want a nature preserve. I can only walk or bike through, I want a balance of open areas with equipment for kids to play on, dogs to run about and for people to gather, meet, BBQ and picnic. Area for boats to exit and enter the river. I want areas that are protected, that provides a setting where visitors can experience how the landscape changes over time and the restoration of ecological systems. That's fine but not more than 40% of the park
- » I prefer a more passive vision. Not every natural area needs to be enhanced and explained.

- » I love that it is about leaving the park in a close to natural state and using it for education purposes, rather than running an LRT line through it, like in Riverdale and Cloverdale.
- » I like the focus on habitat and ecological values of the park. I also feel like calling it a refuge from the city fitting
- » The city, with it's lack of funds can't afford this extravagance.
- » I like both visions.
- » The vision supports environmental sustainability and provides for people to experience nature and be educated on the necessity of such preservation.
- » Provision of educational programs is in conflict with refuge from the city. Large groups will eradicate the quiet nature of the area. The only substantial difference between the two visions seems to be whether the meadow will be restored or not. The vision provided by stakeholders in earlier consultations was clearly for an undeveloped, natural area. Both of these options add significant development to the area. Neither vision reflects the majority desire to leave the area essentially untouched.
- » vision 1 sounds slightly more about keeping the area natural, whereas vision 2 seems to want to introduce citizens to wilderness and educate them.both are commendable statements however i prefer the wilderness aspect as opposed to an interpretive centre.
- » Natural areas are best left natural with subtle development to allow access for users.
- » As long as it supports mountain biking
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » This a unique area with great single track mountain bike riding.
- » Both visions seem convoluted justifications to rationalize development. Considering development has already occurred I would like to recognize the great paved path that connects visitors with mobility issues between both bridges. I would also like to commend the brilliant planning to date that has maintained this park with animal control requiring dogs to be on leash and therefore not being a disruptive nuisance to the natural animal habitat or the many human users. I have observed great co-use by walkers, runners, cyclists and even winter snow shoe enthusiasts and feel the park as is offers wonderful opportunities. The existing paved trail is curved and creative. The natural paths offer huge adventure to young and old. The current path structure offers long distance through its curved twisting turns over a small footprint. Wow- great job Edmonton planning! You really did an outstanding job. Please don't develop any further. Leave it to the original intent of the land donation- keep it real- keep it natural.
- » The park is indeed a natural refuge, providing habitat for many native species. It is an area where natural succession can be allowed to take place. But I think recreation needs to be mentioned. The trail network supports more than just nature interpretation, but healthy active pursuits of walking, cycling and running, among others.
- » this sounds like trying to set the land back to where it was 100+ years ago. as nature is not static I don't beleive that this is realistic as then it would be a forest. If there are natural species missing then selectively introducing them and allowing natural selection to progress would be an acceptable method.
- » This statement embodies the beauty and purpose of our natural spaces.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA.
- » This area is culturally important. It was one part of Enoch Cree Nation which was illegally surrendered.
- » Keep it as natural and wild as possible, with minimal human interference. Allow essential connectivity trails but proceed cautiously over time if further development is warranted.
- » I agree that the park should be a refuge from the city, but think that current habitat should be left as is.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » HABITAT ESSENTIALS
- » I think a combination of the two is best. See below.

- » This vision statement sounds like it means eliminating all single track mountain biking from the park, which has I would strongly object to, as I have been riding single track in this area for several years, and with the new footbridge to Terwilligar dog park/mtb park, this is a very popular loop, especially among the river.

**What is your level of support for vision statement 2 on a scale of 1-5? (1 being do not support and 5 being strongly support)**

- » Here again I see no need for the emphasis on education. Why is this prominent in both vision statements? It's a park and it doesn't need to be crowded with extensive signage telling us what kind of squirrels live here.
- » same as above.
- » |Increase in costs will increase taxes to provide all this vision embodies.
- » Again, I don't think education should be the focus for the vision of the park, as it likely won't be the main reason people visit it.
- » Also good, like the focus on education and passive recreation opportunities, but not sure I understand what "creating new narratives for Edmonton's future generations" means.
- » educations is good, but not inspite of nature
- » I am not interested in educational programs in this park.
- » I don't know anything about the history of the site but would love to learn about it.
- » Either one is good because they emphasize preservation and natural habitat, not disruptive recreation.
- » see above
- » Same as vision #1
- » 3, leave it as is, don't spend any money on it.
- » To focused on visitors
- » It's very bland and neutral.
- » It is a good option but not as good as the first one
- » nature interpretation programs sound good but the City has yet to really do that well anywhere. It is an element best left off the vision statement.
- » I perceive Vision #1 as more tangible / meaningful to me.
- » Not sure how this vision is significantly different from #1
- » This plan also allows the natural environment to develop
- » Focus on the natural elements and not the cultural aspects.
- » Both vision statements are good but I like the inclusion of natural heritage
- » This is focused more on the land and why it's important to maintain. Whether or not I use the park, I can better see the value of it for all Edmontonians.
- » I like the focus on history and storytelling but don't like the words "surrounded by habitat..." It's too passive and describes a disconnect between the area and the visitor. I'd like to see something that describes integration between the landscape/ecology and the humans that inhabited the area in the past, present, and future.
- » It's proximity to other areas that have specific focuses on natural & cultural history seem to be a duplication
- » this option means more development which I am not in favour of.
- » This vision statement seems ambiguous, not sure how much development is required.
- » I like the focus on natural and cultural heritage of the site.
- » lame
- » Nice to learn about the history of the area while in the park.
- » As long as this option does not interfere with the natural habitat too much (ie just have some informative signage and not destroy much foliage) then it would be great.
- » Prefer more emphasis on nature and less on cultural heritage. What is "passive recreation"?!  
I am "cultural heritage'd to death already". Next thing you know we will have to deal with the first nations claim to the lands . . .
- » Cultural heritage isn't exactly obvious in the area. Low impact would be nice.
- » Too Vague
- » Trail penetration through the area with limited human access to other recreational functions is an ideal that should be sought after for this park.
- » I like this one better - it includes the cultural heritage of the site, and brings it into the present
- » I'm mystified why you're divorcing the history that has shaped the land from its ecology. The ecology now and where it will be is in direct tandem with people. How will people create new narratives for future generations if they don't understand the history to the point they are at now? If I have to pick a vision, it's number 1 by a landslide, because it lacks an inchoate idea about cultural (people) interaction with the landscape.
- » It is convoluted and hard to understand.
- » Not strong enough on restoration and preservation
- » More expensive than Vision#1
- » I don't feel the area has much to contribute in terms of human history. I've lived in Edmonton most of my life and was aware of the Edmonton Country Club being there but never got the impression that that was all that special.
- » The more we are educated about the importance of natural diversity and species, hopefully the more that these will be respected and nurtured.
- » Look, it's a piece of floodplain covered with grass and a few trees. No need to spend a lot of cash with interpretive signs pretending it's the everglades.

- » Most Edmontonians are ignorant to the ecological diversity provided by the river valley and using this park as a way to restore ecological systems and inform the public through educational programs is ideal.
- » anything that would beautify the city is a great idea
- » Vision 2 is saying the same as Vision 1 but with more words.
- » too long
- » Inclusive and well defined statement.
- » The vision statement is OK, but I prefer vision #1.
- » Too many things going on in the proposed park (keep it rustic and simple) and would prefer just basic amenities being wide shared trails (paved and unpaved), toilet facilities being portapotties with hand washing provisions, lots of seating and picnic tables, refuse bins, information signage as to the natural and cultural heritage of site and signage informing bicyclists to SLOW DOWN when passing pedestrians.
- » Sounds as if natural habitat is being pushed out to allow for people interaction with site
- » Sounds imposed versus natural
- » Would provide habitat but doesn't seem like it would provide as much.
- » You can't control everything parks should be made to use and experience not just to blame people for use education is good but not to hinder use
- » A bit more intrusive, with more programming and facilities
- » Once again it's important for the public to understand the natural and cultural heritage of areas within the valley.
- » Need to ensure there is education and keep the natural landscape. Cannot lose vision of that when installing these items.
- » This park should not have to deal with cultural issues....
- » Whatever signage is to be used should be well maintained. There are lots of signs along other pathways that are no longer legible or indicative of the area they were installed in 20 or 30 years ago
- » The focus and the priority of caring for the natural and ecological aspects of the areas is noteworthy.
- » We already have a lot of places like this.
- » River Valley parks must be more than just ecological protection areas, and must provide amenities for healthful recreation and education.
- » A more complete perspective
- » There are plenty of recreational opportunities in the city not many natural areas left.
- » This one is better, it is still too long.
- » I would likely have supported this vision more not having read the vision before. I now read this and note that it is surrounded by habitat as opposed to being a habitat.
- » If "passive" recreation is walking or bike trails, a number of open areas with equipment for kids to play on, dogs to run about and for people to gather, meet, BBQ and picnic as well as areas for boats to exit and enter the river. Then I'm supporting that. 40% of the park can be left natural. ALSO the cultural heritage of the site is important and should be discussed, highlighted and informative.
- » The area can simply be experienced.
- » Seems the same as statement 1. Just more wordy
- » Not a bad vision statement, but I like option 1 more
- » We can't afford this!!
- » I like both visions.
- » Motorized access and non-native animals [dogs] should not be welcome.
- » Still a good vision, sounds like more development of the site with signs and man made structures which lessens the natural beauty of the site.
- » This vision is unclear. How will "educating visitors" be operationalized? How is it different from educational programs in vision 1? The only substantial difference between the two visions seems to be whether the meadow will be restored or not. The vision provided by stakeholders in earlier consultations was clearly for an undeveloped, natural area. Both of these options add significant development to the area. Neither vision reflects the majority desire to leave the area essentially untouched.
- » vision 1 sounds slightly more about keeping the area natural, whereas vision 2 seems to want to introduce citizens to wilderness and educate them.both are commendable statements however i prefer the wilderness aspect as opposed to an interpretive centre.
- » As long as it supports mountain biking
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » I like to keep the River Valley as is
- » The key differences between the two statements are unclear. I support natural and cultural heritage interpretation as well as nature interpretation - but not if it comes at a cost to overdevelop an already nice area.
- » Maintain more versus less field as it has existed for last 100 years -- most of Edmonton's history. We already have lots of forest along river. This park is currently more open/spacious and I like that
- » I like it, but I don't feel like the cultural heritage of the site is particularly high. I feel like this vision is less tangible than #1.
- » as it currently stands this is a natural habitat, within the city for various species of flora and fauna.

- » This statement makes the habitat and forest seem secondary to human interest. It is important to maintain the park as it is and allow people to discover nature without human interference.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA.
- » This area is culturally important. It was one part of Enoch Cree Nation which was illegally surrendered.
- » I like that this vision respects the heritage of the site as it has gone through many uses (forest, golf course, farmland) over the years.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » Ecological integrity should be valued higher than visitor experience in this relatively undisturbed area, particularly the section closest to the river.
- » COMPREHENSIVE
- » I think a combination of the two is best: The Oleskiw Rivery Valley Park provides essential habitat to a diversity of plants and animals and enhances ecological connectivity in the River Valley. It provides an immersive experience into the natural landscape while educating visitors on the natural and cultural heritage of the site with nature interpretation and ecological learning. I also like the description as "refuge from the city."
- » Again, if this is code for shutting down singletrack, to allow bikes on the gravel trail only, I oppose for reasons in my earlier response.

## Concept Options

### Access & Circulation: Which Concept has circulation features (including trails and signs) that you would prefer to use? Provide reasons for your answer.

- » I want separation between cyclists and pedestrians where feasible. Cyclists want to go fast and often endanger pedestrians without realizing it
- » To much development. to many signs, trail markers.
- » I like more pathing in the denser, more wooded areas of the park that concept 1 brings.
- » Prefer the more naturalized landscape with less open area. Really don't care about "Historic golf hole."
- » it seems a better use of the park
- » I am a mountain biker, and I would like to have less conflicts with pedestrians, so I appreciate the added trail. Please, please, please do not pave or make gravel the paths in this area! This is a real gem for mountain biking and you would be doing the mountain biking community a grave disservice to modify existing trails. I guarantee you, if you sat and surveyed the park current use, it would be 99% mountain bikers and constantly under use.
- » Reduces conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians
- » Destroys the current natural setting.
- » I'm a mountain bike coach and appreciate the use of new trails to cut down on conflicts between user groups.
- » I like the idea of the restored forest
- » Amphitheater seems like a waste of resources. Not sure it would be used enough to make it worth while due to the lack of vehicle access points.
- » see my first comments
- » leave it as is, don't spend any money on it. no costs estimates. CoE is looking for opinions, without providing costs data.
- » Lesser development.
- » I like the idea of a forest over an open field.
- » Difficult to decide because they look very similar I like the idea of planting more forest
- » People should be more likely to use it if you have trails through forested areas. Concept 2 has no new trails within the existing forest.
- » supports ability to reduce conflicts between trail users.
- » Like the separation of trails for walkers/hikers and bicyclists
- » Please reduce the conflicts with bikes and walking citizens
- » Concept #1 seems to restore more nature.
- » reduction of conflicts between trail users by the inclusion of a new trail

- » I think it's critical to provide separation from cyclists when possible. Older pedestrians may feel intimidated by the speed of some bikes racing past them. That's why I chose No. 1. Do like No.2 because it offers more trail options through the middle.
- » I often mountain bike in the area. Reducing pedestrian-cyclist conflicts seem to be better addressed in 1 than 2.
- » There needs to some open fields to offset trees.
- » less development, therefore less chance of vandalism and fires.
- » I prefer concept option #1 with one exception: no new natural trail connection in the forest.
- » The new Natural Trail connections are nice touch.
- » Concept 1 is important because many people mountain bike in the trails close to the river. These are important trails taht connect to the trails in terwillegar via the foot bridge. Reducing pedestrian animosity toward cyclists is important anywhere possible in Edmonton. It would be shame for cyclists to lose access to these trails as there are limited options in the west end. Keeping pedestrians safe is important, but as a mountain biker AND a trail runner I think we need options for both types of use!
- » The extra natural trail connection in Concept 1 to help reduce conflicts between users makes it my clear preference. Concept 2 seems to have redundant granular trails that don't create any benefit.
- » Both seem costly so unless it is being funded without tax dollars i am not in favor of this endeavor.
- » Either one works fine for me!
- » Less altering of the natural habitat
- » More natural trail.
- » We have to have granular trails. Leaving them natural means they will become potholes filled with water . . . breeding ground for mosquitos.
- » I support the idea to reduce conflicts between trail users.
- » I like the idea of a new mountain bike trail like the existing ones, "flat pete" and "logarithmic"; I would want it to be designed by a mountain bike trail designer, like whomever built "flat pete".
- » Signage looks very similar to me.
- » I mainly use the park for mountain biking, option 1 provides additional natural trails. Otherwise the two concepts appear very similar from a trail point of view.
- » better mobility options.
- » Seems to be less disruptive to the natural environment.
- » People will be using the area in different ways and I think option 1 better reflects that
- » I walk the forest trails consistently - I have far more "conflicts" ie I've been bumped and/or nearly collided with far more times on the faster paved trail than on any of the natural trails. I'm not persuaded that the ROI is worth it for the amount of trail enhancement in option 1 - given how few people walk in the forest right now on the natural trails, I don't see it being growing.
- » Differences are negligible
- » It has the highest natural elements possible.
- » Natural trail connection
- » I like the natural trail proposed. I feel like the emphasis for the educational aspects is a good idea, but will go under-used. Therefore I would like to see resources go towards enhancing the natural aspects.
- » Minimizing conflict areas between cyclists & hikers is preferred. Additional trails will also essentially expand the usable area of the park.
- » Trail outlining historic golf hole? Not interesting to me!
- » The new natural trail connection to help reduce conflicts between trail users is a plus. Is an amphitheater truly going to be used enough to justify the expense? I am not sure.
- » Larger chance for public educational opportunities
- » Overall, I choose Concept 1, based entirely on the addition of the "new natural trail connection" for mountain biking. I discovered the existing trails in this park early this year - they are my favourite in the city. A trail connecting the middle up would be excellent!
- » in my opinion concept 2 will attract younger generation (classroom in the park).
- » Very little difference.
- » I would like to see both concepts merged. I like the trees added to the field. Use the east/west proposed trail in concept 1 however make it gravel. There is NO need for two east west gravel trails as in concept 2. FYI...at some point in time, if a forest is grown in this area, a new trail will be cut right through the middle of it...this is what mountain bikers do. Keep this in mind so there are not 3 trails that all do the same thing.
- » No new trails in existing forest. Historic golf hole. Much better emphasis on heritage.
- » Concept Option #1 seems less invasive.
- » Do not need a children's play area.
- » Maintains more natural appearance and habitat
- » I am not sure that hikers use granular trails when a paved surface is available.
- » Not sure what the granular east-west connection is good for.
- » The reduced conflict with the additional trail is paramount
- » I do like the idea of separate trails for walkers and cyclists. I do both but find many of my fellow cyclists to not be considerate of walkers, going too fast, no bell, no warning about coming upon people & dogs.
- » I like the idea of a two-trail system through the forest area as a way to separate trail users.

- » I prefer natural surface trails and options to separate the pedestrian vs. cyclist traffic is always a plus.
- » An expansion of natural trails is needed.
- » As above - fewer man-made intrusions
- » I believe concept one provides enough trails and limiting costs are important.
- » The flow through felt more natural
- » More simple and keeping the park more natural. Don't need things in a nature park, the nature are the things.
- » I think both concepts look good. Having a trail to circumvent problems between cyclists and pedestrians is smart.
- » I like some of the paths proposed in both and the fewer the better in the other
- » the features in both are good, that I would take advantage of them and maximize the use of either one.
- » I prefer the more natural, restorative option since human use and recreation is less of priority here.
- » It provides the necessary recreational and educational components.
- » Appears to be a more complete option for the most Edmontonians
- » Rather have controlled access in the forest. People are less likely to damage foliage in non trail areas.
- » Leave as much natural features as possible
- » like the addition of a gravel north-south trail
- » The existing natural forest trail is narrow and has many cyclists. A new connection would be useful.
- » The City is creating more and more naturalized grass areas. The impact of more forested areas would be more dramatic, and impactful on the overall vision of the park.
- » I prefer natural surface trails and feel that in general work needs to be done to reduce conflicts between trail users.
- » Reducing conflict between trail users is important
- » Reduced conflict between pedestrians and cyclists, and I like the natural trails.
- » I like the number of access and trail
- » I object to the amphitheatre and learning area. It would be difficult for groups to access - how do buses get there without disturbing the neighborhood and having the facilities to support it like washrooms etc would be an additional maintenance burden. It would be more sensible to have something like this in the Terwilliger Park and groups could walk into Oleskiw to experience the area. I'm not nimbby. The proposal isn't practical. Also, the climb in and out if the valley is eliminated for groups if they access the area from Terwilliger. I'm doing this on a phone while out if the country so please consider this my response to a few areas below that I will skip.
- » Seems like this option has less messing with the natural state of the area.
- » Providing more options for mountain biking and hiking seems like a good idea to reduce conflicts between trail users, especially because I think this area will be more highly used in the future. The new trail connector would also provide more options for people who return to walk or bike the trails regularly.
- » We can't afford to do this!!
- » Separating cyclists as much as possible, as they frequently surprise disturb and occasionally threaten pedestrians.
- » I prefer to use the natural trails. This is currently a very popular place for people to mountain bike.
- » Limit the amount of gravel and paved trails. Only require them in the north south direction. Good idea to connect the natural path in the trees, keep the bikes to the interior trail and hikers to the exterior (river edge) trail.
- » Biking and walking conflicts occur on the current trail.
- » The new granular trail connection will eliminate an existing naturalized trail, called the Oleskiw Meadows trail. It is enjoyed in its naturalized, dirt path state by mountain bikers, trail runners, and fat bikers.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » Option one has introduced conflict between people on foot vs people on bicycle. Is there also insinuation that there is winter conflict between people on foot and people on snow shoes? Or people young versus people old? Is the conflict between people or is the concern safety to people when dogs are not on leash or preservation of wildlife when dogs are not on leash? Difficult to comment what is meant by 'new natural' vs new granular. I suspect any granular trail will require heavy equipment and be disruptive to wildlife in the flood plain. Considering this is a flood area I would encourage considering infrastructure that won't be damaged by a flood. Keep it natural. Even directional signs are a form of urbanization and control.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » Keep the land as natural as possible
- » Is it not a possibility to not allow mountain biking on the trail near the river? That trail is very narrow and currently not compatible as multiple use. I've walked down it many times and it's hard to dodge bikers without stepping on the



vegetation. Additionally, this area might be better served as a low-impact recreational area that protects wildlife, plants, and trees. There are plenty of other mountain bike trails in Edmonton.

- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » Maintaining the existing single track trails as they are should be a priority as they are already well maintained by the Edmonton Mountain Bike Association and are enjoyed by hiker and cyclist regularly.
- » This area is hugely popular in summer and winter for mountain bikers looking to ride on flat singletrack
- » Love cycling in this area
- » Both look ok but I have a slight preference for option 1 due to slightly less gravel paths
- » I like the new natural trail connection proposed in Option #1. Option #2 has too many east-west connector trails. I especially don't like the double parallel "historic golf course hole" trails.
- » I like the new natural trail. I don't like the idea of an amphitheatre. small interpretive centres are more desirable keeping it low-key
- » I would like the proposed granular trail to be removed from the plan. It is a single track trail that is used and loved by the many cyclists, hikers and trail runners that use the park and removing this existing trail would do the park and it's users a great disservice. The installation of such a large and invasive trail would be a great disruption to the way the animals and humans currently coexist in this area. Furthermore, I have witnessed many occasions where the use of digging equipment in Edmonton's forest and parks has introduced invasive plant species such as burdock and creeping bell flower to areas that were previously free of these invasive plants. These plants are not being adequately monitored and removed causing them to proliferate and threaten these beautiful areas. The current trail is loved by many and maintained by volunteers which keeps the maintenance costs of the park low.
- » I don't like replacing the existing natural trail with a granular trail. This is one of the best beginner trails in the city.
- » Programming facilities are rarely used, better return on investment is in replanting, However by no longer mowing and removing invasive species (caragana) the reforestation would be under budget.
- » The less of an impact with development will preserve all that is there above and below ground.
- » I prefer Option 2 because it improves circulation on the west side of the site and leaves the east side (forest) untouched.
- » Keep Oleskiw meadows a single track dirt trail. This trail is currently enjoyed by MTBers, fat bikers and trail runners. This trail is the least impacted and already maintained.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » Given the limited motorized access to Oleskiw, I don't think an amphitheatre is practical. It will be difficult to get large audiences there, but more importantly it will be impossible to load/unload any equipment or gear. If an amphitheatre is built, I expect people will demand additional roads and parking, and because of this I am opposed to the concept of an amphitheatre.
- » Please do not add any more trail, there isn't a need.
- » I like the natural trail connection between the two established mountain-biking trails (to reduce conflicts between trail users). I do not like nor see the need for the new granular trail connection in both plans. A parallel paved multi-use trail already exists in close proximity.
- » "The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA"
- » There are so many elements in each of these. Asking to only choose one package or the other is unrealistic. I like some elements of #1 and some elements of #2, but also dislike elements of both.
- » i like option 2 because it seems to be the least disruptive to nature and also it looks like more natural restoration
- » I think that each concept has too many new trails. We should be avoiding cutting new trails as best as we can to lower the impact. There doesn't need to be the north/south new granular trail (yellow dotted) or the blue trail connection in the trees (blue dotted) from concept 1.
- » I like the idea of introducing a new trail in the forest for pedestrians so that they can access without running into cyclists.

### Is there anything you would improve in Concept 1?

- » I would like concept option #1 if the new natural trail connections were not installed. New granular trail was not installed/developed.
- » it had more east-west connections like option #2.
- » There were closer bus stops
- » I don't think the educational component is necessary. Just leave the park the way it is.
- » I would like Concept Option #1 better if: The the new granular trail was removed. The picnic areas were removed.
- » I personally do not like the idea of mountain biking because they will be all over the place and destroy the place Regular biking on the path YES but not sure about mountain biking
- » Restored even more nature.
- » I prefer concept #1 overall, but would like to see a learning amphitheatre included in the overall plan.
- » Is it possible to make some trails bike or pedestrian exclusive?
- » more cross country ski trails
- » I would like concept #1 better if there were no new natural trail connection in the forest and there were signs encouraging visitors to use the existing paths/trails.
- » None. I like concept 1.
- » the picnic area in concept two is a better choice
- » it had more interaction
- » Maybe if there was less gravel on option 1 it would be better
- » The east/west connector was granular.
- » The east-west natural trails are changed to granular trails.
- » ...there were no trail markers at non-intersection points. I'm not sure trail markers along the trail where there are no connections are necessary. They may prove to be hazards.
- » continue the paved trail from the Ford Edmonton footbridge to the neighbourhoods
- » there were even fewer trails and more habitat restoration
- » I would like any of the concepts better if there was a verbalized commitment to fixing flooding issues on the current paved trail. I would like concept 1 better if the proposed granular trail along the tree-line had a better definition of capacity for winter sports (x-country skiing). I would like it better if you said whether it was on or off leash. I would like it better if you didn't obliterate one of the best open spaces in Edmonton with another forest.
- » I would like both concepts better if the new granular trail would be eliminated or would be a natural trail. If the granular trail stays in, then I would like a ban for bikes on the natural trails. Bikes should stay on the granular and paved trails.
- » I would like Concept #1 better if the currently heavily eroded gravel path that runs up the hill to Woodward Cres. from the Fort Edmonton foot bridge area, was paved.
- » The very winding trail at the north end baffles me. I presume it already exists. Maybe an improvement could be designed which would mean less potential disturbance with people short cutting the switchbacks (and creating even more disturbance) as usage increases.
- » no
- » More even forest restoration across north/south granular path.
- » I'm unclear what the "Winter Installations" are, and what the "Resting Points on Natural Trails" means. As long as the resting points do not create congestion on the trails, they sound good. I like the addition of granular trail connections in the main field area from Concept 2. All told, I think I like the East side of Concept 1, and the West side of Concept 2.
- » there was a space for education for school students
- » It included a prairie grasslands restoration like concept #2
- » See above comments
- » It defined a more highlighted visit.
- » Keep the park simple, accessible for all citizens and not a freeway for cyclists.
- » I would like Concept Option #1 better if adjacent trail loops were not so close as to encourage the inevitable short cutting by hikers and cyclists
- » I think the forest restoration is a bad idea. The expansive open field is so beautiful. We always enjoy the view across this field when we walk or run the paved trail. There is plenty of forest in the river valley; why would you want to destroy this beautiful view?
- » Good public access to encourage use
- » when planning for trail access it's always important to consider wheelchairs and scooters and strollers, whether considering natural surfaces or otherwise.
- » There were additional trails down to the river.
- » I think less interventions to the natural environment the better.
- » Add one of the new granular paths to the historic golf hole
- » I am able to spot where the trash bins, and washroom facilities would be to help me assess better.
- » There seems to be an intermittent sandbar on the north end in the photo that could be incorporated into the plan.
- » If there was expanded emphasis for cultural & educational activities
- » It included the amphitheatre and sheltered learning center.
- » Concept option 1 is fine, if the new granular trail connection does not interfere with the existing, naturalized dirt trail known locally on Trailforks.com as "Oleskiw Meadows", enjoyed by trail runners, mountain bikers, and fat bikers.
- » As an active user both on cycle and hiking with children through the natural trails I believe there are numerous natural trails that would be disrupted through insertion of gravel trails. Since gravel trails don't add access to visitors with mobility issues and would disrupt the natural terrain,

I would prefer a real option that maintains the habitat and looks at adding amenities in alignment of the real trails and land.

- » On both Concept 1 and Concept 2, there are plans for a singletrack connector between Flat Pete and Logarithmic, which is great. But both options also show the multi-use path replacing Oleskiw Meadows.
- » Less development of man made features
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » I would like Concept Option #1 better if there were some progression dirt jumps for mountain bikers. Most dirt jumps in the city are not geared towards progression and difficult to access in the case of emergency (on steep parts of river valley). To do dirt jump progression, cyclists often have to travel to Devon.
- » The developer is in the detail. The gravel is not too intrusive but I believe the project manager will need to review the route and construction in detail to limit damage to the existing natural habitats. There are a lot of deer and coyotes using that open space and it would be good to leave tall natural grass and a gap between the existing trees and the gravel to maintain their habitats
- » there were less signs and trail markers. The entry signs at the very north end along the trail, at the north end of the top-of-bank trail and at the trailhead at Woodward Crescent are not needed. Entry signs at the Ft. Ed footbridge, the north end of the paved trail (south of junction with bridge trail) and at the south end near the Terwillegar Trail are all that is needed. Keep it simple. Also, way too many trail markers. Only the junctions need markers. Let's not spend more than is needed. I think the Master Plan needs to acknowledge access to the sandbar in much the same way as the Buena Vista Laurier Park Master Plan acknowledged access to the "dog beach". The sandbar provides many recreational and user experience opportunities not provided elsewhere in the park. This sandbar has existed for much longer than "Accidental Beach" and its potential needs to be recognized. There is a great narrow dirt trail in the area of the proposed north-south granular trail. This existing singletrack trail should be maintained; the granular trail should avoid impacts to this trail.
- » i like concept 1
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain

bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA"

- » there was no proposal for a granular trail through the meadow.
- » by not putting in the gravel trail, the city removes yet another path that they have to maintain. There are many paths in the city that the parks department cannot maintain, a better use would be to repair and maintain the backlog rather than add to it. The existing single track is accessible to mountain bikers and to pedestrians.
- » I would like it better if the city stopped putting stuff (art granular and paved trails, learning circles etc.) and just stuck with the natural trails and single track.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » It is critical that either plan allows for the continued use of the area by mountain bikers, who are arguably one of the largest users of the park, and among the least represented in the consultation process. Ensuring that the existing single track is preserved for trail runners and bikers is key, as the city has a propensity to advance projects like this at the expense of the existing user base.
- » ... it did not include the new granular trail connection.
- » No granular trail added at the expense of existing singletrack trail.
- » no new natural trail connection no biking on paths adjacent to river no play area or washrooms
- » I would like concept 1 better if the new natural trail connection (blue dotted) was omitted and if the new granular trail (yellow dotted) was omitted.

#### **Is there anything you would improve in Concept 2?**

- » If it included a playground
- » I would like the concept option # 2 if New granular trails were not installed. New paved trails were not built. Keeping more of the park in its original natural design.
- » it had more re-naturalization and less emphasis on open space.

- » you got rid of the silly golf hole - and that's a golfer saying it.
- » it had more natural areas
- » If the trails that are proposed in 1 were included.
- » Restored more nature and didn't leave so much open field.
- » It had more natural trails.
- » If it allowed for separate pedestrian and cycle paths as stated above. Are the granular trails wheelchair friendly?
- » Included a better strategy to reduce pedestrian-cyclist conflicts. I also don't care about the historic golf hole.
- » I understood the golf hole better. I am confused why that would be added. I like the added paths of concept 2 but I struggle with understanding why we need more golf courses in the area. I am probably not sure if I understand that correctly.
- » I would like concept 2 better if it had more Natural Trails
- » If the focus were more on nature rather than historic settler usage and introduction of more infrastructure.
- » indoor buildings and amphitheaters sound expensive should be scrapped unless privately funded without tax dollars.
- » was more reconciliation focused
- » it preserved more trees
- » There was only 1 east/west granular trail.
- » Forest trail introduced to reduce pedestrian and cyclist conflicts.
- » ...it didn't have so many gravel paths.
- » continue the paved trail from the Ford Edmonton footbridge to the neighbourhoods
- » it explicitly accounted for different uses and especially reducing conflict on trails
- » I would like conception option #2 better if: there were better descriptions of the capacity for winter sport on the proposed trails; you defined if any of the proposed trails would be off or on leash; if you identified the costs of building properly drained trails through the suggested routes; if you provided any contextualize on how you visualize trail use growing and how different uses will share/ utilize the proposed design.
- » more forest was restored.
- » No open field, no golf course.
- » I would like both concepts better if the new granular trail would be eliminated or would be a natural trail. If the granular trail stays in, then I would like a ban for bikes on the natural trails. Bikes should stay on the granular and paved trails.
- » A trail around a historical golf hole was not established.
- » no
- » All told, I think I like the East side of Concept 1, and the West side of Concept 2.
- » It included a playground near the picnic area, like concept #1
- » If it had more natural than granular
- » see above comments
- » The concept outlined key participation advantages.
- » I would like Concept Option #2 better if the two new granular trails running east and west were removed.
- » more natural trail connectivity was added.
- » The gravel trail was paved.
- » it was more simple. No need for an out door theatre when it is winter more months than summer, would not be used.
- » Not sure if a historic golf hole warrants preservation in a park.
- » One less path to the historic golf hole
- » I am able to spot where the trash bins, and washroom facilities would be to help me assess better.
- » ... you keep it simple! Not too elaborate.
- » There was a more developed plan to support the open fields as a wildlife corridor connecting with city boundaries.
- » Seems pretty complete
- » It included the forest area.
- » add North South gravel trail
- » Less naturalized grass
- » It had new trails
- » There was more of a focus on the natural environment, instead of just learning about the environment.
- » I like Concept 2 better if it had the one new nature trail in the forest that concept one has
- » it included the connector trail between flat pete and logarithmic.
- » As an active user both on cycle and hiking with children through the natural trails I believe there are numerous natural trails that would be disrupted through insertion of gravel trails. Since gravel trails don't add access to visitors with mobility issues and would disrupt the natural terrain, I would prefer a real option that maintains the habitat and looks at adding amenities in alignment of the real trails and land.
- » "Oleskiw Meadows" will replace a trailsfkr trails with a 3m wide multi-use track on their current Oleskiw River Valley Park Master Plan. Way waste the money and create something that is already there. People in nature want to be in nature and not some wide gravel perfect trail please consider the people the love and use bear trails. Runners, walkers, bikers, dog walkers. We all share and love the simple natural trail
- » Less development of man made features
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA

- » I would like Concept Option #2 better if there were some progression dirt jumps for mountain bikers. Most dirt jumps in the city are not geared towards progression and difficult to access in the case of emergency (on steep parts of river valley). To do dirt jump progression, cyclists often have to travel to Devon.
- » Eliminate the doubled up east-west "historic golf course hole" trail. Avoid trails near the east-west restored forest connection to maximize attractiveness to wildlife.
- » the amphitheatre concept is dropped. I don't believe the golf course hole is required. there's nothing special about it
- » there was no proposal for a granular trail through the meadow.
- » I would like it better if the city stopped putting stuff (art granular and paved trails, learning circles etc.) and just stuck with the natural trails and single track.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » I would like Option 2 better if there were fewer East-West connector trails.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » ... it did not include the new granular trail connection.
- » No granular trail added at the expense of existing singletrack trail.
- » restored more of the field to forest no biking on paths adjacent to river
- » I would like concept 2 better if the new granular trail (yellow dotted) was omitted. I don't mind the trail outlining the historic gold hole.
- » Clustering the picnic, shelter, and washroom areas closer to Terwilligar Park seems to make more sense to me.
- » Don't want buildings in a country park
- » most activities in one area instead of spread out
- » Least amount of new structures is best. Rest areas are not good for current users. Please don't ruin this park with development. Look to your users. Has anyone in the city actually gone and visited this park? It gets a lot of use -- see who your users are -- we are happy the way it is. Don't ruin a good thing.
- » I prefer having the amenities at the south end of the park, as I think this location would see more use from both the Terwilliger and Oleskiw park users.
- » Amphitheater would likely get little use due to lack of vehicle access points
- » I don't know if the natural paths need all of the view points and development.
- » Resting points, no amphitheater which is not needed.
- » it is less invasive - we already have lots of parks in the city for too many activities - it is time we give nature a chance to be more natural and that we can enjoy that softness and calmness
- » Don't waste money on learning circles and outdoor classrooms. If you want to teach people about the restoration of the park, put out descriptive signs. The learning elements proposed for both areas will become just like every other attempt the city has made to make educational facilities in parks. It will not be open enough for the majority of people to even access it and overall will be a large outlay of money with little benefit.
- » Picnic and play area would be great for my grandkids and I like the resting spots on the trails for me
- » I like the natural play area
- » I prefer the location of the amenities like the class room and washrooms. There are a lot of reasons for me to cross the bridge from Terwilligar ( I go there often with my dog). i'm not sure I would walk all the way up to the top and I am not sure if I would drive there.
- » I prefer #2 because it is less cluttered with structures that need maintenance. I do like the amphitheatre because it could be used by non-professional groups.
- » I'm interested in the opportunity for people to learn about restoration and native species.
- » I like the location of the rest rooms as I would most likely be coming from the Terwilliger foot bridge.
- » The sheltered areas would be helpful with young children crossing the park.
- » My concern with concept #1 is the resting points around the natural trails. These resting points could cause conflict between mountain bikers and pedestrians. Better to avoid over developing the awesome trail network that is available in this park.

**Park Use & Amenities: Which Concept has programs and amenities that you would prefer to use? Provide reasons for your answer.**

- » Bathrooms should be available in all parks.
- » Open learning circles with interpretive elements work for all ages. If it is a classroom it becomes more single purpose. I also like the natural play structure idea
- » Looking for trails to walk on. I do not care for the educational portions in either plan
- » No sheltered classroom and more washrooms.

- » I don't see the need for a sheltered classroom and amphitheatre in concept 2
- » I think a lot of the educational goals can be met without an amphitheater (outdoor area and potentially guided walking tours)
- » Both seem costly so unless it is being funded without tax dollars i am not in favor of this endeavor.
- » Either one works for me!
- » less intrusive
- » more resting areas and lookouts seem nice
- » Love the winter installation idea.
- » Shelters are critical to get out of the elements. The park is very bleak, and the winds can be brutal at times. But no washrooms? Seriously?
- » I like the small open amphitheater and the gathering place. I am missing the resting points you have in concept 1.
- » Less things along the trail, larger sheltered area at one end.
- » -Rest stop areas are good -pit washroom at southend is good for people who cant/wont wait to go back up to north end
- » I mostly use this park for mountain biking. A source of water would be welcome as this also does not exist in Terwilligar. As for nature viewing, seating, open areas, I would not use these, just the nature trails
- » Fewer disruptions to the natural environment.
- » I like concept option 2 because it creates hubs at both ends of the park but leaves the in-between area more "natural". I think there should be washrooms at either end of the park. It's a big area and far from other facilities.
- » How many people do you actually anticipate using these amenities??? You've already ID parking and distance issues - where will these groups of people park for any of the amenities?
- » I don't think the classroom or amphitheatre would be used - too remote with no vehicle access
- » The option with the most preserved natural habitat and restored natural habitat is best for animal use and education.
- » Resting points and natural play structures.
- » I don't like our parks cluttered up with facilities. I want to feel that I am out in the wild.
- » More amenities, resting spots are good. Like the idea of the learning circle.
- » Least intrusive, least expensive option.
- » Option 1 seems to have more features that I believe the public will gain benefit from.
- » Still preferring the addition of the extra 'bike' trail. All told, I think I like the East side of Concept 1, and the West side of Concept 2.
- » Resting points for winter are very good
- » More like a park should be.
- » Having washrooms here is crucial. More permanent ones are required for Terwilligar park as well.
- » Wildlife viewing is an example of a key advantage.
- » Pit toilet and play area
- » Lots of resting spots for people to sit and enjoy the experience. NO PLAY AREA. And pit toilets or portapotties throughout the park and not just in a few spots.
- » I only cycle in the area and prefer the wild quiet feel of the park, so selfishly, I would prefer a quieter area with less pedestrians.
- » More frequent resting areas.
- » Better access and use of the park
- » A more developed learning area could be good to allow more people to use the park.
- » Fewer man-made intrusions
- » More useful for casual visitors - ie, does not rely on having interpreters or other programs to operate the classroom.
- » It is essential for the public to have washrooms and resting points allow for individuals of all capabilities.
- » Washroom placement is so important, which side is the most accessed?
- » Once again simple and focused on nature. Not structures to take away from nature. Very few people will use the look out points. People use the trails.
- » Resting areas are a good idea for people with mobility issues.
- » I am not sure I like the addition of so many structures like shelters or viewing sites, the winter installation or the outdoor education
- » At this stage, both looks good to me. I'll maximize both.
- » don't need an amphitheatre - it is a little too much for the space
- » I prefer the less developed, more nature-focused refuge concept and its underlying values.
- » Groups in for educational programming require a roofed shelter.
- » Provision of the most options while maintaining the area more natural
- » I am not sure how much use the outdoor classroom and amphitheatre would get. Perhaps if there were examples of other places in edmonton that has been successful or if there was a relationship with school system to have that well used would help with supporting that.
- » Washrooms and resting areas would be wonderful
- » Less permanent building structures, which I believe take away from the nature aspect.
- » I think both look great.
- » I'm very intrigued by the idea of the natural play structures.
- » I just think it's a better use of the whole area.
- » I think the learning areas should be on the south side or in Terwilliger. More accessible . See above.

- » I like the location of the picnic area in concept 2. I think the location of the south picnic area in concept 1 is too close to the existing trail and would make biking through the park more difficult
  - » It includes washrooms and is less developed.
  - » Learning centre and washrooms at the north end of the park are more accessible to west ridge residents. Like the learning centre concept, outdoor class room is more user friendly.
  - » Too much development. The appeal of this park is that you do not feel like you are in the city. We are not short of play areas, picnic areas, benches, and signs in this city. What we are short of is refuge from the city. This was made abundantly clear in the consultation process.
  - » I enjoy riding the single track trails as they currently exist.
  - » Features, structures and installations leave a human footprint. This is an amazing natural city scape that is truly unique yet so close to a bus stop. What's wrong with leaving some low impact development?
  - » People like to be in a natural space and enjoy the lay of the land the way it is
  - » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
  - » Keeping the park in a more natural state is preferred because it will mean less construction and there by less interruption for the users of the area.
  - » Sheltered picnic areas and natural play structures sound good. Resting points (and lookouts) along natural trails may encourage more traffic not aware of the primary use of the trails - mountain bike and trail runner traffic is cognizant and aware of fast moving traffic whereas slow/large parties often are not and present a hazard to other trail users.
  - » The gathering place in concept 1 scare me. Construction will damage more habitats than you need to and the only people I have seen gather in the bush are homeless and teenage party's. Better to keep gather spots that are visible from the current asphalt trail
  - » I don't think this park needs a "play area" as shown in Option 1. I also like the idea of a wildlife viewing platform in Option 2. I also have doubts about the level of use a "winter installation" would receive.
  - » it's low-key, keeping the groups small. I like the concept of the learning circle as opposed to a classroom. keep any structures as minimal as possible!
  - » The park is beautiful as it is. I'd like to see the park undeveloped but the installation of pit toilets and picnic areas would be a reasonable addition. I am strongly opposed to the proposed amphitheater and picnic shelter as I feel structures I. The river valley take away from the beauty of these areas and add little to them. Why do we need to bulldoze and build over nature? We need to learn to appreciate and preserve nature as it is and the park gives us this opportunity in its current form.
  - » Resting areas are concentrated away from narrow natural trails.
  - » a smattering of features that serve to finish off the budget, the differences between the concepts are quite undistinguishable from a usage standpoint
  - » More is not always better.
  - » Not sure why the city feels the need to continually add "stuff" to the beautiful natural areas we have.
  - » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
  - » I prefer Concept 2 because it does less to disturb the trail along the bank of the river and because it offers a washroom at the north end of the park.
  - » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
  - » like the wildlife viewing area
  - » Less human footprint on nature is best!
  - » For either option, the sandbar is a popular beach in the summer. Access should be improved, so that people are not forced to make multiple ad hoc trails.
  - » Please stop building things down there, it's great just the way it is
  - » Appears to be lower impact.
  - » I like the wildlife viewing area.
  - » Again, there are certain things from each concept that I like and others I don't.
  - » I like the idea of having a nature viewing station in the park.
- Is there anything you would improve in Concept 1?**
- » If it eliminated the learning circle
  - » it also included a wildlife viewing area.
  - » You do not allow cyclists on the same path as pedestrians - sheer lunacy. As pedestrians we have to put up with that daily in the city -please not in a park
  - » There were no development

- » I don't believe existing enhanced viewpoints are used very often. I've ridden many of the river valley trails frequently and those viewpoint areas are often empty.
- » had less amenities
- » there was more than one washroom facility. (small children)
- » I'd like to see natural play structures for both adults and children.
- » If it had the wild life viewing structure over the art installation
- » I would like concept option #1 better if there were no gathering spaces along the natural trails.
- » It did not include the resting areas.
- » it had more smaller hangouts
- » Covered facilities introduced.
- » the small open amphitheater is included.
- » ...there were no rest areas along the natural paths.
- » Running water at least for refilling water and quenching thirsty hikers
- » it was a little leaner on the public involvement side.
- » It didn't have rest areas along the trails
- » I'd like it better with more garbage cans. If there weren't so many forest amenities near the river bank - it's destroying the vital, yet elusive nature of solitude that the park currently provides.
- » It didn't have the outdoor classroom
- » ...you all just left it alone. I like it the way it is.
- » Remove gathering spaces on natural trail
- » Wildlife viewing areas! More art
- » no
- » All told, I think I like the East side of Concept 1, and the West side of Concept 2.
- » It had a wildlife viewpoint like concept #2
- » - need one more garbage can along the rivers edge trail halfway between the north and south points.
- » It could be more activity specific.
- » I would like Concept Option #1 better if the learning circle had an overhead shelter (protect from rain), and if there was a washroom at both ends of the park.
- » I like concept one but I think there needs to be a north washroom/pit toilet with either plan.
- » Don't allow mountain biking - it is very damaging to trails when less than dry, and still damaging even if dry
- » I think more nature, less amphitheater, classroom, etc. Don't students go into nature to get away from these things?
- » if it further minimized the human use features.
- » If it could incorporate more open field.
- » more educational options
- » There is a great natural beach/ Island at the north end of the park which can be difficult to access when the river is high. A bridge to this beach would be great so it could be accessed all summer.
- » It had the ampitheatre
- » I do not like the idea of winter installation. What is that? Why? The number of people using that park, unless Birkebiner and stuff like that uses the area, is going to be pretty small in winter.
- » the picnic and play area were moved off of the main paved path
- » There were picnic tables near the other end as well
- » learning centre and washrooms were included at north end.
- » Less development of man made features
- » No winter art installation. The park is beautiful as it is, it doesn't need art. I like the idea of nature play for children.
- » Four enhanced viewpoints is too many, especially the two in close proximity to each other adjacent to the sandbar. I can't appreciate what is meant by "gathering space" or "winter installation". A bench should be provided along the proposed granular trail.
- » a bench isn't need on the natural trail. If you need the bench you should use the main trail.
- » in concept #1 loose the gathering space and view points. because to me that sounds like talking out trees. and we want to keep the area as natural as possible
- » it didn't have multiple resting areas and viewpoints in the middle of the trail. I would like them more concentrated towards the north or south ends, limited to just one in the middle accessed by another trail from the meadow.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » I would like Concept 1 better if it did not have 'gathering spaces' on the trail along the riverbank.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » no washrooms no shelter no biking on paths adjacent to river no learning circle
- » I would like Concept 1 better if the education circle was natural (like a circle of rocks or logs), no new structures were built and if the washrooms were a composting style (like in some national Parks) to eliminate the needs of big vac trucks coming to clean them out.
- » There was a washroom at the north end of the park, close to Ft Edmonton Bridge, as well as a drinking water source. It would be preferable to have a washroom at both ends, but I



believe there are washroom facilities in the Terwillagar Dog park already, which is close to the south end.

### Is there anything you would like to improve in Concept 2?

- » If it eliminated the outdoor classroom
- » There were no development
- » If the washrooms were located near the Terwilliger footbridge.
- » Get rid of the learning facilities and I like option 2 better.
- » There were more rest areas, seating etc at the southern tip.
- » I would like Option #2 to have resting spots provided.
- » It provided more active opportunities rather than passive.
- » there was no picnic area
- » food trucks
- » Washrooms introduced.
- » resting points are added.
- » ...it didn't have as large structures.
- » Running water at least for refilling water and quenching thirsty hikers
- » There were play areas at both ends of the park
- » Why do you have a wildlife viewing area with trails going in three different directions? Despite the urbanized deer, what wildlife are you hoping is brave enough to walk through the trails to be seen at the edge of a forest with multiple trails? I'd like it better if all picnic stations and shelters had garbage cans. I'd like it better if you didn't have seating in weird areas - like beside the golf course maintenance yard; or in high wind zones in the winter.
- » more natural area was restored.
- » ...You didn't use it.
- » Remove amphitheatre
- » Rest stops More art
- » no
- » All told, I think I like the East side of Concept 1, and the West side of Concept 2.
- » It had a winter use area like concept #1. Also, more seating along the natural trail area closest to the river. Users with mobility issues, or elderly may need to sit more frequently and this trail would not be accessible.
- » Washrooms south side (as that would be the nearest to the parking), scraped the amphitheater as they never get used and it takes away from the natural aspect of the park.
- » - need one more garbage can along the rivers edge trail halfway between the north and south points.
- » The concept could offer a level of seasonal guidance.
- » Instead of the amphitheatre and outdoor classroom, use the learning circle from concept 1. I don't think the amphitheatre will see much use to justify construction.
- » as above in Option #1
- » It didn't have an amphitheater.
- » there were no amphitheatre
- » if it further minimized the human use features.
- » If the open field could be integrated with a wildlife corridor to the city limits.
- » Possibly more rest stations
- » it had option 1's winter installation. Also is there going to be a place to put a Kayak, canoe or any boat into the river from this location?
- » there was less developed space. Natural areas are preferred. We don't need a classroom located outdoors. Outdoor learning should be done outdoors.
- » Less development of man made features
- » The wildlife viewing structure makes no sense - what is its purpose? People can view wildlife from the trails, this is a waste. I like the idea of nature play for children. I also don't understand the educational area. A learning circle, sure, but a shelter isn't needed.
- » Four enhanced viewpoints is too many, especially the two in close proximity to each other adjacent to the sandbar. I don't think a shelter is a necessary component of the picnic area. A bench should be provided along the proposed granular trail.
- » remove any structures, i.e. classroom and wildlife watching structure. the location of the south picnic area is odd. Keep it next to the paved trail and bridge
- » it didn't have multiple resting areas and viewpoints in the middle of the trail. I would like them more concentrated towards the north or south ends, limited to just one in the middle accessed by another trail from the meadow.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » I would like Concept 2 better if it did not contain a 'nature play' area on the north side of the park.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » no biking on path adjacent to river
- » Hate the picnic sites...the more people, the less wildlife. There are so many other areas available in the city to picnic. Would prefer the educational area be near the Ft. Edmonton Footbridge - would seem more accessible there.

- » I would like Concept 2 better if the education circle was natural (like a circle of rocks or logs), no new structures were built. The learning circle is more natural and low impact.

**Natural Asset Management: Which Concept provides natural areas that you would prefer to visit / have occur in the park? Provide reasons for your answer.**

- » It feels more natural and 'wild' as maintaining the open field sounds like it would require ongoing intervention (mowing etc)
- » Quit telling me where I can and can't go
- » the park is being restored to a natural state. minimizing human destructors.
- » I would prefer trees to plains and/or prairie vegetation.
- » Prefer as much re-naturalization as possible.
- » most natural
- » Whatever is best for the animals using the area
- » Grassland maintained
- » Personal preference for more vegetation and less field
- » what about cost. I cannot provide opinion without cost estimates.
- » I think natural habitat should be encourage, not diversifying to create habitats that would not naturally occur there.
- » Forest restoration
- » I like the idea of planting more forest
- » Too much emphasis on the field in option 2. Fields are only really a benefit for dog parks, which will reduce the natural wildlife living in the area. Option 2, in my opinion, will be better for promoting active living by providing walks through wooded areas in an urban setting.
- » More types of vegetation and habitat
- » like the natural prairie area
- » Restores the most nature
- » I think the grasslands will make the area more approachable. Going up to a forested area, one is never sure if you are supposed to be there. The grasslands will open it up and help people see that they are welcome. Signage is easier to spot this way as well.
- » Like the idea of both grass and trees.
- » I'm not familiar enough with the ecology and if one option is a better option for encouraging the health of the local ecosystem. Diverse habitats are appealing but is it the healthier option?
- » I really like the forest restoration idea.
- » A balance between maintained and natural green space should be the goal
- » This concept seems to restore the land to the natural state with a natural occurring mix of vegetation/forest.
- » There is already a wide open field in neighbouring Terwillegar Park. I think the focus for Oleskiw should be naturalization. I'm not sure that open fields would have been part of this landscape before settlers arrived.
- » I like more interpretive signage in the park.
- » more trees!
- » Open field is nice for using in winter when you can feel the sun. In forest it becomes to shaded and cold.
- » Accidental Beach hasn't taught anyone anything? People want access to the river!!! They want to see the river!!! Aren't we a river city!!! If I wanted to walk through a forest I can go to Elk Island and at least get to see animals.
- » Forest is more heavily used and enjoyed by people in parks such as Terwillegar; provides more interesting things to do
- » I like the idea of more trees vs open field and trees
- » neither concept impacts my primary use of the park. Additional forest along the paved trail might make a more compelling trail and breaks from summer heat
- » Forested areas have a more sustainable wildlife biome. Open fields will encourage random romping through the areas where they exist.
- » I'd like to know more about the area - like why is there a field? What is this landscape best suited to...forest?! I guess I need more information before deciding
- » Option 1 destroys one of the few open fields in Edmonton with that scope and scale, I'd like to preserve it even if it isn't natural
- » I like the idea of full forest restoration, returning to original form
- » Tiny bits of habitat are of very little use to most animals. The larger the natural area the more diversity.
- » Almost ALL natural aspects. #1 is the proposed reforestation and natural plants. Please keep this one plain and simple.
- » I like the open field. Just let the forest come back on its own, without plantings.
- » Build more forest and tree cover.
- » Allow the area to return to its natural habitat as much as possible.
- » My thought is that the area was predominately forest before the golf course and the farm and once it becomes reestablished it will be more likely to stay that way.
- » If the forest is the natural developmental stage for the area, that should be fostered.
- » more diversity
- » Like restoring vegetation.
- » I like the openness of the meadow currently. It would be a shame to lose that. Definitely keep some.
- » It is very important to include more habitat areas within the park, including prairie restoration and grasslands.
- » I value the east-west connection.

- » Was it trees or prairie years ago? I do like the thought of native prairie and shrubs
- » For me, forest restoration is more important.
- » Lots of native vegetation desired.
- » Restoration of native plants is extremely important.
- » PLEASE maintain the open field!! It's beautiful and unique.
- » The greater variety of concept 2 is attractive
- » Better habitat for animals.
- » We don't need any more open fields in the river valley.
- » Better use of the park
- » I appreciate the extra habitat types that are encouraged in this concept.
- » Having different types of environments is preferred.
- » I like the variety for educational purposes
- » Whichever is most economical, many times I have seen unnecessary plantings of trees when it would be filled in by natural growth soon enough. For example by the Footbridge that connects the zoo area to Hawrelak park there are 5 areas where the city planted trees, placed large boulders and fenced off the area where I feel it was not necessary. An indiscreet fencing would have allowed nature to fill in the area quite sufficiently and far more cost effective.
- » Like the restored prairie, trees and scrubs. Not so much brome grass field.
- » Less maintenance, the city has enough to groom.
- » Let nature do its thing. DON'T ADD STUPID, USELESS "ART" ANYWHERE! This is a waste of money, we don't need statues or clumps of meaningless metal in the middle of a "natural setting"
- » the greater variety of plants and shrubs that will be planted is appealing to me.
- » Restoring forest habitat is an ecological need and priority. I also would find it more attractive for visits, as there are few options for undeveloped, highly trafficked wooded areas.
- » Better mix of habitats supported... we need more open fields... trees grow naturally... more than appropriate without Mother Nature providing fires.
- » Natural vegetation and species should be used as much as possible (possible exception for slumpage mitigation)
- » the eco-system variety
- » Don't mess with nature. Refrain from introducing vegetation that isn't natural to the area.
- » more diverse than concept 1
- » Strikes me as less maintenance. The important thing that both concepts have is growing forest in the former farmers field, that should be the priority and don't confuse it with trying to establish and maintain a bunch of different habitats that no one will notice anyway.
- » Portions of the open field should be maintained
- » I prefer treed area versus grassland.
- » I like the forest area in Option 1.
- » like the restoration of a variety of vegetation communities helps to create a variety of habitats throughout the park.
- » Restoring prairie and maintain the grassland provides a more unique experience in the river valley, which is largely forested. While the hay field was introduced, the concept of maintaining open areas through fire and clearing was also practiced by indigenous people to attract bison.
- » I like the more heavily forested landscape.
- » Anything that uses native planting makes sense to me.
- » Since so much of our river valley is forested vegetation I think restoring some native prairie and keeping the brome field would be a nice change. this would add more diversity to the river valley, something different
- » It maintains more of the field.
- » like the idea of more forest and native habitat
- » Like the idea of integrating the prairie habitat. Although not natural will provide a good learning experience.
- » Add the native prairie/shrub area to plan 1.
- » Variety
- » Just let it be and put money toward development that needs to be developed or rehabilitated. The irony is that a wild space will grow if you let it. Sometimes there is value in doing less and embracing the natural beauty we are so lucky to have been gifted.
- » As long as the area is not developed I don't really care if it's forest or field. A forest might be nice for wildlife movement and birds. A combination of both might provide habitat for multiple animals.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » The open field is a very nice area for dog walkers and hikers to stroll and enjoy nature.
- » Option 2 provides a better overall balance in habitat types being encouraged. I especially like the wooded east-west connection extending from the ravine to the west. This connection should accommodate seasonal ephemeral surface water flow from the ravine. During spring melt and after heavy rain there is significant flow from that ravine (it overtops the trail; a culvert is needed under the paved SUP).
- » we're not mother nature - keep from further disturbing it.
- » I like both proposals as they both have the potential to enhance beautiful natural areas. However, the installation of the proposed granular trail would build a massive fault line dividing the forest and grassland that the animals of the area live in and use. Why would we do this? For human

enjoyment? There is already a low impact, volunteer maintained trail that humans and animals use and it should not be changed or expanded.

- » As long as the natural trail through the meadow is maintained, the forest could be restored to the meadow.
- » I vastly prefer Concept 2 because it leaves a larger portion of the brome grass field intact. This is a very important part of the park as it allows for expansive views and a better feeling for the size of the park. It also honours the heritage of the landscape and pays tribute to Alberta's agricultural history.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » While I don't support the amphitheatre in Option 2, I do think the mix of vegetation is preferable. A large portion of the park is already forested, and maintaining prairie or grassland sections would be good.
- » Lower impact and maintains existing field.
- » "The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA"
- » restore east west connection as in #1
- » I like the idea of established (rather than restored) prairie (native plants). I don't think there needs to be any built structures (like a wildlife lookout) or shelter. Restored forest is a good idea, but using suckers from the current trees, not having to plant a bunch of new ones. I also don't think the open field needs to be mowed. The City of Edmonton has seemed to demonstrate that letting grasses grow is good for erosion control, maintaining habitat for insects and rodents and will retain more water.

#### **Is there anything you would improve in Concept 1?**

- » it also provided more east-west connections.
- » it had native prairie and native shrubs
- » Less field
- » There didn't seem to be a wall of woods.
- » I would like concept option #1 better if there were a mix of grasses and shrubs planted.
- » I would like concept #1 if restoration was complete to natural habitat.
- » more restoration

- » more open field was retained
- » If there was river access or viewpoints.
- » ...the east-west connection was restored.
- » it allowed for multiple kinds of habitats - concept 1 seems like only forest. why?
- » If it didn't have so much forest.
- » Native plant area.
- » I would like concept 1 better if it restored the east-west connection
- » Would be nice to see concept 1 preserve more of the existing meadow
- » It were more like option #2
- » It better accommodated competitive interests.
- » again, cease mountain biking - too damaging
- » I really like it, no changes.
- » if it reforested the entire area.
- » Allowed a greater variety of systems
- » Build a bridge to the sandbar
- » include the restored prairie
- » Need to explain and justify exclusion of the sandbar from the planning of both options.
- » it's too idealistic and makes the park a forest
- » I would like Concept 1 better if it left more of the brome grass field intact.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » if the east west connections were included.
- » "The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA"
- » See comments above.

#### **Is there anything you would improve in Concept 2?**

- » there wasn't the east west path with the golf course
- » Eliminated the open field; restore nature instead.
- » I'm very happy with this concept and can't see how I would improve it.
- » Depending on the wind directions, which concept would thrive better as we know the strength of the winds will be growing with climate change.
- » food options
- » If there was river access or view points.
- » ...there was more overall trees.

- » i understood better what the different habitats would be and why only a small area can be native prairie/shrubs
- » If the East/West connections were eliminated as they are not necessary
- » More large areas of natural habitat were created. The habitat should be authentic. If this was originally prairie then reintroduce prairie. If it was mixed forest create mixed forest.
- » You forgot about this one.
- » less grass emphasis
- » There was less field.
- » If it put more of the brome into restores prairie plants and shrubs and trees.
- » Less of the field was maintained
- » There was more treed area and less brome grass fields.
- » as above
- » There was less grooming of natural field.
- » if it had a larger forested area
- » Why to concern for “some forest growth”? Can't a park have some wide open fields and grasses? Can't we encourage more grassland species and other ruminants (well OK, not Bison)?
- » I appreciate what is presented
- » Build a bridge to the sandbar
- » Any natural creeks running through the area that can be incorporated?
- » More open field was forested.
- » left more natural space.
- » I like this idea.
- » I would like Concept 2 better if it left more of the brome grass field intact, particularly on the south side of the park.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » “The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA”
- » See comments above.

**Atmosphere & Identity: Which Concept has elements that would help create an atmosphere you would like to experience? Provide reasons for your answer.**

- » More natural and less feeling like a staged classroom
- » Just let me walk in the park. Don't turn it into something else
- » Maintenance is minimal. Recusing cost and taxes.
- » Trees! If I want to see hay bales, I'll drive outside the city around some farms.
- » Better focus on winter activities and ecology.
- » It doesn't have shelters that distract from the natural environment - stop planning parks for sissies
- » i like concept 2 without the field
- » most natural possible
- » Not sure
- » Even though it's nice to think these spaces will be used by educational groups I think that differs from reality. Maybe an early spike in interest followed by a quick waning interest to organize events in these locations due to logistics.
- » leave it as is.
- » The key statement - winding trails ... invite visitors to explore the park and feel connected to nature. This is KEY. lots of development along the river valley. Having more pockets of nature, feeling away from hustle and bustle while within city limits is important.
- » I think this concept is less intrusive
- » I like the idea of concept 1, but drop the art installations. The city has NEVER managed to do art installations correctly, temporary or otherwise. Because of how subjective art is, especially for those who seem to pick it for the city, art is often a more divisive element than uniting element. And the money expended has very rarely been worth the public benefit.
- » Like the winter installations
- » I like winding trails
- » Less invasive
- » I like the idea of a winter installation and that it will encourage outdoor Edmonton in the winter. Further I am a big fan of self guided tours. Interpretive snag always feels like a treasure found on a trail. When it's maintained it very fun to stop, read and share.
- » I like the involvement of communities to take an active role in parks along the river valley.
- » I like the educational opportunities about restoration but also like the opportunity for temp art installations.
- » Differing programming areas and opportunities seem like the best use
- » I prefer the minimal installations, man-made disruptions in the park. The beauty of the natural areas is artistic and does not require artificial art installations. Any shelters should blend with nature.

- » The more shelters involved the more policing needed
- » I like the idea for warming stations.
- » I do really like the idea of all these installations, I just worry about the impact to the environment. I'm sure it can be done in a gentle way.
- » I like the winter installations in 1. I like the variety of environments in 2.
- » Winter installations are a great idea.
- » I enjoy more nature based recreation activities.
- » Less infrastructure along the natural trails is better.
- » If additional park use is desired, the addition of warming huts could encourage people to spend more time there
- » I like that concept #2 will be done in partnership with community or partner organizations
- » I'm familiar with the shabby and worn-out "teaching" in Whitemud Nature Preserve - it's embarrassing how forgotten and unmaintained it is. I have less than zero interest in spending the suggested budget that has been placed online on another similar effort. Despite the edifying content. FWIW - I'm part of a community group that used the building at Whitemud Nature Preserve - the bathrooms are great. The indoor shared spaces are a very, very expensive warming hut. I walk daily through the River Parks in the city - the small natural gathering spaces have a distressing amount of garbage collecting in them. None of this concept plan describes the ongoing maintenance of the park as conceptualized and if it will be done better.
- » It appears to be more authentic.
- » Reforestation. Connection to nature. Education aspect and opportunities. Art installations
- » Less interference of use with restoration
- » The overall look is much more appealing.
- » I believe option one would be used more.
- » concept 2 seems a bit simpler in its approach. I like the preservation of more of the park as-is. Rehabilitating a section to native plants sounds nice.
- » More thorough.
- » A community partnership focus.
- » Concept Option #1 seems more natural to me.
- » Provide shelters/wind break for weather changes, ie summer storms. Do not need "warming shelters" as common sense would be if you are coming to an outdoor facility, one would dress appropriately. Too much coddling in the design
- » I would not use the park in the winter so I can't determine whether the shelter would be used.
- » Winter installations
- » I like the self-guide and connection to nature vision in this concept.
- » Good aspects to both
- » I like what is provided but feel it is important to have warming shelters that are suggested in concept 1. I am 64 yrs old and when using the valley it is nice and important to have shelters where one can get out of the cold. That is necessary for people to have these shelters do that the valley is usable and more inviting all year long.
- » A touch of human art or unique space to warm up in winter adds to my experience especially since this is still in a city.
- » I prefer concept one, however am tired of seeing all these artistic buildings. The concept for the warming hut, it is something that does not look functional, looks like it is expensive, does not look like it blends in with nature and will be outdated quickly.
- » I do like art in parks ( only because I value public art)
- » Parks should be natural with fewer man-made structures of any kind. Places to sit only encourage people to leave their waste behind. Include recycling bins beside garbage bins.
- » Why you don't add a coffee shop with view to your plan?
- » Community partnerships
- » Keep the building of any structures to a minimal.
- » Winter Warming Shelters should be everywhere in the river valley, love them.
- » Fewest changes to a natural area
- » I like the less is more, love the warming huts, and art.
- » I love trails through the woods. I find that the trees muffle noise which allows you to feel entirely disengaged from the hustle and bustle of living in a city. I'm also quite intrigued by the idea of experiencing winter ecologies.
- » I like the educational programming with community groups
- » very difficult to decide between the two but there is more of the educational component in concept two that appeals to me more.
- » It feels more natural to have a forested landscape. Hay bales seem out of place.
- » Whichever is cheapest and least disruptive to the natural environment that is already there.
- » I support winter use
- » Like the warming huts and forested area with nature trails
- » Warming shelters are an interesting idea, but I think it's clear that they would become a problem area. The consultations were clear: Less development. Refuge from the city. Add a few signs and benches and leave the area alone.
- » as per previous comments.
- » I like them both. Keeping it more natural is best. The natural heating art was a cool idea
- » Lots of cool features; but consistently the bike community input is overlooked. Mountain bikers are already existing users of this land. I fail to see how any of these ideas have acknowledged their type of use and needs. The mountain bike community are volunteers who build and maintain trails

and have been begging for trail signage. Its disappointing to not see progress on this and yet I see a lot of man made features and signs in these plans

- » I like elements of both, but can't pick one as there are things I don't like about both. I don't get the need for a warming shelter/art installation. I think it's a waste. I also don't like the amphitheatre/classrooms. The park is lovely now, it doesn't need extra amenities.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » Less is more, buildings should be limited and warming huts are not required.
- » Covered shelters sound nice. Make sure interpretive signs are well off of trails so as to not interfere with nighttime users. Don't encourage slow traffic to use singletrack - it is primarily used and maintained by mountain bikers and trail runners and slow/large parties unaware of the primary usage of the trail present a hazard.
- » Warming areas in a low traffic area at night is asking for a lot of maintenance and potential issues.
- » They seem very similar in nature with extensive overlap in scope. I think the infrastructure necessary to support both options could be identical.
- » let nature take it's course with just a small helping hand
- » Please do not widen the trails. The park is beautiful and vibrant as it is. Why does the city constantly destroy trails that users such as runners, cyclists and hikers already love and enjoy in low impact and healthy ways? These are the activities the city should be encouraging and promoting and widening these wonderful trails will destroy them as they are currently used and loved. The trails have created communities and relationships. People that use them year round in their current form and these trails are the most unique asset in our city. Widening these trails will fundamentally alter the the park and trails in a negative way. Instead of trying to widen trails, install structures and install granular trails to encourage people to get healthy and use the park, why aren't we educating people on its current uses and its value In its current form which would lessen our human impact on a beautiful vs what is being proposed. The park is a great asset as it is and if we as a city could embrace that we would enhance our connection with nature and lessen the cost of developing these parks. Let's educate our citizens on the existing trails, how to use and connect them together in a low impact, active way.
- » I don't like the rest stops on natural trails.

- » Less is more.
- » Too much stuff (signs seating etc) is added.
- » I like the hay bales, restored prairie educational space, and educational programming by community partners in Concept 2. I don't like the 'Winter installations' and 'small gathering spaces' in Concept 1.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » restoration of plants is important
- » Less human footprints the better. By increasing the level of traffic in this area you are also going to increase the need to make sure littering and proper respect for this environment is taken. We already have a homeless problem in these woods, I fear that warming shelters would encourage that.
- » I suspect option 1 to be generate more traction. And activity within the park
- » If you do this to this park it will eventually be just like the path in Laurier park where bikes aren't allowed on the gravel path anymore. And what fun is it to only be able to ride a mountain or cross bike on a paved path?
- » When it comes to trails, I think that avoiding cutting new trails as much as possible is important. Education spaces are a great idea, but low impact is key. Maybe have one education circle and then save moments to stop in the adjacents parks. I think keeping Oleskiw as natural as possible is important. Strategically placed and durable interpretive signs are great. I like the winter warming shelter idea as we are a winter city so if it can also be an art installation and maybe even have solar panels or something like that, that would be great.
- » no need for warming shelters or temporary art

#### **Is there anything you would improve in Concept 1?**

- » there were locations for educational programming like in the second option. One or two...
- » It'd be great if it was environmental art installations that use local materials from the river valley, and have low impact on the restoration processes while adding to the education piece.
- » I would like concept #1 better if there were signs advising visitors to remain on existing pathways, and not to litter.
- » more trails
- » more variety of environment rather than mainly forest
- » What about developing native fruit orchards? Put all that land to good use. New Canadians can be taught how our original settlers lived off the land.

- » ...there were only signs at major intersections or along paved or gravel, not along “natural” trails.
  - » additional use cases such as snowshoeing or cross country skiing would make warming huts better value
  - » it also included some element of community partnership
  - » Like better if: you could clearly explain why people will alter their behaviour to increase the small groups when there is limited parking options. So why do you want build space for that function?
  - » Signs only at the gathering areas
  - » Keep more of the existing meadow, add the native plant area.
  - » I would like Concept Option #1 better if there was no “winter installation” in the park. I don’t feel that it is needed and is an unwanted unnatural distraction and eyesore.
  - » I’d like to see option one have more indigenous information/ context.
  - » There were still room for the amphitheater or another picnic area near the north entrance.
  - » no mountain biking - by the way, I have been a mountain biker in the past
  - » Change the design of the warming huts and structures. Classic design is what is needed for function, looks and longevity.
  - » No changes.
  - » you can have community education groups come in with very little infrastructure
  - » Stronger educational supports
  - » Build a bridge to the sandbar. People already use the sandbar as a beach. It would be safer if there was a bridge to access it.
  - » If it had the best parts of concept 2!
  - » open area with restored pair at the north end is included.
  - » I’m not convinced “gathering spaces” need to be formalized.
  - » i don’t like this option. it’s man trying to be mother nature
  - » the trail should be the destination, not a rest stop.
  - » I would like Concept 1 better if it did not have ‘winter installations’ or ‘small gathering spaces’.
  - » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It’s the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
  - » See comments above.
- Is there anything you would improve in Concept 2?**
- » Educational signs on special plant species.
  - » It offered more focus on ecology and winter use.
- » it had a smaller open field. The open field encourages the off-leash dog folks. Off-leash dogs destroy the environment, and will ruin everything you’re trying to achieve ecologically. Banning them isn’t a solution, because dog people go off-leash no matter what.
  - » Encouraged using the space in the winter a bit more.
  - » I like concept 2 because it is about the natural setting and no added artwork or warming huts. But information signs are important to inform the public what is growing or happening at a specific site.
  - » Included the opportunity for temp art and warming shacks.
  - » more lighting
  - » Programming was kept small scale. Winter installations were included.
  - » What about developing native fruit orchards? Put all that land to good use. New Canadians can be taught how our original settlers lived off the land.
  - » ...there were only signs at major intersections or along paved or gravel, not along “natural” trails.
  - » warming huts
  - » it specifically mentioned the importance of use in winter
  - » You could clearly explain what is wrong with the identity of “solitude” that the park currently has.
  - » Cost over runs.
  - » It also included winter shelters
  - » It also featured the warming shelters from concept 1.
  - » if there were the additions of warming shelters or temporary art installations.
  - » as above
  - » It had multi season consideration.
  - » The educational programs are city-run.
  - » If it included the winter warming shelter... put a infra-red propane heater in the picnic shelter!
  - » Incorporate warming shelters
  - » No hay bails.
  - » It had the warming huts
  - » It made specific note of its winter uses.
  - » if it had the small gather places and the winter installations warming shelters and temporary art
  - » Include more winter activities such as Cross Country skiing.
  - » it promoted natural spaces.
  - » The interpretive signs should be either left out or maintained. Currently the city is installing them and not maintaingin them so the look like crap. Walk down the white mud creek if you want data.
  - » I like it
  - » can’t see why option couldn’t have winter shelter?
  - » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It’s the



least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA

- » it included warming shelters and temporary art.
- » ... it included art installations.
- » no large shelter
- » See comments above.

## Park Elements & Program

### What specific park elements do you prefer?

#### Access + Circulation : General Comments

- » There already exists a trail near the river bank that is seeing increased use. People need a choice between paved, flat granular and a basic trail with little improvement except maintenance.
- » I support Low environmental impact and low costs. thinking how upkeep maintenance costs/taxes will impact future generations, children, grandchildren great grandchildren.
- » N-S granular trail is less important to me, but these types of trails are good for dog walkers and cross-country skiers.
- » as long as it is useful and doesn't impede then it is a worthwhile endeavor
- » consider line of sight for granular trail so cyclists can see people on the trail.
- » the city of Edmonton cannot afford any of these ideas. Balance the books first before spending my money on new projects
- » The natural trails MUST be made inaccessible to mountain bikes and dogs, or they will destroy the ecological values that you are trying to achieve.
- » It's a natural park and should have natural trails not granular nor is the added expense a good idea.
- » Maybe not necessary
- » Granular trails are not great for cycling or running as the trail materials used in other trails (which I am basing this on) tends to be of the "ball bearing" size - making footing and tire contact sketchy.
- » Stable walkways are very important and have a less impact on the environment
- » As a mountain biker, I appreciate the efforts to reduce conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians.
- » I like that the cyclists can zoom through if they want and the walkers can use the granular trail, away from the faster paved trail when they want.
- » I would like to see concept #2 as a straight out and back trail, not a loop.

- » I support an new natural trail if it can be done without the use of tax payer funds (e.g., by donation or corporate sponsor). I however do not support expensive projects or superfluous endeavors like a "natural resting spot" with interpretive signs.
- » I like both concepts equally.
- » East/west granular trail would be better if it was just in 1 direction, not a loop.
- » Support all granular trails. The City of Edmonton has a poor record of maintenance, so I am reluctant to recommend natural trails or that will be an excuse for the City to do nothing.
- » Gravel paths are kind-of anti-cycling. It would be better to have natural or paved. Natural trails are good, but trail hazards - signs - are not.
- » resting points makes use with young children easier and more compelling to them. Granular trail should further reduce conflict on the natural trails assuming the granular trail has a similar nature experience as the natural trail
- » Minimize the natural impact. Trails are OK as is -- improved to the extent of encouraging public use (staying on the trails).
- » I think more trails are good - without trails people cannot experience the space as easily
- » People can already loop using the forest trail. More interesting is how you would like them to loop (snow shoes, x-country skiing, slowly (the elderly, children and the disabled)). As proposed this doesn't add that much functionality and is at odds with improving the environmental impact and improving wildlife habitat
- » Some benches would be appreciated in both concepts.
- » Intrusive, costly
- » I use the park for mountain biking. I love the thought of another trail connector. I like the granular loop trail an wildlife viewing station. cool idea. I have doubts about how much the interpretive signs and "gathering points" will get used, but I'm not opposed to their addition. The North-South granular trail looks like it would wipe out the existing single-track along the meadow. As long as the meadow is still there, that's cool. If the meadow gets converted back to trees, I don't think the granular trail is worth the expense.
- » Toilet facilities would be the decent thing to have.
- » As mentioned previously, two gravel trails are NOT needed going east/west through the newly proposed forested area. One is enough. Natural seating is not required anywhere.
- » Interpretive signs need to be maintained if they are installed. Many of the interpretive signs in Whitemud Ravine were damaged by falling trees and never repaired by the city. Instead, a citizen repaired them and added nature photographs.
- » These trails would provide some variety to hiking through the area.

- » I am not sure granular trails are used when paved paths are available. The usage may not justify the cost.
- » Cost should be of a major consideration and making sure that these educational changes will be accepted and used
- » If these concepts and additions are age-friendly, meaning it increases the access, usability and enjoyment of our seniors population that it would work well.
- » I would prefer to see no new trails and the entire area reforested.
- » Granular walking trails will help to separate the commuter bikers from walkers.
- » The golf course is a disruptive element in the neighbourhood. They should not be acknowledged in any way.
- » I want to see the environmental impact as low as possible
- » This is the first time throughout I feel they've really mentioned what the "cultural" part is of Concept 2 - what culture and history are they remembering. And the example is a golf hole. This admittedly makes me feel even less positively towards Concept 2.
- » I support this because I think it's important
- » The last 2 concepts are too invasive. It is a park. Leave it alone and don't mess with it too much.
- » Signage could have wood elements or materials that do not detract from the overall experience of the trail but add to the experience by having certain points where people can stop and read a fact about maybe the type of birds that reside in the area or some sort of historical fact about the area.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is. It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from various mountain bike clubs and the Edmonton Mountain Bike Alliance
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA I strongly believe that the funds required for this path would be better directed to repairing the numerous other river valley trails that already exist but have been closed indefinitely due to erosion.
- » I have observed people picnicking in the grass and sitting on logs. Also had chats with people resting on their walker seats. People seem thrilled that there is just some natural space where they can google things they find and learn on their own. If you make a look out for a deer chances are the deer will have found another home.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » Interpretive signs and large/slow groups of people are a hazard to the existing users of the natural trail in this area (bikers and runners).
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from mountain bike clubs in the city and the Edmonton Mountain Bike Alliance. Thank you.
- » New natural trail connection MUST be singletrack similar in nature to the existing north and south sections. A trail to the lookout makes sense, but it does not need to be doubled up. Gathering places are a good idea, but need very little "formalization" - don't overdo it. Ensure north-south granular trails avoids existing singletrack dirt trail along edge of field.
- » the new natural trail and granular trails give options to people and allow dispersion of users of the park

- » I do not support the widening of trails or addition of rest stops. These alterations affect the current character of the trails and destroy them as they are currently used. The installation of the north-south granular trail should not be done as I said earlier in the survey. There is already a north-south trail in the park that is used to connect the two foot bridges. As I had written earlier in the survey: I would like the proposed granular trail to be removed from the plan. It is a single track trail that is used and loved by the many cyclists, hikers and trail runners and removing this existing trail would do the park and it's users a great disservice. The installation of such a large and invasive trail would be a great disruption to the way the animals and humans currently coexist in this area. Furthermore, I have witnessed many occasions where the use of digging equipment has introduced invasive plant species such as burdock and creeping bell flower to areas that were previously free of these invasive plants. the current trail is loved by many and maintained by volunteers which keeps the maintenance costs of the park low.
  - » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
  - » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA”
  - » The existing natural trail where the proposed granular trail lies is already a great trail for kids and beginners to introduce them to singletrack running, biking, and walking.
  - » either you put in the new mountain biking trail or the mountain bikers will..... Interpretive signs are inexpensive and add to the park experience.
  - » I do not support the north-south granular trail because it would have a high environmental impact (higher than the plan estimates), but it would be nice to instead have a smaller natural trail along the same route.
  - » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
  - » Sorry missed the open house, your work is amazing. For now, the project might really need a second thought that with no major vehicle access to the center of the park, any future public investment will be worthy. The park has some very interesting feature, the only(?) nature beach and the vast open area of grass land in the river valley. It is a shame already people can't fully enjoy them, because it is almost not possible to carry things to the park, all the parking are too far, esp. for communities on the north side of river. it is understandable that because of the slope, city can't build vehicle road on the park land on north side. Is it possible city negotiate with the golf club to use their road? or part of the road? Maybe some bridge construction can be negotiated to minimize the impact to their members? viv@vivz.ca
  - » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by biker and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already well maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA.
  - » I support that either concept you build the wildlife look-out,.
  - » I must reiterate the importance of ensuring that any granular trails do not come at the expense of existing infrastructure built for and by enthusiasts that have been the major users of this area for many years. The single track can't be mowed down in favor of granular walking paths in this area yet again...
  - » “The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA”
  - » “The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
  - » this is the one time i like concept 1 better
  - » No need for the wildlife lookout - there are viewpoints from the bridges. No new structures needed. No new trails needed.
- Park Use + Amenities: General Comments**
- » I support minimal changes to the park. Some accommodation for school groups is fine. People rarely use picnic tables that are not close to vehicle parking.

- » Quite trying to add non-natural items to the park. Leave well enough alone. Besides, most of these concepts will soon be vandalized and require continuous maintenance until the elements are eventually removed.
- » How many citizens or visitors use the parks? What is the cost per user? Extrapolated to the taxes TO UPKEEP, MAINTAIN AND ADMINISTER. Keep is simple.
- » Prefer the smaller picnic areas and education areas. Don't think the need to be very big given the natural constraints of the area.
- » I don't think any groups will actually use this park. Access is too difficult -- just leave it natural.
- » The environmental impact is too high.
- » I think the educational elements are great but, I don't think they will be used enough to justify the years of ongoing maintenance they will require. Interest will drop off drastically as it has throughout the older parts of the river valley.
- » the city of Edmonton cannot afford any of these ideas. Balance the books first before spending my money on new projects. See my previous comments on Jackie Parker spray park.
- » would this actually be used? what is the return on investment.
- » Why does an outdoor classroom need a structure built for it? Same for picnic shelters. An oxymoron if I ever saw one. You go on about a natural environment and then want to build unneeded structures. Structures are not natural.
- » not sure this last one is needed We already have the gathering areas.
- » I like the natural seen rather than more lawn
- » Too far from trail heads that access the site to be practical for most groups to go for educational purposes.
- » I would like to see a few picnic tables but not ones with shelters. Also, I see the amphitheatre concept which I had earlier supported but I believe it is not necessary in the above format especially if cost is high. Outdoor classrooms -- would they really be utilized? I like to see benches and resting areas. Perhaps there would be other areas along the river valley that might be more suitable for such classrooms.
- » I would support the play area if it included innovative, natural play elements for adults and children. I generally prefer options that have minimal environmental impact but having a concentrated area for activity may be beneficial for community building.
- » I do not support unnecessary expenditures. Children can sit on the ground and are generally happy to. There are further many playground in the city and therefore these are not needed in this natural area. Instead we should be encouraging them to be in nature. As for picnic areas all that is needed is a couple of basic picnic tables which i am happy to have tax dollars go towards.
- » We need some covered shelters and more facilities in the park. Picnic tables and washrooms, along with the educational components, are important.
- » I can hardly imagine the outdoor education area ever actually being used. It would be nice to keep the area a bit more natural.
- » A picnic area without a washroom nearby might be asking for trouble.
- » Again, minimize the impact to the ecology
- » Any environmental impact as well as costs for this project should be kept to a minimum
- » No maintained lawns - it's a goofy suggestion given the budget suggestions to remove non-natural plant species from the space. The options beside the Terwilligar footbridge are the only ones really worth considering since the parking considerations around Fort Edmonton Footbridge limit group size and the distance from parking at Terwilligar and walking to the other end of the park approach 30 minutes on a clear path for a relatively mobile person.
- » If a park is about native plants and restoration then Kentucky blue grass is not an option
- » I feel that by providing open classrooms would encourage people to bring their families to the park. I also feel that open classrooms would be a hands on experience rather than studying the area through a text book.
- » The picnic area & shelters would better placed in Terwilligar Park, close to the new bridge. Keep development inside the park to a minimum, place any structures towards the outer boundaries. As for the learning centers, I do not believe they would see much use.
- » These seem like expensive installations that may not get used a lot.. not opposed, just like to see city resources get used enough.
- » Concerned that without a city program or school participation, these educational areas will not be utilized as they are intended.
- » Toilet facilities is required.
- » I like concept 1 but I think the learning Park might be something kids won't actually use. Probably better to add few extra rocks and an upcycled tire swings than text on boards they'd never read. Seating is always a good idea along the trails but big meeting areas need to be well selected by those that use this area regularly as they would know where the normal break points are.

- » I support a washroom and a small shelter however I do not support a children's playground. Playgrounds are NOT natural and should not be part of the overall scope of this park with the idea of keeping this area a natural area. The less build up here the better.
- » Concept 2 has better options.
- » In concept #1, the learning circle should be covered, so kids are protected from rain, etc. In concept #2, I like the covered outdoor classroom, but do not like the grass amphitheatre. I think it should be removed from the design. It will be nothing but a problem to maintain. If you are going to put in an amphitheatre in this style, make the seating out of stone. I can't even imagine how muddy it would be, after a rain storm. In the summer, we get rain frequently in the evenings.
- » Picnic tables throughout the park and not in one space. Feels like a restaurant atmosphere as I would prefer to consume my food on the trail itself. Provide LOTS of refuse bins. And do not support the educational pits. Overkill as educational groups can cluster in spots throughout the park for instruction, etc.
- » I do not know whether school groups would use the park enough to justify the cost.
- » I like the idea of natural-type seating and small rest areas for families and groups. I don't see how an outdoor classroom would be used if there's no way to get schoolbuses in to the park.
- » I question the cost of some of these changes as to the benefit
- » An open space is all that is necessary, no need for structures at this time.
- » Concern with shelters is people loitering in them. Have a shelter in the park by my house and there are people living in it in the evening and over the winter. We are a winter city and therefore need to keep that in mind when building structures in our parks. Structures are not used in the winter and during the summer when there is bad weather.
- » I don't believe we should have man-made structures in this park. Would school groups really use this park in this manner as there is nowhere for buses to drop off or pick up the students?
- » I did not like the Concept 2 picnic area because there is no mention of a washroom. Having a washroom is very important for this to be family friendly and age friendly.
- » natural amphitheatre may be very costly to maintain
- » Classroom shelter needs to provide, wind, sun and rain protection... and possibly with the addition of winter heater... see prior note.
- » Why can't we have Concept 1 picnic areas in Concept 2? Why are they mutually exclusive? And why can't there be picnic areas/pit toilets on the north end of the park as well? It may be an extended destination for some people will little other amenities for a day in the park.
- » Minimal buildings...
- » Keep the Park as natural as possible
- » After viewing the concept drawings, concept two is nicer than expected. Still, has a minimal feel.
- » Without any information on what kind of programming could be provided it does not make higher cost infrastructure for ampitheatres, etc. particularly tempting.
- » Greater use by the children of Edmonton in concept 2
- » Combine with the picnic area in the south. North is less accessible and limited parking available on north sude, particularly for larger groups.
- » I would prefer to see the most minimal approach possible. Minimal meaning environmental cost and dollars.
- » For a city that can't fix it's potholes, this proposal reeks of incompetence.
- » Addition of restrooms to the learning circle concept would be ideal.
- » Trail head Signage can provide maps with a QR scan code that could be scanned with your smart phone for additional facts on the area or maps so that you can continue your journey through your phone lowering the impact to the area and providing a unique experience to those looking for more.
- » "Partner interest" is likely to be in conflict with minimal development and refuge from the city.
- » These plans all represent more impact and development. Maybe a better place for a park is in Terwillegar where there is already a big parking lot and it is a destination for families (both with kids and dogs) who may appreciate the development.
- » Keep noise levels down in this natural area. There are enough playgrounds and picnic areas in the city but only a few places people can walk in peace and quiet.
- » I support a natural play area but not the picnic area. I don't feel it would be well used as the area is walk in, without close parking.
- » I think a pit washroom would be best located at the trail junction at the very north end of the park where the Ft. Ed footbridge trail, trail from Woodward Crescent and the trail from the Wolf Willow stairs intersect. The washroom will receive significantly more use from trail users than "educational groups". Trees should be used for shade/picnic shelters - avoid excessive infrastructure. Re: picnic area in south near Terwillegar footbridge - this needs to be coordinated with Terwillegar Park planning. Formalized picnic area needed in only south Oleskiw OR Terwillegar, not both. Given the lack of close parking, how much use

would an “outdoor classroom” actually receive? Must consider this realistically. Excessive unused infrastructure would be a massive disappointment.

- » keep it low-key
- » Learning circle seems the least obtrusive
- » high cost low return.
- » Picnic areas do not need shelters as the park is so remote that people are unlikely to access it during inclement weather. The learning circle and outdoor education areas should be well off the main path so as not to disturb foot and bike traffic.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » Edmonton parks should serve to separate people from the human elements of the city. I support more natural (and natural-looking) features over obvious man-made shelters and paths.
- » Natural is better for environmental education. The cost of maintaining the grass amphitheater over time would cost a lot more
- » I don't see why we need to build anything. Whatever happened to a good old fashioned educative tour with speech and walking? Why should the environment have to be encroached upon to teach? That makes no sense at all. You cannot ask people to care about the environment while eradicating it to get your point across.
- » Keep it all natural
- » The education circle should be as natural as possible (rocks or logs). NO need for the seating/sign.
- » the playground is a good distance from automobile parking. Most children will have problm accessing the playground.

#### **Natural Asset Management: General Comments**

- » These seem to be low cost and easy to maintain ideas however a wildlife lookout is unnecessary.
- » More natural grasses and less cultured lawn is ideal!
- » Lower cost of maintenance means I support the open field
- » Restore the vegetation but scrap the wildlife lookouts. Stop adding structures; keep it natural.
- » Appears costs are being considered in with an open field concept.
- » Area was naturally more forested, re-naturalization should reflect that. Wildlife lookout is a great idea.
- » less field more vegetation
- » If you want animals and nature, then don't put in human structures and paths. These are counter intuitive concepts.

- » without trees the park would be cold, windy, and expensive to maintain/weed.
- » I've been riding these trails for years and have rarely seen wildlife (besides dogs). Wildlife will be even less likely with the suggested development. Save the wood and paint for something else.
- » the city of Edmonton cannot afford any of these ideas. Balance the books first before spending my money on new projects. See my previous comments on Jackie Parker spray park.
- » The field should not be a “mown field”, but rather a hay field that can be hayed as needed.
- » this is not needed
- » I love the restoration of the forest and a bird blind might be nice, but would there really be enough wildlife to see with all the activities happening? I'm not sure
- » I like this - keep it simple!
- » Eliminate the open field and restore nature.
- » I like to see some natural reforestation as we all know the importance of it as long as they are trees that are native to here that are planted. Is the cost high for natural vegetation initially to plant it or is a long-term cost?
- » Not supportive of mowed grass field. Support restoration that is most positive for the river valley, whether that's diversity of habitat or forest.
- » I don't believe that fields that require mowing should be included in this park. The field, if included in either concept should be a naturalized prairie landscape.
- » I do not support unnecessary expenditures. However i do feel that restorative actions are positive and beneficial. I would prefer to see these endeavors be privately funded or at least partially so. Perhaps they could be sponsored by companies like Wild Flower Farm (who sell wildflower seeds) if you provided a space for their businesses to be promoted?
- » Leaving a field seems like a waste of land. And then the cost of mowing?? Plant some fruit trees so the public can enjoy and use them.
- » More natural areas are nice. Forest is nice, but open field is okay too; natural prairie is okay as well, but seems unnecessary. The wildlife lookout is an interesting idea, but seems unnecessary?
- » I'm not a user of open fields in this park so I have no comment
- » less field more protected environments.
- » Urban deer, that aren't afraid of the trails leading in all directions from the viewing area aren't hard to find already. Neither are the coyotes that stalk your small dogs on days when you're more alone. Do not understand what other wildlife viewing is enhanced by investing in the structure: birds? Rabbits? Bringing back the forest radically alters the scope and experience of the park as it is right now, for a

high cost and I'm not persuaded it is worth it to have more forested trails in Edmonton. The current scope and sweep of the views is rare and valuable.

- » Keep the park as natural as possible without pretending to create habitat when the size of the field only supports mice.
- » I think that this is an excellent choice for the park as it gives people the chance to see wildlife in their natural habitat rather than at a zoo.
- » Intrusive, costly. Areas that require any maintenance should be minimized.
- » I like the wildlife viewing platform, though I've never seen wildlife in the park. If there's something to see, by all means, build it. I like the native prairie rehab portion. Would support that over the whole field. I prefer leaving the meadow \_as\_ a meadow - please don't convert it all to forest - we have lots of that already.
- » The wildlife lookout looks much less appealing after seeing the visual with houses in the background. I think the field should not be mown, and should be allowed to grow naturally with the variety of plant and animal life that inhabits it. The restored prairie area looks great in the visual.
- » Toilet facilities are a decent thing to have.
- » Field does not need to be mowed and let the natural/native vegetation grow where it will.
- » Rather than mow the field can you use goats or sheep....
- » I don't like the idea of a big open mown field, a very small field for kids to run around in would be okay.
- » You have to look at the benefit versus the cost when you have a park with visitors commonsense shows that most wildlife moves on
- » Let nature take care of areas where restoration is needed.
- » Let nature take over naturally
- » trees would likely encroach on their own
- » Why does the field have to be mown? Why can't it be turned into natural short-grass prairie?
- » Would see more wildlife if the park was left as natural as possible
- » I prefer the least amount of human disruption to the park as possible.
- » I really would like to know which programs are going to be short changed to fund this experiment.
- » Again the concept of developing nature is counter to letting nature be. I have had the pleasure of encountering animals on the trail and watching birds from various points in the park. It is truly spectacular that within easy access of the parking lot in terwillegar, or by foot or bike one can become so quickly immersed in a natural environment with their family and get our feet muddy while creating memories of a great day. Please consider option 3. Less is truly sometime more.
- » Why would allowing trees to grow out into the grass area have a high cost? Nature is doing the work, the plan does not seem to propose planting new trees.
- » I do not support the wildlife viewing, it seems very silly in an area where you can easily see wildlife from the ground. Plus, it's not that common to see much more than birds and the odd coyote in a trip.
- » The restored prairie is a good idea in principle, but does the high cost make it a justifiable inclusion? I think the interpretive/educational value of the park would still be HUGE without this potentially unnecessary expense. Re: restored forest, natural succession can be encouraged/allowed. Some active restoration could help, but this need not be a massive active restoration effort that will have a high cost. Perhaps small annual efforts can be planned to spread out the cost. I think the open field adds to the diversity of the available habitat and to the users experience - a good balance should be maintained.
- » the field is not currently mown. Leave it natural and do not mow it
- » I don't know why the native plants section is so costly for such a small area.
- » I am supporting the larger open field, but what it has to be mown?
- » A wildlife lookout is likely to have little use as users would scare wildlife away as they approached. The prairie restoration would be a good educational opportunity. Limited restoration of the forest would be good for increasing habitat. Maintaining a large portion of the open field would give the users a better sense of the scale of the park and a more profound experience.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » I support the open concept and the natural restoration projects but would like to see the park without man-made shelters/features and without mowing grass areas.
- » Either concept the vegetation over time can come back on its own if allowed
- » The prairie is not actually being restored...there was no prairie there. Restore it as forest.
- » I like restored vegetation, but not the wildlife lookout. I like the restored/established prairie but not the shelter in the picture. I'm curious about what the restored forest will be - hopefully we can avoid planting a ton of new trees and use suckers from current forest. The open field doesn't need to be mowed.

- » I don't really understand this question -- does mowing the field mean not restoring the forest? I would like to see some open field maintained

### **Atmosphere & Identity: General Comments**

- » The riverside benches would be a great opportunity for Edmontonians to get closer to the river. This is similar to the benches in Twin Brooks Park and provides an element of discovery.
- » Winter shelters are a great idea and suited for encouraging more people to get outside in the cold
- » Benches with a river view are highly desirable
- » Anything to keep costs/taxes at the lowest possible.
- » Love the idea of a winter warming hut, very important to encouraging winter activity. Lookouts are also good.
- » Shelters are a lovely idea, but without a homeless strategy that actually works, what is there to prevent people from squatting in them?
- » I think most people currently use the trails but not as a destination for hours on end. Most existing lookout and gather site sit vacant 80% of the year and still have to be maintained. Please do seasonal traffic monitoring before considering any permanent fixtures in the valley.
- » the city of Edmonton cannot afford any of these ideas. Balance the books first before spending my money on new projects. See my previous comments on Jackie Parker spray park.
- » I'm not sure what the community activities would be
- » Definitely like the river view benches - good place to enjoy the wonder of nature. Definitely agree with community involvement. As far as space for community gathering, I guess it would be necessary if community involvement is to be encouraged.
- » I like the option for temporary art installations and warming huts, and educational opportunities.
- » No art installations unless they provide shelter or shade... this is nature-art in its purest form. NO MORE USELESS ART INSTALLATIONS
- » More shelters would mean more policing
- » I do not support unnecessary expenditures. However a few river view benches seem like a reasonable use of a small amount of tax dollars. Though perhaps they could be sponsored like has occurred in other areas to minimize costs.
- » i think the outdoor classroom is a little dramatic and the amphitheater would suffice.
- » You need to do more than this!! River access . . . more viewpoints!!
- » River lookouts are nice; gathering areas are nice; a winter warming hut could be huge in making a rest stop for people in the cold.

- » I will not use this park for its open space or community gathering. I use this park as part of my cycle trips either mountain or paved.
- » I don't see the winter installation as being useful if the drainage issues on the existing trails aren't fixed due to the freeze/thaw/ice issues at several points. The people most likely to use warming huts will not be able to use the trail to get to the hut for long stretches of time during the winter. The warming hut is a fine idea...but on cold days it's so windy that if you stop moving without the right equipment, frostbite is a real risk. Still do not understand for how many people the gathering spaces will be designed for, where they will park and what types of activities/gatherings will be supported after lugging gear/equipment for a picnic or education session at least 15 minutes based on the placement of the current concepts/
- » I think that this would encourage families to plan outdoor activities in the park.
- » no strong opinions on these. Benches by the river seem nice.
- » wind protection during winter is good (Concept 1)
- » Parks should have toilet facilities, it is the decent thing to do.
- » Educational groups do not need special structures or cleared spaces to teach.
- » Viewpoints are nice but only if bushes are pruned to maintain view. Otherwise not a viewpoint.
- » I like the idea of small river lookouts. Again, I don't see how there's going to be a way to get large numbers of people into the north amphitheatre unless it's across the Ft. Edmonton footbridge.
- » Natural habitat will develop itself without us trying to change everything
- » It is important to have warming shelters or a place where one can warm up. We are a winter city and it does get cold walking in the valley..
- » I like being able to admire the view
- » I prefer minimal impact, forest restoration, natural habitat restoration, and ways to educate people about environmental restoration and preservation.
- » Gathering areas for community youth groups is very important.
- » Again, why are possible amenities tied to the concept? Why can't Option 2 also have warming shelters/installation?
- » Keep Park as natural as possible
- » Putting warming shelters in would attract the homeless who would eventually destroy or damage the shelters
- » Benches in naturalized areas creates complaining. Either concern regarding view, or bank seems to be ongoing issues.



- » Art installations etc sound wonderful but don't fit with the natural aesthetic of the area. They would be minimally used and targets for vandals. If you're planning educational areas, make them easy to use and not requiring the long walk up the river bank. Class of 30, 2 kids with learning disabilities and one in a wheelchair? Not feasible.
- » I like the benches. They do not harm much of the environment and provide a resting place, as well as a nice place to just absorb the setting and the river.
- » Again low impact signage that can be scanned and further information attached with the convenience of your smart phone.
- » As per previous comments. Do not support. In addition the building of river seating looks like trail development is required but not mentioned anywhere.
- » I would prefer less development of the park
- » Art installations make sense at park entry points, but not in the middle of a natural park. I'm not convinced of the utility of warming shelters. Most users in winter will be participating in active recreation, reducing the need for warming shelters. If they are only temporary in nature, they could be trialed. The minimal footprint of the river lookouts is good, but still I don't think the plan needs to include too many.
- » keep structures to a minimum. benches next to the river would get overgrown in the summer. as well the view isn't that great
- » Please don't develop Oleskiw park with structures and look outs. How do you improve nature? You remove invasive species and teach people to enjoy it as it is. Teach them to lead low impact lives in nature. Find it's beauty, explore it and take care of it rather than build on it, now it down and alter it to make it more comfortable for human use. This kind of proposed development is a product of our human beliefs that nature must be tamed to enjoy it which leads us to not respect it and in turn, we teach this ideology to our children. The park can be left as it is and be loved and used if we teach people how to respect it and use it in its current form.
- » River lookouts bring too many user groups into the same area.
- » Why would one want to be like other cities and have the exact same features? This is a unique area so keep it that way. As pristine as possible.
- » The reasoning behind the creation of winter installations (to create new ways to experience winter ecologies) is absurd. The park is remote and users would have walk a kilometre to access these installations - save them for Ice on Whyte. There is value in a snowy plain/forest and this 'refuge' should not be disturbed by such installations.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » I would prefer non-intrusive art installations (by local artists) and minimal winter shelters. Large gathering spaces/made-made features are unnecessary to enjoy park space.
- » I just don't agree with making this a high traffic area for people to mill about. More people means more vandalism, more littering and more undesirable people in the off hours. Is anything going to be done to monitor and make sure this area is safe and maintained?
- » keep as natural as possible
- » Yes to restored prairie but no new structures needed. Viewpoints and benches should be as low impact as possible - try to fit in where spaces are and not where areas need to be cleared so much.

## Overall Preference

### Which concept do you prefer overall? Please comment on the reasons behind selection.

- » I don't support the winter warming areas and art installations. These are just opportunities for vandalism.
- » Both plans have good points.
- » I like the learning circle vs a classroom. Also really support warming huts. Makes a huge difference to park usability
- » Quit trying to insert structures into Nature. Leave it alone. Do restoration, but don't build huts or play areas or classrooms. Hands off Nature except to help with regrowth and restoration.
- » Why can't we have a park? Why is there a need to turn it into something it isn't like education, places for art, ... just leave ave the poor park alone
- » Costs/taxes need to be at the lowest possible. Is development of the land really necessary? Maintain it in its natural state. when humans are allowed into the park costs increase for enforcement of bylaws, maintenance, repairs and upkeep.
- » Higher focus on ecology and reforestation. Smaller-scale picnic and education areas are more sensitive to area and better suited for reduced accessibility into the park.
- » stuff from each concept, a combined concept would work best
- » Environmental impact is too high.
- » Would prefer elements from both.

- » Less fixed structures that need to be maintained. The trails are already generating visitors even without the fixed structures which will need to be maintained.
- » They both have really good points. I would get rid of the play and picnic area in favor of other items.
- » the city of Edmonton cannot afford any of these ideas. Balance the books first before spending my money on new projects. See my previous comments on Jackie Parker spray park.
- » I prefer option 1 but like the idea of keeping the open field.
- » As whole concept 1 seems more low key. Smaller elements would be my preference over all.
- » Concept #1 is more natural with less of an environmental impact...which should be the focus. The sheltered picnic area should be removed.
- » with winter installations, outdoor learning and gathering areas. Naturalized resting spots (large rocks) along a natural trail
- » more emphasis on the natural environment especially the play area. But I also like the prairie vegetation in the 2 nd concept
- » Seems the better option for more nature restoration.
- » I don't like Concept 1 because of the play structures, winter warming huts and artwork or sheltered picnic areas. But in Concept 2 I am not in favour of outdoor classrooms and amphitheatre.
- » They both contain aspects that encourage building relationships with native habitat, while still using the park for recreation.
- » Both have elements that I do not support
- » Would like this concept even better if art installations and gathering spaces along trail removed. PLEASE NO MORE ART INSTALLATIONS in natural settings unless they are functional and relate to nature. Example of useless and ugly art installations: Terwillegar Park - wide open meadow - no shade, no seating - such a wasted opportunity to provide an installation that could have provided both.
- » Both contain unnecessary expenditures and are a poor use of tax payer dollars.
- » Either one works for me.
- » Seriously if you do Option 1 why bother? It would be a lot of money spent for little impact.
- » I really prefer the new natural trail option, in concept #1, but would probably go with smaller play elements, or no play elements.
- » I would like to see warming shelters / winter installations in concept #2
- » nature trails is the aspect of the park that I use the most. As such, concept 1 provides more of what I use the park for
- » Both concepts spend a tremendous amount of money on group function installations with no clear info on the expected number of users & capacity, where those people

- are going to park and how they'll get their gear walked over the distances under consideration. I'd be in favour of a more cautious, multi-year approach that leaves group installations to the end, so park usage can be better understood. The expanded trail network seems at odds with the ecological priorities that have been stated. If the trails are going to be expanded, go for it and design them to support winter and summer sports around the edge of the field and leave the existing forest as untouched as possible to lessen environmental footprint. The wildlife viewing platform is a mystery of "why?" The deer and coyotes are consistently around and the birds (except the scavengers) don't seem to give a care about humans. I like the benches, wish there were more garbage receptacles and love the idea of signs with history lessons but am terrified of the existing neglected examples the City has left littering the parks throughout the valley since the 1980s.
- » I think both concepts are excellent for everyone.
  - » Truthfully, the only thing I prefer about Option 1 is the additional 'natural trail'/bike trail. I prefer keeping the meadow as a meadow. Most of the interpretive locations and gathering points in either concept are fine, but I doubt how much they'll get used.
  - » The prairie restoration and more open field is what attracts me to option #2.
  - » I prefer concept 1, with toilet facilities. Trails are the basic park amenity that allows use of the natural park. Especially for cyclists like myself. I don't prefer either if there is no toilet facilities provided!
  - » I would like to see certain elements of both concepts adopted as well as certain concepts dropped. Overall less building here is better in order to maintain a large portion of its natural state. I like keeping some of the field open as well as adding more forest to the existing area. A few washrooms and shelters are good but less is more for my taste.
  - » I like some of option 1 and some of option 2. I think a natural, useful for walking and looking, playing, experiencing park is what would be best. Bathroom areas near play grounds are practical for children unless we want them using the outdoors as washrooms.
  - » Any human activities and construction of new elements in the park area will distract wildlife and native vegetation. I don't like any proposed options and suggest to leave the park as is with a minimum improvement of walking trails.
  - » In my view, neither concepts are great. My preference would be to take some elements from both concepts and merge into one. If there is an outdoor learning area, it needs to be covered. I like the expansion of the forest area and small lookout points along the river edge. We don't need winter installations, larger play elements (this is not a

playground, it is supposed to be a natural park area), a new granular trail loop outlining historic golf hole, or an open amphitheatre.

- » Do not need a wildlife viewing structure. What wildlife is posing in this area to view? Wildlife is throughout the natural vegetation - go there to observe. River lookouts with benches - yes.
- » I like Concept 1 the best, but there are elements of Concept 2 that I would like to see included (Sheltered outdoor classroom and open amphitheatre, and interpretation of past land uses)
- » It seems to be the best for the environment yet still allows for human access.
- » The native plant restoration is important but I am not convinced about granular paths. I am leaning more to concept 2 but am concerned about the impact of the wildlife structure, although if there is a lot of wildlife it would be amazing to see them up close.
- » winter installations
- » The concept goals that I support are ones that are less environmentally intrusive and focus on natural pathways and structures.
- » Overall I prefer a re-naturalization to forest - I would like to see more information/engagement/context with tradition indigenous uses of the land.
- » They seem to be looking at limiting the overall use of the area
- » Cost is important . However what is important is that people use it to a moderate degree but allowing shelters for people to get in from the cold.
- » Prefer self-guided options to designs focused on partnerships that are not yet developed
- » We don't need play areas or picnic areas in natural parks. Kids should learn to amuse themselves looking at the natural world around them. There are a few picnic tables in Terwillegar park. I have only ever seen 1 family eating at one. Mostly the dogs just climb them and pee on them
- » I am very much more in favor of Option 1, and I would like it better with an even more minimalistic approach.
- » Option 2 appears to increase the possibility of use by the most citizens
- » Minimal buildings...
- » Least disruptive to the natural areas of the park
- » The cost of these projects to the tax payers is too much and could be spent on more pressing issues.
- » I like both of the options very much
- » I'm inclined to select the larger educational and recreational use of concept Two. Concept one has many good features, particularly the winter and art features and the new nature trail. I think the path highlighting a golf hole is silly and should be dropped.
- » #2 with disagreement on the proposed learning area on the North side.
- » I like the winter options and the bicycle options but they appear on different concepts
- » I would prefer whichever costs the least and has the least affect on the environment.
- » More forested area and features for people to be in the woods. The playground is important for kids to have fun in nature and develop a sense of ownership of the environment. Gathering area for learning would be adequate instead of sheltered area but native planting and washrooms at the north end of the park with would be a real bonus.
- » Remove learning circle, play elements, sheltered areas. As per earlier consultation, this park is valued as a refuge from infrastructure of the city. These elements would mean the area is no longer natural.
- » Variety of eco zones. However I see no need to replace the north south trail with a granular trail.
- » both concepts have indicated granular trail development. This final list is misleading. I do not support further development in this park.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » It is unfortunate that both concepts include the North South granular trail, of which I am opposed. As mentioned, it has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » I like elements of both. These are my preferred elements: - new natural trail connection (Option 1) - balance between field and forest (Option 2) - restored forest east-west connection from ravine (Option 2) - nature interpretation (both) - wildlife viewing structure (Option 2) My dislikes are: - historic golf hole double trail (Option 2) - natural play areas (both)
- » I prefer the concept #2 for the field and #1 for the structures and trails.
- » If implemented, these concepts do the city, it's citizens and foremost, nature a disservice. Oleskiw Park, in its current form, is a beautiful opportunity to teach people to be a part of nature with out the need for development, human structures and more. Let's put our efforts into educating

our citizens on the existing network of natural, volunteer maintained trails and how year round use of them leads to healthy lives and healthy natural spaces.

- » Seems less developed, but I would prefer that the existing natural trail through the meadow is not turned into a granular trail.
- » Concept Option 1 contains a number of things I don't like: winter installations, small gathering spaces, larger natural play elements, and restoration of the forest. Concept Option 2 has only two things I don't like (wildlife viewing structure, and granular trail loop) and several features I do like (open field, interpretation of past land uses, and native planting with potential for educational partnerships).
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » Concept #1 seems to provide the least amount of man-made features and doesn't affect existing (used and maintained) singletrack trails and park features.
- » Whichever concept means less things needing to be built, less human footprint, less things getting in the way of nature is what I choose. I appreciate the attempt to educate people in the process, but that isn't a 24 hour possibility. You have to understand and acknowledge that there are a lot of undesirable people that hang around this area and use it for activities that are not warranted. So taking everything in consideration, what are you going to do to make sure this place is monitored, maintained, kept clean and that people don't take advantage and further harm it?
- » "The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA"
- » There are too many components of each concept to only choose one or the other. Consider including some elements of each, not simply grouping them into only two options for the public to choose from.
- » I like bits of both concepts. The main values I have are - low impact, no new trails, education is good, so signs and a low impact education circle can accommodate that. Places to pause and enjoy nature are good - like benches (low impact). I think because the parks to the north and south have good infrastructure (or planned infrastructure), then Oleskiw can be kept more (uniquely) natural!

- » Overall I concept option #2 has more elements I prefer, but I would prefer to see a new trail connection in the forest as part of option #2, and don't see why that is incompatible with the other elements in Option #2 (why not have both a new trail in the forest and the golf hole loop?).

## Help name this park!

### Do you have any park name suggestions or comments on your choice?

- » It already has a name Oleskiw park. It doesn't require a special name
- » Oleskiw River Valley Park
- » Wolf Willow park has a nice ring to it.
- » Let's continue to not only respect and highlight the area's indigenous heritage and the fact that we are on Treaty 6 land, but also enhance it and bring it to the forefront.
- » what is wrong with "Oleskiw River Valley Park" or Edmonton Nature Park
- » Annie Jackson Park
- » Oleskiw
- » Perhaps a native word for a natural element of the area....
- » Name it after the treaty for the land.
- » Let's honor the environment with a park named after one of the many beautiful birds in the region.
- » Parky McParkface
- » how about leave it as is
- » I feel our indigenous citizens should be choosing the name.
- » Political figures are too divisive. My dad will not go to Hawrelak park for anything because he saw Hawrelak as a corrupt mayor. Indigenous Heritage is a nice idea but the names are often difficult to pronounce or spell, which will potentially isolate parts of the population. Natural Heritage and Historical names are safer and more inclusive.
- » I prefer names that help me find the site. Location based names are very helpful. Terwilliagr, Hermitage Rundle, all these names while having ties to individuals are also names of the areas in which I will find the park. So really, I don't have a preference as long as it is helpful in finding it. I only answered the last question because I couldn't leave it blank.
- » If all of the parks in the river valley are going to be re-named, then maybe come up with geographical names that reflect their locations and then when a name is said, we could easily locate it mentally. Not as basic as the numbered avenues and streets (which really is a very good method to locate places)but something like that. As we have now learned, political figures are too controversial.
- » Taylor Cahoon Park Caleb McLean Park Nathan Anderson Park MiCayla Kunz Park Randy Clavejo Park Deanna Behr Park Kaleigh Fisk Park Karolina Kaluzna Park Princess Park Zach Hudson Park Aaron Liddle Park Karren Hudson Park Mackenzie Boehmer Park Snoop Dogg Park Kim Coleman

- Park Jeff Hogenson Park Diane Bennett Park Ildiko Laszlo Park Isabeau Jessen Park Taylor Swift Park Haydn Selk Park Cory Strasbourg Park Audley Sailsman Park Spencer Jones Park Jaren Weber Park Daniel Goodrich Park Reggie Pasco Park Ronnel Tesoro Morado Park Alfredo D'Boy Pangan Park Brady Schow Park Dr. Ethan Kutanzi Park Dr. Ted Jones The Bear Park Weston Palmer Park Joe Kastendieck Park Spencer Rolfson Park Kevin Edmonds Park Sarah Edmonds Park Teagen Schnoor Park
- » Reference indigenous heritage.
  - » Munson Park
  - » Jansen River Park
  - » Oleskiw River Valley Park
  - » This question and the ranking 1-4 do not match what is stated above (where 1 is the MOST preferred and 4 is the LEAST). It's confusing and some people might vote the wrong way round.
  - » Please enough indigenous recognition. The public is tired of this. The indigenous people didn't build Edmonton. Hard working immigrants did.
  - » Oleskiw sounds find to me.
  - » Gathering Place
  - » On leash park Ribbon to Suspension Park Diet Terwilliger Oh, there's a park here?
  - » Park This
  - » Oleskiw River Valley Park works just fine.
  - » Oleskiw River Valley Park seems nice. I also like the thought of Wolf Willow Farm, or an indigenous name for the land. Please don't name it after a person or people though.
  - » wawakamow (winding river)
  - » Ralph Klein Park
  - » Wolf Willow Farms Park
  - » Lodgepole Pine Tree Park (Tree of Alberta) Birch Tree Park (River Birch Park) Wild Rose Park Jack Pine Park Blueberry Hill Park River Alder Park (or Alder Park) Aspen Grove Park Willow Park Poplar Park Chokecherry Park
  - » Indigenous heritage sounds fine to me if it is confirmed this was a site
  - » Name it after a plant or tree. Wolf Willow Park Silverberry Etc.
  - » The name should be determined by natural heritage
  - » Edmonton Flood Plain Park
  - » Cottonwood or an Indigenous word for cottonwood aspen trees
  - » Irregardless of what people want, it's going to be named after an indigenous person. Politically correct.
  - » Goldeye Fish Park
  - » I like the name you are using already. I choose Natural Heritage as the most preferred as that is what was here first then comes the Indigenous Heritage and Historical should go together as they both happened.
  - » Oleskiw River Valley Park - it's already the name I know it as. Why change it. (for God's sake, please don't name it Connor McDavid park)
  - » Alex Decouteau Park. He was not only proud of his ancestry but also a proud Canadian who helped forge a nation in difficult times. All Canadians/First Nations should be proud of what he accomplished in his lifetime and how he carried himself.
  - » Wherethehellami park
  - » Don't have name suggestion but if not sticking with current name, you should consult to come up with appropriate name that honours Indigenous Heritage
  - » Something easy to pronounce
  - » Aspen Park Sandy Park Deer Park
  - » Mooneye Park. "North Saskatchewan River Mooneye are frantic, hyperactive fish and their impressive leaps and passionate fighting style has earned them the nickname "Freshwater Tarpon". Mooneye feed readily on terrestrial insects, and provide fine sport for a fly rod angler. These silver jewels of the North Saskatchewan River will also take small lures and natural baits with gusto. Deep highly compressed bodies and a prize fighters attitude have put the North Saskatchewan River Mooneye on Alberta's Sport fishing list." - North Saskatchewan River Guide
  - » Park should be named after pioneers who settled in this space. That includes indigenous peoples. NO POLITICIANS
  - » Country club park
  - » Wapusati - I understand this to mean Aspen in the Cree language
  - » To please everyone is impossible. Good Luck...
  - » If it had an aboriginal name, we should use it.
  - » Not specific names, but I like #3
  - » no
  - » I suggest you name it after a local historical Indigenous female.
  - » wâwâkamow "it is winding (as a river or road)"
  - » Oleskiw Park or Wolf Willow Park. Please no political or indigenous names
  - » I strongly feel that the name should reflect indigenous heritage, and especially not a political figure, since we are hard pressed to find one who reflects our cities values right now.
  - » As the city is working with Reconciliation with Treaty 6, I think it would be a great thing to work with indigenous communities and name this park.
  - » Papaschase
  - » na
  - » I'd like to find a historical figure or indigenous heritage name for this park
  - » Indigenous preferred.
  - » I have no respect for politicians and do not understand why anyone would want to name anything after one.

- » Strongwood I believe this is the original Cree nation at this spot.
- » Wolf willow park
- » an indigenous phrase for: experience the land, or: walk in wild, or: peace with nature i would prefer an indigenous phrase as opposed to and indiginous name.
- » A First Nations word for 'Restoration'
- » Name after original First Nations in the area.
- » Strongwood. Original Cree inhabitants.
- » Strongwood
- » Leave as is
- » Sounds like the park is already called Oleskiw Rivervalley Park? Again there seems to be some real interest to 'develop' this space. This survey question isn't giving the user choice to opt out. That creates a survey bias.
- » I like the natural heritage
- » Ask the First Nations Peoples to select name
- » NOT 4! Prefer 3 then 1.
- » Oleskiw River Valley Park. Keep it simple, keep it cheap.
- » I like Natural Heritage and Indigenous Heritage equally.
- » or you could leave it as Oleskiw unless there is some outstanding reason to change it...
- » No because I do not support adding a pathway and spending unnecessary dollars.
- » Historical go hand in hand with Indigenous heritage. One would have to examine the historical records to see if there was a cree name attached to the area. Then the area would have the proper context to it.
- » Munson Park, Brome Grass Park, Maskotew Park, Todd Park.
- » No comment
- » I would support any non-political name of the park given that it had proven and confirmed historical significance.
- » Wolf willow
- » I like Oleskiw, but if that is going to be replaced then something indigenous would be preferred.
- » No suggestions. It's part of the River Valley System, which is one of Edmonton's most prized attributes and the fact that we keep the river valley undeveloped, natural and connected is so important and should be reflected in the name.
- » stop looking for ideas to spend my money. Reduce taxes and control spending by city council
- » I will be happy to visit the park with either development in place
- » Is there any room for a dog off leash park within this concept? It would have to be maybe fenced and could be small but would allow more interaction and socialization.
- » If all parks are going to be reviewed, then perhaps some areas are more conducive to ie outdoor classrooms as they are more accessible to schools etc. Also, the costs of maintaining and keeping the areas safe have to be considered when any structures are added to a public park that is not supervised.
- » As always, I would like to see the results of the survey.
- » Evicting the Country Club and annexing it would help restore the river valley "ribbon of green" to the public.
- » None come to mind
- » I'm just not seeing how this plan optimizes the park based on access. It's all about in-park experience while ignoring that some of the proposed features are a significant walk from parking - which means that groups of children will need a 2-hour window to utilize some the proposed installations, which is a deterrent for school groups. I'm also concerned that the balance between optimizing experience and the environmental impact is off. In part, because I'm not certain the designers have spent a tremendous amount of time walking through the park in all four seasons of the year.
- » It's a floodplain. Give me an asphalt path, parking lot, and bathrooms. Thank you, that is all
- » Don't forget to include toilet facilities in the park!
- » Not at this time.
- » I found the open house presentation boards very complex. I have lots of time but didn't find these delightful to explore. The younger folks you surveyed might have preferred something simple, clear, un-jargony. I realize specialization results in language and approaches specific to each specialization but the general public might expect something less "park planning specialization".
- » Keep the park simple and as close to nature as possible.
- » Looks very exciting! Thank you!
- » no
- » Who writes these survey questions? Be more specific. Too vague. Easily can be misinterpreted...
- » na
- » no it was very good thank you
- » There are great ideas here. I do understand the want to make something special for this area, but I believe leaving it as natural as possible is the best way to enjoy a park. Too much development and you strip away the very nature you are trying to preserve. Please lean on the less environmentally disrupting approach.

## Additional Comments

- » Keep the costs/taxes down!
- » Please be sure to work closely with indigenous leaders and communities in the area to truly bring the pre-colonial history of the area to the forefront. Don't just name it in respect, design it in respect too.
- » Both options offer medium environmental impact. Not impressed.

- » Major users of this space will be dog owners. Your concepts and survey virtually ignore that inevitability. Terwilliger park has been practically abandoned, de facto, to off-leash dogs. Don't make the same mistake again!
- » Please contact me if you need assistance with the signage as I can provide 3D concept drawings and pricing details to make this project a reality!
- » as a born and raised edmontonian, i am so pleased to see this sort preservation and wilderness celebration occurring. as much as i feel we need to encourage citizens to visit the river valley in downtown core with boat launches, boardwalks, kiosks, cafes and activity, i am also a huge fan of having designated wilderness areas where we can walk and cycle with nature as it is meant to be.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA I strongly believe that the funds required for this path would be better directed to repairing the numerous other river valley trails that already exist but have been closed indefinitely due to erosion.
- » Please keep the single track single. We all love and enjoy the trails for what they are and they don't need to be perfect and are maintain. The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA.
- » The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » the material is amazing!
- » Keep the single track...don't make new users come at the expense of the existing users as the City often does.
- » The proposed granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA"
- » I do not like nor see the need for the new granular trail connection in both plans.
- » "The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA"
- » "The North South granular trail has a high impact and high cost. It already exists as a naturalized, dirt single track called Oleskiw Meadows, and is currently enjoyed by mountain bikers, fat bikes, and trail runners. Leave it as it is: It's the least impact, and the lowest cost. These types of trails are already maintained by volunteers from MTB clubs and EMBA
- » Thanks for having the survey as I could not make the open houses.
- » Thanks!

# Online Map

November 6 to November 26, 2017

19 respondents

<https://www.edmonton.ca/oleskiwparkmasterplan>

As part of the online survey, an online map tool was developed to capture spatial feedback from participants. The interface allowed the public to provide detailed comments about areas in each concept option they liked or would like to see improved.

**Tallies and counts of park amenities are included in the Phase 3 What We Heard Report. The following is a listing of the comments that were posted with park amenity options in the activity.**

## Written Comments

- » Please leave this trail alone
- » keep as is
- » keep the single track as is
- » Bathrooms would be nice here and picnic area but keep as natural as possible. NO pavement
- » good spot for viewpoint if new natural trail is made
- » good spot for viewpoint if natural trail is made
- » More garbage cans to reduce littering.
- » Vehicle access will hamper the use of this site as a ""destination"" which requires more fixed structures. Would like to see more waste receptacles.
- » Add 1 more garbage can here to the proposal
- » Need a washroom/pit toilet on the north end of the park too.
- » needs to connect to across the river
- » Too many logs in pathway
- » Remove
- » This is totally unnecessary
- » Art installation is unnecessary
- » This trail is very narrow and very well used by bikes in the summer. It creates conflicts as walkers must dodge bikers non-stop. The vegetation is also quite sensitive. I would prefer to see this trail restricted to bikers and have them moved to a trail in front (west) of the forest.
- » This is a bad spot for a gathering location. You are going to remove a bunch of natural habitat for a very doubtful idea. For example. How will workers clean and maintain this area? If they need truck access or quad access the level of damage is high. Better to move this to the edge of the open field
- » Bad spot for gathering area. You will either build access and destroy a bunch of habitat or not build access and then cant maintain it
- » I think the sandbar needs recognition in the Plan, or else explicit explanation/justification for why it is not included in the plan. The sandbar receives a high level of use, especially in late summer, and the City should acknowledge and sustainably manage/plan for its use.
- » Another washroom in this area would be really useful.
- » Garbage receptacle here would be handy.
- » Keep as much singletrack mountain bike trails as possible. This will keep the user groups separated as much as possible.
- » The importance of this junction needs more recognition. Good place for entry sign, wayfinding signs/map, and pit washroom facility.
- » Way too many trail marker signs. Only needed at trail intersections.
- » This entry location is more an entry into the river valley than it is a specific entry into Oleskiw Park. Not sure entry sign here is needed for the park.
- » keep existing natural trail
- » keep existing natural trail
- » Vehicle access is a huge problem for worthy of any future investment. Is it possible to negotiate with the golf club to use their road?
- » Have another waste receptacle here.



# Emails

External stakeholders and members of the public wrote emails to the City regarding ideas and concerns for the Oleskiw River Valley Park Master Plan during Phase 3 of engagement.

**The following is a summary of the topics of discussion in these emails. We are taking this input into account as we work towards creating a consolidated concept for the park that will be shared in Phase 4.**

## **Email Topic**

- » Email regarding the existing single-track trail 'Oleskiw Meadows' and a desire not to make the trail granular.

