

# **OLESKIW**

## **RIVER VALLEY PARK**

### **MASTER PLAN**

---

**What You Said**  
**Phase 4: Preferred Concept Option**  
**September 2018**



# What You Said

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

---

**69**  
public engagement  
participants

**13**  
external stakeholder  
participants

**322**  
online survey  
participants

**89**  
internal engagement  
participants

**2,021**  
open-ended  
comments

**1,722**  
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](https://edmonton.ca/oleskiwparkmasterplan)

This What You Said report documents the individual comments we received during the Phase 4 engagement activities at the public engagement session, external stakeholder session and online survey. The comments are presented according to engagement activity.

# 3,743

in person + online  
interactions



# Public Engagement Session

July 9, 2018  
Westridge Wolf Willow Country Club Community League,  
5-8pm  
69 Attendees

Visitors to the Oleskiw River Valley Park Phase 4 public engagement session were welcomed at the door and provided with an overview of the event setup. Participants had the opportunity to read background information on the

project, including the City's decision-making process and the various inputs that guided the plan. The vision and concept plan for the park was presented in a series of five key areas: Slopes and Mobility Corridor; Top-of-Bank; Valley Field; Forest Corridor; River Edge and Sand Bar.

Participants were asked to comment on the phasing approach, the proposed park elements and their overall support for the Master Plan.

Feedback from the event survey reported mixed feedback on the event advertising. Participants enjoyed the clarity of the presentation material, the progression of the plan in response to public input, and the ability to speak to staff with their questions and concerns.

**Comments were made using sticky notes on the open house presentation boards in response to the informational panels as well as four specific activities.**



## Public Engagement Session: Presentation Boards

### Vision and Principles

- » How are you going to handle unplanned use (? Beach)
- » Accessible to wheelchairs
- » Restore to native plant species
- » Should be a natural area
- » Open trails to xc ski + biking
- » Keep open field
- » Like: benches to sit & fish along river
- » Natural, signage, some seating, viewpoints
- » Need alternative access. Only route is through Wolf Willow Ridge
- » Like: activities should be low-impact
- » Also like: native plant proliferation
- » Need benches + resting area in north area, not just at Terwillegar
- » No picnic areas attracts garbage + animals
- » Like formal + informal paths
- » change - add some lights along paved path
- » Concern - where will people park?
- » Parties, noise, fire hazard. Need more police.

### Park Use & Amenities

- » Fenced off-leash area is a great neighbourhood feature
- » No off-leash please
- » More on leash signage fines \$ include
- » Or fenced off leash :)
- » Edm. X-country Assoc. may help maintain x-country trails
- » No off leash area please
- » One route through park allowing dogs off-leash. No! No!
- » No off-leash
- » No off-leash area please!
- » Off-leash areas are dangerous to pedestrians and bikers
- » No off-leash areas please
- » No off-leash.

### Access & Circulation

- » Will need to be super clear on parking ban in WWR
- » I would volunteer to groom x-country ski trails
- » Improve trail from Woodward Crescent. Consider purchasing land from golf course to create switchback.
- » Hill surface washes out & heavy rain. Better surface or switchback?
- » This is existing trail already [pointing to new natural trail]
- » A granular path on the east edge of the field would be good
- » Parking on Woodward Crescent will be issue
- » Woodward access trail s/b paved or water/drainage runoff controlled
- » Consider kayak/canoe launch

- » Wanyandi stairs really limit access. 200 stairs too many.
- » Need switchback access.
- » Lots were purchased when lower lands were privately held, not subject to a public park with no access.
- » Lots were purchased with knowledge that this valley development was in the works. The decision was yours! (Parking)

### Natural Asset Management

- » Do not plant polar! We have enough spring "snow"

### Overall Comments

- » Only access point from west end is through Wolf Willow Ridge. Too much traffic & parking issues.
- » Separate hiking + xc ski trails in winter.
- » Should provide blufones at warming huts.
- » Shade structure in summer?
- » Concern warming hut will collect debris/invite vandalism or 'squatting'
- » No warming huts - shelter for homeless?
- » Love the idea of separate groomed xc ski trails
- » Concern with safety of shelter. Could be a "hide-out" for potential stalker.
- » Groomed x-country trail. Could be separate to prevent people walking on tracks.
- » New pit washrooms will be problematic and attract homeless.
- » Strongly consider paving access from Woodward Cres. Very difficult after rains to access with a wheelchair and a regular commuter bike (bicycle)
- » Possible concerns: installations could be abused and create risk to park + neighbourhood
- » Any "installations" should look natural (ie. not made of rusted metal-modern art)
- » If installations were up-scale and well-maintained, this could be a fun/unique feature
- » Parking! Where is everyone going to park? New beach... learn from accidental beach.
- » Could you add some periodic solar lighting (for safety)
- » Agree w/others warming hut seems unnecessary. This is a remote area - keep it natural.
- » Warming hut? Where really cold I doubt people will be there.
- » Like the lookout. Able to access from top of stairs north of park?
- » Who would fund installations? (Is this why Westridge is losing ETS bus service?)
- » Skip the interpretive signs - they get vandalized or weather damaged; like the pit toilets
- » Pit washroom good; don't mow field (keep natural)
- » Pit washrooms would be great s/b close to bike

- » Keep natural no pit washroom no picnic area
- » Is a covered shelter really needed? Picnic tables and garbage cans are enough
- » Signage to support shared use trail etiquette for bikes to warn walkers
- » Signs with maps are a good idea - but make them durable. Have given people directions on more than one occasion!
- » Love “granular trail” concept
- » Really like the addition of a picnic shelter & pit washroom
- » Fix the hill at Woodward Cres. access
- » No pit washrooms!
- » Need security to enforce park safety. Especially after hours.
- » I like the idea of pit toilets near the bridges - could they be composting toilets?
- » Love the large open field - don't plant more trees!
- » Need another access point from west side. Unfair for WWR neighbourhood. Too much traffic.
- » Love this! [pointing at new natural trail]
- » Signage - NO - have you seen the Ft. Edmonton signs - looks bad
- » Flood damage?
- » Sand bar will grow could make a nice beach
- » Or another terrible blight!
- » Really neat to see families enjoying the sand bar
- » Ensure (illegible) are large enough
- » Want signs but signs in Terwillegar are already peeling after 2 years. Need to be durable.
- » Sand bar will attract lots of people and issues. Garbage, noise, safety. City needs a plan ASAP!

## Public Engagement Session: Feedback Boards

### Which, if any, Park Use & Amenities elements do you support and why?

- » Trash containers required throughout park
- » Resting benches would be nice! :)
- » Love the proposed “lookouts”
- » Benches good.
- » Fewer winter installations (warming huts). Fewer viewpoints. They both disturb the natural character of the park.
- » Agree.
- » It would be awesome if you could put in a water fountain. I appreciate the hard work put in so far!
- » Looks good. Listened to feedback.
- » If hill isn't fixed - winter installation not worth it.
- » Winter installations will not be worth it
- » Agree.

- » Some good ideas but some real risks too that could compromise the natural serenity of this area.
- » Nicely planned.
- » Support your hard work on this.
- » Good suggestion re: water fountain. Is the infrastructure (H2O lines) close by or would this be expensive?
- » Wonder about use in winter. Looks good! Feedback listened to. Thx.
- » I strongly support all aspects of the proposal.
- » Very exciting!
- » Beautiful concept!
- » I look forward to a park and amenities we can use in all 4 seasons.
- » Strongly agree as leashed dog zone only!
- » Strong support to keep it natural.
- » Keep special use groups on a tight leash. Ensure public access open
- » Great concepts! Would like to see fenced off-leash area added.
- » Public to have access even when special groups operating.
- » I love Edmonton's river valley trails + efforts to improve use + access.

### Which, if any, Park Use & Amenities elements do you oppose and why?

- » How do you access area. Only through Wolf Willow Ridge! Need alternative access for west side
- » No picnic area.

### Which, if any, Access & Circulation elements do you support and why?

- » Good but Terwillegar will need still more parking added. Already near capacity at times.
- » Develop parking lot at the Ft. Edm. end of the bridge
- » Support more parking at Terwillegar end of park as this is the best access point
- » More signage to prevent people from criss-crossing field.
- » “You are here” signage could be useful at some of the trail points.
- » Strongly support. Important to maintain access year-round.
- » Circulation looks good :)
- » Support the project
- » We strongly support this entire project.
- » check

### Which, if any, Access & Circulation elements do you oppose and why?

- » Without dedicated off-street parking provided, foresee unhappy neighbours

- » No parking lot in Wolf Willow Ridge. Need alternate access... Country Club?
- » Need to build a small parking lot on the park property otherwise you will be creating neighbourhood strain.
- » Add small parking lot at top of Woodward Crescent to eliminate street parking & increase accessibility
- » Suggest a parking ban in WWR neighbourhood... resident only
- » Safety and police monitoring is necessary. Parking will get worse as more people try to access the area.
- » Parking not an acceptable solution :(
- » Parking & access through Wolf Willow Ridge is unacceptable
- » Need an alternative access point from west side. Currently the only access is through WWR
- » Consider residential parking ban in Wolf Willow Ridge
- » Support full removal of brome+ other diminishing its ability to spread. This method should also limit the use of herbicides in later years.
- » Option #1 do all rehab at once.
- » Do it once, do it right. Lowest overall cost, can still use the existing trails during the 3 years.
- » Do it once with shorter timeframe.
- » Would be nice to see a bit of natural prairie - an opportunity was lost with the big dirt patch from the bridge construction.
- » Removal of invasive species is key. Hurry up + get it done.
- » Not realistic [re: valley field cleared and re-planted]
- » Unrealistic [re: The picnic and learning area, with a pit washroom, is built after naturalization of the valley field.
- » Leave some smooth brome - it's become part of the character of the park. Also would allow access to the park. Not in favour of 3-year closure.
- » Phased approach - construct trails + some brome remains.
- » Phased approach.
- » Waiting three years to enjoy the Ribbon Bridge is too long. Cost of shelter and amenities may increase in price in 3 years to add to total cost.
- » Prefer the phased naturalization.
- » We have waited a long time for the park/bridge. Let's not wait another 3 yrs to enjoy it.
- » The smooth brome looks fine to me + the cost is prohibitive to remove it.
- » It is not worth closing the park for 6 years to get rid of the brome... it will likely come back.
- » Better [pointing at Phasing Option 2]
- » Phased is best for people and wildlife and nature
- » Consider residential parking ban in WWR. Need more enforcement after park hours.
- » Light and signage
- » Plant aggressive native species

### Which, if any, Natural Asset Management elements do you support and why?

- » However let nature enhance sand bar + make it a beach
- » Love the natural, low maintenance approach
- » Keep it as natural as possible. Manage/get rid of invasive species.
- » Strongly support.
- » Yest to restoration to native plants.
- » Please leave meadow. Keep natural.
- » Make sure re-naturalized field is not disturbed by off-trail pedestrian traffic. Don't mow.
- » Good luck keeping people off the sand bar (though I agree with the concept). Yes to naturalizing.
- » I like the natural approach and keeping the beach use to a minimum if at all.
- » Yes to natural areas man.
- » Happy to see the forest restoration. Natural look is awesome!

### Which, if any, Natural Asset Management elements do you oppose and why?

#### Phasing Comments:

- » Trying to fully eliminate brome may not be viable?
- » Support 3 yr plan - if paved + granular paths can be fenced + stay open
- » How will the City plan for unplanned use of sand bar?
- » Get it done, and quickly. Please!
- » Unsure if Option 1 will be successful @ fully eliminating invasive plants - Terwilligar Park has it too
- » Do it all at once. Do it right the first time, please.

### Which, if any, areas of the plan do you support and why?

- » I support keeping the ecosystems safe & viable. The amenities (warming huts, picnic area) seem excessive & costly to maintain. How much use would they get.
- » Please no picnic areas - trouble
- » Would be nice to see amenities that maximize seasonal use and accessibility. Support lighting, benches, paved paths.
- » Good idea - just worried about the cost. How do we get bikers to contribute?
- » Overall good concept. Needs a few tweaks.
- » I would like to see the changes managed so we can still enjoy the area over the next 10 years.
- » It would be great if the park was a natural respite in the river valley.

- » Phase 2 please. Park remains open. Cost concerns. Love a natural state. Please minimize signage. No lights etc.
- » Very happy with the plan + that you listened to public input.
- » A lot of thought + planning. Well done
- » Strongly support because the River Valley is precious and it gives us a place to connect
- » Please consider access for those with mobility challenges - from the west end. There is none with hills and stairs!
- » Looks good. Like the natural approach + limitations to usage as presented. Signage is definitely needed.
- » Looks great. Looks like a lot of thought and hard work put in. Thank you.
- » I strongly support the rehabilitation + minimal infrastructure/maintenance approach.
- » Like it but would like to see some lighting along the paved path for winter evenings.
- » Looks good. Appreciate maintaining natural look with some amenities like washrooms + warming spaces.
- » Great overall! My only request is to keep open field (smooth brome or more native species)
- » Great plan. Please work on parking.
- » Very well thought out. I appreciate the balance between amenities and natural spaces.
- » Looks good. Like the naturalization and low impact focus.
- » Strongly support. Consider some solar lighting. Don't go overboard on infrastructure to contain costs.
- » I like it. A nice addition to link the existing Terwellegar & the Fort. Looks to be calm, quiet & peaceful.
- » Thanks for a job well done. Love the natural look & minimum structures [illegible].
- » Nice job!
- » Love it/Love it! PLEASE designate it as an ON-LEASH ONLY area!

**What, if anything, would increase your level of support for the plan?**

- » You have to have a neighbourhood access.
- » Parking is a problem. This is going to cost a lot for only local access.
- » I still believe less is more. Paths, benches, lookouts etc. You can always add more if you feel it is needed.





# External Stakeholder Workshop

**July 10, 2018**  
**Westridge Wolf Willow Country Club Community League,**  
**5-7 pm**  
**13 Participants**

Participants of the external stakeholder workshop were welcomed to the event and given some time to peruse the open house presentation material. Participants were split into two groups and asked to contribute to small group discussions on the following themes:

- » Park Use and Amenities
- » Access and Circulation
- » Natural Asset Management
- » Overall Concept Plan

Stakeholders confirmed elements of the plan that they supported and provided suggestions for areas they felt could be improved through facilitated group conversations. Participants were also provided with surveys with the same questions from the open house and online survey in which they could provide comments during the evening or mail in at a later date.

The following organizations were represented at the stakeholder workshop:

- » Edmonton & Area Land Trust
- » Edmonton Country Club
- » Edmonton Mountain Bike Alliance
- » Edmonton Native Plant Society
- » Edmonton Nature Club
- » Edmonton River Valley Conservation Coalition
- » Friends of Terwillegar
- » Wedgewood Community League



## Group Discussion Summaries:

### Which, if any, Park Use & Amenities elements do you support and why?

- » On leash: off-leash across river in Terwillegar!
- » Trash receptacle: prefer in-ground type (Terwillegar)
- » Shelter: combine with solar energy collection (panels). Winter warming?
- » Like the minimization of amenities.
- » Pit toilets good
- » Maintain character of trails - enjoy while going through the park
- » Gathering space good for education - but may be too far of a walk

### Which, if any, Park Use & Amenities elements do you oppose and why?

- » Biking on certain natural trails - erosion, sensitive vegetation damage. Area is preservation zone. No extra trails.
- » Signs might get vandalized.
- » Budget for interpreters rather than just signs. (Master Naturalist Program: stewards adopt sites, partnerships with COE)
- » Budget for training + support for interpreters/stewards. Organize nature walks, etc.
- » Welcome on-leash dogs needed
- » Overkill on winter shelters - would have fewer
- » Concerns about unregulated activity and increased maintenance on structures i.e. vandalism
- » Washrooms on other side of Fort Edmonton Bridge? Easier access for maintenance
- » Terwillegar may be better suited for washrooms
- » Include covered garbage cans - may need fewer than shown on plan
- » Fewer winter installations/warming huts
- » Minimal and easy to maintain

### Which, if any, Access & Circulation elements do you support and why?

- » Management of natural trails by City of Edmonton
- » Partnership with EMBA to do maintenance/stewardship/education (ERBCC; trail runners group partnerships)
- » Happy that asphalt trail not placed along river edge
- » Some support granular trail offshoots
- » Keep trails shared use

### Which, if any, Access & Circulation elements do you oppose and why?

- » Trails near bridge: should not have mountain bike access - erosion, sensitive vegetation (native understory) damage. Area is preservation zone.
- » Openness of areas that are sensitive: introduce Rangers to monitor use/access to sensitive areas
- » Need maintenance on new trails i.e. granular
- » New granular trail loop - you can make loops with existing trails
- » More trails need more maintenance
- » Could address conflicts in trail use
- » Can see increased pressure on the Terwillegar parking lot
- » EMBA would like the opportunity to work on new natural trail
- » Why continue to approach the top-of-bank as manicured?

### Which, if any, Natural Asset Management elements do you support and why?

- » Improve species biodiversity in the River Valley - even if it is not what was originally there
- » Improve experience in River Valley
- » Open meadow: different class of fauna. Has value. Keep.
- » Remove thistle first.
- » Scaled-back approach from earlier suggestions appreciated.
- » Establish benchmarks for success
- » Prioritize removal of noxious weeds in forest areas first: they do more damage there than in the field

### Which, if any, Natural Asset Management elements do you oppose and why?

- » Current and past management of invasive species is not effective - need better methods - specifically mulch
- » Need management of existing woodlot i.e. removal of trees for suckering
- » What does re-naturalization mean?
- » Costly - can the City manage long-term?
- » Need a good public messaging strategy
- » Brome removal very labour intensive. Why here? Very difficult to do.
- » "Eco-Island": Kill invasives and plant aspen + shrubs. Easier than herbaceous
- » Mixed wood zone rather than grass. Xone in Edmonton
- » "Bud Brush" / "Dog Bean" / "Canada Buffalo Berry" / "Saskatoon" (Low shrubs instead of grass option?)
- » Sowing native grass and try
- » Not undertake turning of soil/brome

- » Let reforest by natural suckering rather than active. Cut aspen and will sucker!
- » Staged closing rather than wholesale closing for long time
- » Plan not designed as ecological corridor, is detrimental to use by wildlife
- » Restrict human use in certain areas of River Valley (Preservation Areas)
- » Will take years to grow stock of native plants to restore

#### **Which, if any, areas of the plan do you support and why?**

- » Need education to inform that brome and other invasives need to be managed/removed
- » Important to get community/stewarding groups involved - manpower and sense of pride in the park
- » Provide simple information that people can reference and help out
- » Increases education and understanding of the area - sense of ownership

#### **What, if anything, would increase your level of support for the plan?**

- » Phasing Option 1 looks unrealistic - phased approach could be better
- » Could promote research and have controls (i.e. naturally occurring forest growth)
- » No point spending money for something you're not sure will succeed
- » Many think the brome is natural anyways
- » Consider costs - one time funding may be easier to attain than long-term operating costs
- » Is this the place to spend \$10 million? Other areas in the city are higher need for spending
- » Education! Educate on what is invasive and why it's an issue
- » See challenges with invasive species creeping back into the park
- » People would be very turned off with Phasing Option 1 - park would be closed
- » Follow up - what's happening right away? i.e. farming equipment that's in the forest - will it be removed?

### **External Stakeholder Workbook Comments:**

#### **Which, if any, Park Use & Amenities elements do you support and why?**

- » Pit toilet ok
- » Waste receptacle - suggest in ground as less frequent p/u and damage to other infrastructure.
- » Support EMBA to maintain sensitive trails with addressing erosion concerns
- » Like concept of more natural viewpoints
- » I strongly support the amenities outlined. I encourage as many garbage cans as possible at regular intervals in the park. Washrooms at both bridges is important.
- » 3 waste receptacles (north, middle, south) should be sufficient, with seating benches at the same places
- » Perhaps one "pit washroom" at north end
- » A. I am in favour of pit toilets at each end of the park. (Generally, there is an abysmal lack of such facilities in City parks.) Also a picnic area and shelter.

#### **Which, if any, Park Use & Amenities elements do you oppose and why?**

- » Suggestion: put up stations for bags for dogs. Even if they are on leash they need to "do their business"
- » Winter installations seem unnecessary
- » A. Too much unnecessary seating. Remove benches from the north end (seating available on Ft Edmonton footbridge), from base of slope (from residential area) and 2 stages along the trail. Reduce the number of winter installations to 2.

#### **Which, if any, Access & Circulation elements do you support and why?**

- » Concern over parking + pressure [illegible] upon Terwillegar
- » Has the use and count been calculated? Suspect site will see increased use and therefore demand for access from neighbourhood, Fort Edmonton + Terwillegar needs be balanced so as not stress over [illegible]
- » No comment - seems fine to me. Strongly support.
- » Construction of new trails (and maintenance of old trails) should be guided by sustainable standards (established elsewhere? Known to bicycle clubs)
- » "A. I support the existing asphalt trail in its current location, for multi-use (pedestrians and cyclists). (Where there is a shared trail consider putting speed limits on cyclists?) I support the continued existence of the natural trail (riverside trail) that runs alongside the river, but not as a granular trail, for pedestrians only. (Bicycle use damages



habitat by compaction, erosion, trampling of vegetation, disturbance of wildlife.)

I support a cross-trail connection to the river lookout. I support the interior trail (meadow trail) running north-south more or less on the edge of the meadow, for pedestrian and bicycle use. (Cycles can only move slowly.) It should be left natural, not granulated. “

### **Which, if any, Access & Circulation elements do you oppose and why?**

- » The “new granular trail” seems superfluous
- » “A. I completely oppose the continued existence of the “natural” (read bicycle) trail to the north (convoluted interior trail along the escarpment and paralleling the riverside trail part way) for the reason that is causing erosion, compaction, damage to vegetation, disturbance to wildlife and in general violating the serenity and sanction of that part of the densely wooded environment. It is redundant: similar trails exist or have been newly created in Terwillegar and should prove sufficient for recreational/mountain bikers. This trail should be blocked off by fencing at strategic points and allowed to revegetate. Likewise, a “new natural trail connection” should not be created. I also consider it unnecessary to convert the current natural meadowside trail to a granular trail and to create more granular trail around the meadow perimeter. There should be one natural cross-connector trail from the main asphalt trail in the north, as shown, as well as a cross-connector to the river lookout and a short spur to connect the stream trail to the riverside trail. To sum up:
  - Main commuter (Ribbon of Green) trail between the two footbridges and from residential area (asphalt, multi-use).
  - Riverside trail with only two connectors, all natural, pedestrian use only.
  - Meadowside trail, running north-south, natural, pedestrians, slow bikers.”

### **Which, if any, Natural Asset Management elements do you support and why?**

- » Agree with management of open field
- » [illegible] blue grass - eco island buck brush (?) - canada buffalo
- » I don't know enough to comment.
- » (“poplar dominated forest” means “mixed aspen & balsam poplar”?)
- » Some ideas need to be developed
- » What constitutes “shrub” and “re-naturalized field”?

- » Inclusive education is required to protect the sensitive sand bar
- » “A. I would like to see the stream and appropriate riparian vegetation established if possible. I would like to see the escarpment environment in the north that has been damaged by bicycle trails closed down and allowed to rehabilitate naturally. The rock pile should be removed. The management of invasive species should be a priority. It is shown on the map as being confined to a small area (perhaps this is just a graphic representation) but in fact the majority of weedy species are rampant and well dispersed throughout the area, including both the field and woodland trails. Removing noxious weeds such as Canada thistle and tansy should be a priority, and sweet-clovers should be targeted too. Tough decisions will have to be made about the extent of control of burnet-saxifrage and yellow lady's-bedstraw, perhaps initially maintaining control to avoid further spread to Terwillegar Park. Control of smooth brome requires similar decisions, based on expert advice. Any area of brome killed will require speedy transplanting, for example, with shrubs such as buckbrush (*Symphoricarpos occidentalis*), saskatoon (*Amelanchier alnifolia*) and Canada buffaloberry (*Shepherdia canadensis*). Gradual removal of *Caragana* on the west escarpment should be undertaken, with replacement with aspen (preferably coppicing of naturally occurring ones) and native shrubs. (I suspect this *Caragana* supplies good cover for both coyotes and deer, so should be done in patches.) Elsewhere, I see no need for the City to spend a lot of money on planting trees, with the possible exception of some white spruce along the asphalt trail in clumps for shelter. Existing aspen can be encouraged by lopping, or by controlled burns, which also might increase regeneration of balsam poplar. The plan lacks details at this point regarding management and restoration; for example, what is meant by “field renaturalization.” All material used should come from local-collected, local-grown sources. I oppose the use of any “manicured” (cultivated?) material in the park. “

### **Which, if any, Natural Asset Management elements do you oppose and why?**

### **Which, if any, areas of the plan do you support and why?**

- » Not sure what to comment on that hasn't already been covered.
- » Pit washroom only at north end

- » naturalization' is a good idea, but how?
- » Some intensive research/experience gathering required
- » "A. Generally, the plan has done a reasonable job of keeping things simple and natural, with the exception of the trails plan, which is too excessive and laissez-faire! (See earlier comments.)  
I have no objections to pit toilets, a picnic and learning area, and a reduced number of benches and winter installations. "

**What, if anything, would increase your level of support for the plan?**

- » I don't see the need for winter installations.
- » "Picnic & learning area" not required at present
- » These type of installations should be provided at nearby Terwillegar Park
- » The new "granular trail circuit" in the south is not required at present.
- » "A. Blocking off the north "convoluted escarpment trail" as previously stated and restriction of cyclists to two trails only: the main asphalt trail and the meadowside trail. (In fact, cyclists should be discouraged from using Oleskiw as a recreational cycling area – Terwillegar escarpments do more than enough in that respect. Appropriate signage will be needed to educate cyclists ("No Cycling" signs) as well as monitoring by wardens and handing out of tickets for violations.  
Is interpretive signage planned for the park?  
Some reference could be made in the plan to stewardship opportunities – or does that come with the management plan?"



# Online Survey

July 10 - July 31, 2018

322 survey respondents

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

The presentation material from the open house was provided on the project website for the public to view on their own time. Participants of the online survey were encouraged to read the open house material prior to beginning the survey.

The survey outlined the main features in the Concept Plan as well as some of the management practices proposed in the Master Plan. Participants were asked to provide their level of support for the concept plan and management practices and were given the opportunity to leave open-ended comments.

**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](#)





### Which, if any, Park Use & Amenities elements do you support and why?

- » On leash: off-leash across river in Terwilligar!
- » Trash receptacle: prefer in-ground type (Terwilligar)
- » Shelter: combine with solar energy collection (panels). Winter warming?
- » Like the minimization of amenities.
- » Pit toilets good
- » Maintain character of trails - enjoy while going through the park
- » Gathering space good for education - but may be too far of a walk
- » I strongly support the warming huts. What a great way to embrace our Winter City and make a park useable all year round. Support the washrooms as well.
- » I support pit washrooms, benches, a picnic shelter. They all sound great.
- » picnic shelters and year round (winter temp) facilities
- » Waste receptacles, one pit toilet.
- » The washrooms will be a great addition. Currently there are none which makes it difficult to be done there for a long time. The benches will be nice for walkers. The lack of shade currently down there makes it a long & hot stretch in the summer months. The addition of trees will be a welcomed addition. The warming huts in the winter will allow more people to use the space in the winter.
- » Trees and trails
- » On the whole I am happy with the park design, and aside from the trail elements and the lack of an urban beach, I think this is a good plan.
- » The winter warming huts are an interesting idea. I would like to hear more about what this entails.
- » The warming hut for winter hiking. Also, there should be cross-country skiing.
- » River lookout and amenities like washrooms. River lookout so you can see the nice river and the ravine views. Washrooms so its cleaner and more wholesome in the park.
- » I do like the idea of adding a washroom, as I never recall seeing one when I go there. Fire pits/benches/warm up shacks would be a great way to bring people to the park as there really aren't any places to stop and sit down other than on the benches on the bridges. Shelters would be nice because it would give me (and others) the opportunity to have a picnic down there! The forest is too thick to sit in but the big field has no shade, meaning it isn't currently a nice place to sit and spend the afternoon. I always just walk around and go home. But it has so much potential, I'm pumped that you guys are adding stuff! ^^
- » They are all good, lookout points are nice to have.
- » I like the warming huts, garbage receptacles, and keeping the rest as natural as possible.
- » "Viewpoints at the river - accessing the river is important
- » Washrooms - important resource to have
- » Gathering space - if programmed appropriately, could be special place"
- » Like the picnic areas and additional outhouses. The river valley needs more washrooms!
- » I support all of the amenities, and especially appreciate the washrooms so that people aren't trying to go in the bushes on the dirt trails that they feel might not be well used, but are used by cyclists.
- » "We walk the park from Fort Edmonton and enjoy it year round. The addition of public washrooms is an added feature that is more than welcome!
- » (Because the park is in a natural 'flood plain' - there should be no construction that could be affected.)"
- » I support all of these amenities because Edmonton is so much in need of Park areas within the city. So beneficial to those who are unable to travel outside of the city as well as more green space.
- » Having washrooms and bench seating is nice
- » the washroom seems like an ok idea. I appreciate you are leaving the mountain bike single track alone
- » I support all of the proposed park use and amenities
- » Trails, public washrooms, picnic sites, sitting sites. Less impact of humans (noise, garbage, etc.) on a natural area but at the same time, humans can enjoy a relaxing outside retreat.
- » The warming huts are a fantastic idea!
- » I support all of the proposed.
- » Washrooms are good well placed. Like the viewpoints too and the warming huts
- » It is nice to see four viewpoint areas.
- » The washrooms
- » Washrooms, washrooms, washrooms. There cannot be enough washrooms. The lack of them prevents me from going to other parks on a more frequent basis.
- » I like the all season aspect of the planning and the footbridge connections to Terwilliger and Ft. Edmonton parks
- » All.
- » "Benches - I see many walkers and bike riders where I assume some would appreciate the resting space
- » Picnic Area - I could see that being utilized"
- » I believe at least some built up infrastructure is required for the park to make it usable and functional. So benches, rest points, small picnic sites things that support usage at a basic level.
- » make it dog friendly

- » I tend to support all but I note a lack of scientifically informed backup for statement that this master plan will support the vision statement. The valley needs some firm benchmarks and commitment to monitoring. For example will you pick a scientifically informed bench mark by which to monitor effects on enhancement of this area for wildlife?
- » "If the intent is to leave this park as a waypoint only then I agree. It is a great idea.
- » But the connection to eh west end is lost because there is no access down the cliff."
- » I support minimal use to allow this area to be restored. This plan looks like a lot of amenities for the area. When I reviewed the feedback from earlier consultations, I got the impression people want a strongly natural space with minimal intervention. This plan seems like a compromise, but I wonder whether there isn't more that could be removed to enhance the ecological restoration while still supporting some human recreational use.
- » Bathrooms, rest points and winter warming areas make the main trails more welcoming and easier to use. I like how the river lookouts encourage people to stay on the provided paths.
- » Most amenities seem to promote use of the park
- » warming huts and washrooms are a great addition
- » None - it is much to difficult to get to. No onsite parking and to difficult to access down a steep hill
- » I support them all, I like that there are small upgrades, but nothing too disruptive or difficult
- » I support all, but would recommend more waste receptacles.
- » I support the washrooms which are important. I love the idea of rest stops with benches.
- » As my kids are young, I appreciate the access to rest stops & washrooms.
- » Looks good. Keep it minimal.
- » Walking Trails, Bike Trailsj, rest stops, shelters, toilets
- » The washrooms are the best part. I need washrooms regularly at my age.
- » "I personally wouldn't use them but I can see a potential use. The paths don't seem to get as much volume as I expected so spending money on them doesn't seem needed at this time.
- » O would support benches, pit washrooms and shade trees"
- » All except possibly washrooms and warming huts
- » All the elements add to the usability of the park.
- » I support all of the proposed additions / modifications to the park amenities - minimal, cost effective amenities focused on long term casual use is most appropriate given the access opportunities (pedestrian / cycle) and the intended usage as integrated into the natural landscape.
- » I simple picnic and gathering space at each end of the park will allow people with limited mobility (seniors, parents with several kids, etc) to use it as a rest and meeting place. The locations are also adequat becuase most of the influx of visitors comes from terwillegar Park and there is no rest areas on the way down to the bridge.
- » I support the multiple accessibility options near the Terwilliger Foot Bridge and Fort Ed Foot bridge.
- » none
- » Parks with picnic areas and walking trails
- » Everything but the "partnerships" item. Why do groups listed need to be marked out as special? . . . and not treated like any other group that wants to use the park? Sounds like someone is virtue signalling here.
- » Resting points, viewpoints, gathering spaces and picnic areas. Vital for any park.
- » I like the addition of bathrooms, especially if there is a water fountain. Mountain biking here is awesome, but often you need to get more water or use the bathroom. I would support the enhancement of the mountain biking culture, and leave all of the single track alone.
- » I like the ideas of "warming huts". I like that there is a sense that the new park should be used during all four seasons. Viewpoints are also nice.
- » I support all or the amenities and love the winter warming areas. The more inviting we can make our parks and rivervalley areas the better. I think you need more bathrooms.
- » I like all of the seating, and the shade aspects of the park, I think these areas would be great art attractions as well. But please do not plan giant silver balls that can't be used by the public. All public art should also be able to be used by everyone.
- » "The shelters, washrooms, and warming huts will be excellent additions as the closest public facilities or shelter are currently fairly distant (in Terwillegar to the South and east in Whitemud Park)
- » The addition of recyclable receptacles could be considered."
- » I support all the amenities, but why no playground for kids?
- » Waste receptacles, Warming huts, Seating
- » I love the lookouts and the benches. It indicates a theme of quiet respite from the busy city and is therefore highly beneficial to both personal well-being and nature at the same time.
- » "walking trail(s), parking, washrooms, lookouts
- » dog walking ability (on or off-leash)"
- » All proposed looks fine to me
- » waste bins for dog waste
- » I love our River valley and parks even if I'm not able to physically use them, they're important to keep up with the changes in our society and uses
- » Limiting use to trails etc

- » River look out
- » Washrooms and resting spaces, important for kids.
- » Looks like a good plan. minimally invasive with new forest and low disturbance to existing trails.
- » "I belong to one of the hiking groups in the city, washrooms are greatly appreciated. The more natural you can leave the park, the better for all concerned. Teenagers etc. are going to make their way down to the park, there have to be safety features so that nobody feels unsafe down there.
- » Try to keep as many of the trees and bushes as possible though please."
- » I love the idea of walking paths and benches throughout. The resting points are a great idea. Interpretive signs are also an excellent idea.
- » seems good
- » I really like the proposed layout and think it offers everything the people who will use it would hope for. I would be happy to see more waste receptacles closer to the river bank areas. The flexible shelters and gathering space make me especially happy.
- » I like almost all of the features - it would make hiking in all seasons much better.
- » I like the river outlooks and the new nature trails as well as the added washrooms
- » I support all the listed uses and amenities. They are sufficient and in some cases necessary (pit washrooms) in a foot access park. No point in overdeveloping as this will likely always have limited access.
- » why does it need to be developed more. nothing wrong with the way it is
- » benches, shelter, washrooms all make the park more usable and accessible. However, are washrooms not intended for 4 season use. They should be
- » Benches and washrooms are good
- » I like seeing trees being planted there and that there are facilities for picnics and human comfort (e.g.: warming shelters, rest benches.
- » I would definitely support the park but as councillors have said they don't have the money to maintain the green spaces so making another would just lead to it being run down and poorly maintained as other green spaces. Put the money into the parks/green spaces that are already created
- » "I especially support there being washrooms - this is the main shortcoming when trying to enjoy the Edmonton park system.
- » Amenities are low maintenance and encourage 'nature in the city' experiences."
- » More parking as it is remote
- » Resting points, relax.
- » The pit toilets should add to the park as currently there are limited (if any) nearby public washrooms.
- » None.
- » trails for cycling and general accessibility
- » I like the lookout areas. Washrooms will definitely be good to have.
- » All of them, specifically the winter installation.
- » Viewpoints, seatings, washrooms, picnic area
- » "Two washrooms are an excellent element, especially with kids in tow.
- » Warm up shelters for winter activities are great."
- » all of them but I would add more waste receptacles by the seating
- » It seems as if the plan is simply keeping the park as natural as possible and that is a plus
- » All as shown on the map
- » The park is being kept as natural as possible and some being returned to nature. WE needs parks that are more for nature and less for people o=in our river valley system.
- » I support all elements of the plan because they will enhance the park experience.
- » The layout looks good. Leave as much area natural with little impact of structures
- » Washrooms and picnic spaces are a must
- » No development should be done on flood plains,wasted of money.Critical thinking needed here.
- » resting areas and picnic shelters and gathering places, they should be accomadating and some overlooking the river, make it a place to go and relax not just stroll through and view nature.
- » once again city council totally wasting tax dollars when roads in the city are a total disaster. Council needs to stop listening to special interest group and start to properly use tax dollars !
- » I like the idea of a naturalized area that is provided with sufficient amenities to make a visit convenient and comfortable. I like the idea of a group area together with lots of natual spaces for individuals or smaller groups.
- » Support all of the recommended park use and amenities elements. I would like to maintain and protect the natural feel and serenity of this area, but recognize that washrooms for example are necessary. Would want all to be built in a manner that complements / blends with the existing nature and landscape as much as possible.
- » Make it as attractive as possible to as wide a group of users as possible.
- » this park is underused and the amenities will encourage more usage
- » "Improving the trail system and parks.
- » All amenities.
- » Benches and toilet pits are necessary especially for young families or seniors"
- » I love the idea of a naturalized park where people in the city can go and see natural beauty

- » winter insulation for more outdoor activities
- » The plan opens up the park for many more people that would not normally be able to manage to get through the park.
- » I support everything I have seen
- » “Paved and unpaved trails are good. Paved trails provide a reliable surface for visitors who use wheelchairs and walkers, folks with strollers, etc. Unpaved trails are less of an environmental impact.
- » Public washrooms in good condition and assiduously maintained are necessary in a public space this large and this far away from other “public” facilities in convenience stores, libraries, etc.
- » I support many picnic tables and grilles, such as at Rundle, etc.”
- » Leave it as it is.
- » Warming hut for cross country skiing enhances year round use of the facilities.
- » Walking and bike trails
- » public washroom (with security elements to prevent possible use of criminal conducts/safety compromise)
- » I support a minimal and cost effective use of this area. Washrooms don't have to be fancy. Would be nice to keep it as natural as possible. I don't want the city to spend a lot of money.
- » I support pretty much everything suggested for the park, all put together it sounds like it will be a wonderful park to visit when completed.
- » Keeping the natural forest and keeping the mountain bike trails that are there. Putting in winter shelters will promote some cross country skiing and other winter activities in the area.
- » Washrooms are a very welcome necessity. As the park is mainly accessible by foot with apparently minimal nearby parking (a good thing) resting benches with shade will be appreciated by those with mobility challenges. I strongly support the efforts to maintain the natural solitude the park provides.
- » Viewpoints. They add to the experience of using the park.
- » washroom near Fort Edmonton is good, no public washroom nearby. good to have gathering space hopefully it will be fully developed for walker, elderly and wheelchair access, and the surrounding picnic areas can be booked for large groups for outdoor parties, picnics.
- » All features look like an excellent use of the park.
- » All except warming huts
- » washrooms, viewpoints will be well received
- » “LOW IMPACT is key - great..
- » High importance of the movement/flow of animals using the RV to traverse the City as well as quiet & security for those that stay.
- » would also propose water fountains/drinking that do not require use of washroom...”
- » River look out, washrooms and pit stops
- » The general lack of development is a good thing. A basic trail to get people through the area is a must. Everything else should be minimized, and it appears to be relatively minimal in the proposed design.
- » Bathrooms and garbage disposal units are important! Picnic shelters, benches, etc are welcome
- » I strongly support the low-impact approach, because the river valley is a crucial ecosystem that needs to be protected.
- » The placement of toilets and teaching space near the footbridges.
- » all, anything that gets people there to use the park...dog-friendly
- » I support the new amenities, however, given the lack of vehicular access to the area, I wonder what the plan is for garbage removal, particularly if you are encouraging groups to picnic there.
- » Winter huts. I cycle through the winter and respite if required would be welcome.
- » “Washroom at the north end is well positioned.
- » I love the thought of another cycling trail in the trees connecting the two single-tracks.”
- » All the amenities. As I age I find that I need to rest more often, and unfortunately need to use the washroom more often. I would appreciate having a shelter to use when eating. I would like to know if access to the river outlook is a maintained path or a more rugged trail.
- » “I like that there are a number of benches. Enables people who need to rest along the way the opportunity to do this.
- » I like pit toilets. Toilets are needed and why not pit toilets?
- » I like the shelter/gathering space. It has the opportunity for groups to use the space as an open-air classroom.”
- » Good trails, and features
- » “I support
- » pit washrooms
- » Picnic Shelter
- » Educational and community partnerships
- » Resting points - these can be expanded into picnic points with picnic bench-tables
- » formalised viewing points”
- » Picnic area, washroom, but they need to be expanded.
- » I appreciate how reclamation and ecological functions were emphasized over pure recreational benefits.
- » Keep the park as natural as possible. Minimize paved trails and maintain the existing paved trails. Discourage bikers from going around puddles and developing wider trails.
- » Benches with shade, this makes it more effective to use when you have a young child with you.



- » Distribution of resting points across the trails to allow people, with different fitness levels, to be less intimidated to access the space. Sheltered spaces to allow people to use for programming or meeting up.
- » pit toilets and as little development as possible
- » I only support the benches or resting places and one pit washroom if we have to have one.
- » Love the proposed washrooms and resting/shelter area
- » Heated public washroom like at goldbar . With personal lockers , video cameras , emergency phones .
- » Washroom access at both ends and shelter is fantastic
- » The seating, winter shelters and washrooms are great.
- » As a cyclist/mountain biker/jogger/xcountry skier, I strongly support developing river valley natural areas for people friendly use; including cycling, jogging, walking, skiing, etc. Restroom facilities and coffee shop type services would draw people to the area for both recreational, leisure and social experiences.
- » “Strongly support proposed new naturalized trail connectors between the existing naturalized trails, as this will help keep traffic from advanced bikers and runners off the busy and generally slower-paced trails that parallel the river.
- » Excellent additions to the park area!”
- » The washrooms are a good idea. Preserving and enhancing the trails for biking looks great as well.
- » Maintain all existing single track trails!
- » The new natural path connecting bike paths.
- » Pit toilets and resting points. Anything that will support a primary use of single track mountain biking
- » Trails that can be used by cyclists.
- » I would use the waste receptacles and look outs. Proper disposal of waste and access to the river are very nice
- » Rest stops and river lookouts. Allows you to relax and enjoy the beautiful river we have
- » I support the proposal especially the defined mountain bike trails for safety reasons.
- » Select areas with existing views are formalized into viewpoints with seating and interpretive signage.
- » Warming huts are a great addition to encourage winter use and activity.
- » Washrooms are always a nice thing as Edmonton has too few public ones
- » Little impact to existing natural areas.
- » I support all of the features, in particular the pit toilets, warming huts and benches. They will increase use year round and support use by those who may need to rest frequently.
- » I support them all. As an all season mountain biker, I will likely not use them. However, I see lots of seniors and parents with infants/toddlers in the park that I think would benefit from them. I may use a winter warming hut.
- » “The connector trail. Helps divert traffic so runners and bikers both get more space.
- » Washroom. Well you gotta go sometime”
- » Minimal impact; preserves a lot of parkland.
- » All elements support use of the park while retaining and enhancing its natural values.
- » Washrooms, pit stops, and warming huts are a good idea. This is a large area so pit stops and warming huts would be welcome.
- » I like all the proposed amenities
- » I like the washrooms. There also needs to be some more benches/rest areas. It is important that this park be accessible to all people not just those fit enough to walk or cycle to the park. As the population ages this will become very important.
- » Trails for mountain biking
- » Keep it all on the paved path.
- » I support keeping the area as natural as possible. I really enjoy using the natural trails currently in this park.
- » “Looks good, please ensure that the garbage bins are emptied regularly and that they’re animal-resistant, and that they’re set back a bit from the trail as not to impede flow (quite congested on that main paved path in the summer).
- » Also, that North junction, where there’s a new proposed pit washroom, needs some attention regularly due to the gravel and sand coming down and collecting there, causing some bike cornering issues.”
- » Washrooms and lack of interface with current natural trails.
- » I think the winter installations are nice. Would be nice to see more refuse bins near the beach area.
- » I like the design. One suggestion; at one of the 4 river lookout points clear some trees so people can sit on some grass and have a picnic while they watch the mighty North Sask move(similar to Government House Park). I think the northern most river lookout point would be best as it has the sand bar when people like to swim or play with their dogs. The river is the crowing jewel of our city and what will make this park unique is if you can see it while you are in the park. Please try to include more comfortable views of the river.
- » “WINTER WARMING STATIONS.
- » SEATING ALONG PATH
- » SHELTERS.
- » RIVER LOOKOUTS AND NON PAVED WILDERNESS PATHS”
- » I support all as it gets people outside and into nature, however, proper mitigations should be put in place to preserve the trails already being used in the area.
- » Lack of large structures.
- » None. Stop wasting money
- » Like the idea of partnerships for educational groups.
- » Pit toilets are better than no toilets.

- » Walking trails, clean safe washrooms
- » The plan makes sense. The amenities are sufficient and the natural theme is consistent and it is achievable.
- » bathrooms and trash cans.
- » ONLY bike and foot traffic
- » “access to washrooms to allow for extended use of the area
- » rest areas along the pathways for those with mobility issues or to support extended use of the area
- » shelter to again allow for users to spend more time in the river valley
- » warming huts to encourage winter use of the trails; get people outside in the colder months
- » selected benches with lookout points along the river, while still maintaining the existing trails (i.e. not paving or otherwise changing the trail along the river)”
- » “Pit washrooms to allow visitors the ability to enjoy the area without concerns.
- » Waste receptacles to limit garbage reaching the natural areas”
- » I like the viewpoints and locations for the pit washrooms.
- » if there is a sand bar that will attract people - waste receptacles should be placed along those areas.
- » Benches, viewpoints, and trails. I support these items as my family enjoy these features in other parks and I feel they will limit the amount of development
- » “All are good, maybe a few more seated area’s and a few more viewpoint area’s and a few more water stations.
- » I do not want the park to be a victim of it’s own success, where you didn’t put enough amenities up front and tried to build them later.
- » Having shelters in more than one area is good as well, just in case of major storms or rain that flare up every once in a while.”
- » “I like the idea of bathroom facilities as we usually are on our bikes going through there and the closest facility is far away.
- » Benches, great idea for those walkers/pit stops”
- » “washrooms, very much needed.
- » What about access to the river?”
- » I like that it is really easy to figure out where the public washrooms are (locations at either end of the area). I like that there will be benches (some in the shade) so people can sit and just take in the scenery. Educational trips for students, children is a wonderful idea.
- » minimal development
- » Cross Country Skiing!!!
- » I like the idea of shady resting spots along the way. As well as shelter areas in the event of dangerous weather.
- » I support a trail-based activity park use, and the washrooms seem very useful.
- » Location of washrooms and rest areas.
- » One washroom would be enough, do not need to disrupt area too much with construction. Park benches are good.
- » I am in favour of it all. I regularly walk or cycle this area and I feel that the plan enhances the area in just the right amount.
- » Toilets are very important for a trail system that is so large, but will have to be constructed from 100% non-combustible materials or we will have fires set in the river valley.
- » It will be nice to have access to bathrooms at both ends of the park.
- » Washroom & viewpoints
- » Washrooms and resting places
- » A place for people to meet, have lunch, and a safe place for people to relieve themselves when needed
- » Preservation of natural trails for use in cross country running and or mountainbiking.
- » washrooms, waste receptable
- » “pit washrooms, warming installations, waste receptacles.
- » I hope there will be water available at the washrooms.”
- » Maintain and extend natural trails and areas.
- » I like the toilets, the benches, great spot for the shelter
- » Mostly natural trails
- » Bathrooms are a nice thing when I am running. Warming huts will also be nice.
- » I like that much of the area will continue to be naturalized and that the existing single track trails will be untouched.
- » We would use the warming hut and washrooms, as well as low impact trails.
- » The natural trails. Enjoying the valley with minimal construction or damage to the environment.
- » “Resting points
- » Select areas with existing views are formalized into viewpoints with seating and interpretive signage
- » helpful to all users”
- » Singletrack mountain bike trails are very important. The amount and quality of trails we have in Edmonton are very rare for an urban environment and something to be cherished and ideally expanded upon.
- » Natural trails. As a mtn biker these are crucial for my enjoyment of river valley
- » Specifically, washrooms make it easier to spend a longer time in the park area.
- » “I support the construction of washrooms as it will discourage people from “going outdoors” - as long as they are kept clean.
- » I support interpretive signage, especially if it educates the public on history, ecology, and environmental issues within the park.”
- » Pit Washrooms. With heavier public use we need to provide a clean centralized place for bathroom breaks. Much easier to have kids out using the area when there are washrooms.

- » The pit bathrooms and rest areas would be very beneficial and are definitely needed.
- » pit toilets and garbage receptacles will make a big difference in keeping the park clean!
- » Keep and maintain singletrack system
- » Washrooms, trash cans, seating, shelter
- » trail connection, Winter warm up, Picnic area and washrooms
- » Multiseason amenities are very important, as are a robust mountain bike trail network
- » The addition of washrooms and shelters are welcome. Right now, people use the wild outdoors for toilets, and either in the blazing sun or freezing winds, there is no shelter whatsoever - even if one is caught in a sudden storm.
- » Due to limited access, the limited development option sounds good...pathways, benches, warming hut, shelter, etc. are all within the current use and will benefit visitors to the park.
- » Walking / bike paths
- » The washrooms and waste receptacles. These are very much needed. I have a disabled teenaged son who likes to walk but needs a diaper change roughly every 90 minutes. These amenities would make it possible for us to spend, say, an entire afternoon in the part.
- » Washrooms and benches! Both very useful when taking my kids for a walk, run or bike ride
- » Natural growth
- » All of them. You have several resting, viewing, shelters, and more.
- » Include covered garbage cans - may need fewer than shown on plan
- » Fewer winter installations/warming huts
- » Minimal and easy to maintain
- » This is a natural space. Why does the city feel all usable space must be “developed? Even the more natural concept will require more maintenance (which the City isn’t doing well with). Winter installation? It will be rarely used. The City wants to re-introduce native plants, and then there will be the ongoing maintenance. The City is creating a money pit where the easy solution would be to just leave it as untouched as possible.
- » Gazebos, bbq areas, fields, anything super costly.
- » “The “granular” trail should be a paved, hard surface trail in order to be more welcoming to the full range of trail users. This includes disabled users who are less likely to use a granular trail. A granular trail needlessly excludes wheelchair users, inline skaters, summer cross-country ski trainers, and many road cyclists accessing the paved trails at Fort Edmonton and those farther upstream near the Anthony Henday bridges.
- » Secondly, an urban beach should be developed upstream from the Fort Edmonton footbridge.”
- » I’m not sure it needs two toilet areas. One higher quality / more routinely maintained toilet area would be better for a space this size.
- » Nothing.
- » No smoking please or put a designated smoking area. No fire pits please
- » Honestly, I don’t really oppose any. I think the features you are proposing will all help bring people down to enjoy the park!
- » None, however, the park might need more waste receptacles though. For the size of park there doesn’t seem to be enough, they are too spread out.
- » Not opposition, necessarily, but it is not very easy to get to. A big picnic spot and shelter will not be used by many people.
- » N/A
- » N/A
- » I don’t oppose any.
- » I don’t specifically oppose the warming hut, but am not sure that its needed in this area
- » I am not sure from this picture, but I am cautious about any impact to the mountain bike trails in this area. I would like those to not be damaged.
- » none
- » None.
- » none
- » “What amenities?”

**Which, if any, Park Use & Amenities elements do you oppose and why?**

- » Biking on certain natural trails - erosion, sensitive vegetation damage. Area is preservation zone. No extra trails.
- » Signs might get vandalized.
- » Budget for interpreters rather than just signs. (Master Naturalist Program: stewards adopt sites, partnerships with COE)
- » Budget for training + support for interpreters/stewards. Organize nature walks, etc.
- » Welcome on-leash dogs needed
- » Overkill on winter shelters - would have fewer
- » Concerns about unregulated activity and increased maintenance on structures i.e. vandalism
- » Washrooms on other side of Fort Edmonton Bridge? Easier access for maintenance
- » Terwillegar may be better suited for washrooms

- » Pretty underwhelming use of a wonderful piece of land. What will attract people to the park? Nothing.
- » Concerned that pit washrooms will not be maintained well.”
- » None
- » I think the plan is lovely.
- » None
- » None.
- » If I'm reading the map correctly, five warming huts seems excessive.
- » None noted
- » make it dog friendly
- » Interpretation is likely overdone. Trend now is to more experiential teachings and less built infrastructure. I see no plans to include programming. Parks have great potential for under or un employed. Also good for addiction recovery programs
- » none
- » “The number of shelters. Does a park of this size really need five warming huts? That seems excessive to me.
- » I don't ""oppose"" viewpoints, but I hope they can be minimally built.”
- » Not sure what is meant by a pit washroom. Is this an outhouse? In the middle of a city? I would oppose that.
- » Heating shacks for the winter are stupid. In view of the access difficulty no oe will use them
- » none
- » I don't oppose anything I see
- » None
- » Ensure signage is clear that this area is NOT an extension of the off-leash area. Also, the large field-like space should be naturalized, and get rid of the fenced area near the south end with all the logs in it. Reclaim.
- » Will too many visitors, and distract communities normal lives and not safe
- » “any fixed structure besides single stall pit washrooms.
- » I just don't think structures would be used enough to make them worth it. Vehicle access is too far away to make this a high traffic zone of the river valley.”
- » “Washrooms - will they be vandalized?
- » Warming huts - ditto
- » Costs to City for damage if vandalized. I realize a washroom is necessary, but depending on vandalism could be extra costs”
- » I would minimize the River Lookout amenities as I don't believe that they would be used to the same extent as others planned.
- » The use of interpretative signage is one of the features that might be efficient to have as they usually suffer the weather and get damaged/rusted/whitered quite soon
- » Not seeing waste receptacles on paths nearer to the river. I find that people walking dogs need trash cans near by to encourage poo pick up.
- » All. Waste of tax dollars. Wouldn't it be nice to not have a tax increase every year? How about fixing our roads instead?
- » None
- » Pit washroom are disgusting, unsanitary and cannot possibly be good for the ecosystem. Build PROPER washrooms with indoor plumbing, running water, and drinking foundations outside.
- » I like the whole idea, at this point. I am wondering if there are ways to include interpretation of the different flora and fauna?
- » You need at least one more bathroom area.
- » I find that there is never enough
- » I wish the city would plan a cross country ski park in the west end. Oleskiew park would be ideal for that. The warming huts are good, but I'd like to see groomed trails. I didn't see a mention of this in the master plan.
- » none
- » All proposed looks fine to me
- » None
- » None
- » none
- » more shelter/seating on river trail side, by Fort Edmonton footbridge trail
- » There is nothing there I would like to see removed!
- » None!
- » why does it need to be developed more. nothing wrong with the way it is
- » None
- » I am really not opposed to anything, but would like to see more of the park put into forest.
- » As with other city park spaces what measures are being taken to manage inevitable vandalism and homeless camps.
- » Not sure about the warming huts, if they will be used or if they are needed. Maybe one to start.
- » All of it, the park does not need to be “developed”.
- » Possibly one washroom might be enough.
- » Pit washrooms, somewhat unsanitary.
- » none
- » None
- » None
- » I oppose none of the elements.
- » None
- » None
- » Critical thinking needed here.Can these planers predict levels of water flow.
- » ALL -- wasting my tax dollars!!
- » “Have concerns re there may be insufficient parking?
- » Possibility of becoming a homeless camp site
- » Wonder about how it will be policed?
- » Wonder if the research sites could be harmed by public?”
- » N/a

- » nothing
- » nothing I do not like
- » All of them.
- » Not sure on the seating areas in the field.
- » None
- » Need more developed park space in this end of the city, similar to Rundle and Mayfair (Hawrelak), sheltered for larger picnic/bbq/firepit areas
- » Too many warming huts
- » Point of warming huts? No other River Valley Parks have these - why would this one? Not sure why there are so many - quantity seems unnecessary...
- » None.
- » none
- » Waste receptacles should be at every seating area.
- » Seems like too many winter warming huts.
- » I don't necessarily oppose any but would like to ensure that garbage removal and clean up is well thought out.
- » "Washroom at the south end seems unnecessary, and more challenging for employees to care for (further from trailheads). There are washrooms in Terwilliger park.
- » As a cyclist, I'm concerned that fixed lookouts along the river will increase foot traffic considerably on the trails near the river in the trees (trails built by and for cyclists). However, The main river path could be widened a bit to be a shared path."
- » There seem to be a lot of warming huts, but I'm not really sure what these consist of. Maybe more huts than are required, I think most people will stick to the paved trail in winter.
- » I don't oppose any, but I would like to see natural play spaces (hopefully this is coming up later?). Logs to walk across, stumps to climb across, etc.
- » None
- » Any space people can smoke (obviously because it's disgusting and needs to be done at home or in isolation)
- » The term pit washroom eludes me. Is this a porta-potty?, an outhouse? A heated restroom? google was inconclusive.
- » Keep picnic area to a minimum. I do not believe it will get heavy use due to it's lack of access. No point in making it bigger than it needs to be.
- » Formal structures aren't required, it should be kept as a transient enjoyment, not staying longer than a sit at a bench.
- » off leash for dogs if it is proposed
- » Very much opposed to any picnic amenities. This will attract trash and unwanted animals. No gathering places either.
- » The view points. They would increase the traffic along the river trail which would make mountain biking difficult. Construction of the view points may also destroy the mountain bike trails.
- » I strongly support all elements proposed.
- » Why is there 4 river lookouts? Seems excessive
- » none, they all seem applicable and usable
- » "Adding minimal infrastructure to this park is appropriate, as there are significant costs for maintaining the built environment. Also, people visit this park for the natural amenities therefore creating more infrastructure often detracts from the experience.
- » Pit washrooms may result in garbage being thrown in them, resulting in more man-hours to clean. This is an on-going issue for Alberta Parks / Parks Canada in many remote areas."
- » Limited accessibility to this park will likely cause it to be under used. A potential hidden gem?
- » None
- » None
- » none
- » I don't oppose any but I am not sure the proposed goes far enough in including facilities for activities in all seasons.
- » None
- » Gathering area should be moved to the west. Keep it all on the paved path. The average person will not follow general trail educate ( widen paths due to jumping around puddles, trash, right of way, etc.).
- » Too many proposed warming huts (north, south and east should be more than sufficient).
- » As a rest station, there should be amenities for drinking water.
- » I would like at least one river lookout to include a clearing with some grass so you can have a picnic while watching the river move. Please add more views of the river. The 4 lookouts aren't enough. Their needs to be a least one view point that you can sit and have a nap and picnic. Try to incorporate more of the river into the park. It is the best thing about Edmonton.
- » There may be too many formal viewpoints, this takes away the natural beauty of the river valley, or if there are to be viewpoints the less disturbance to current natural trails the better.
- » Lack of water fountain.
- » None they're useless
- » na
- » None
- » I think all are needed in this park.
- » Washrooms - too much development and infrastructure required
- » "none so far, but a more detailed plan and design might bring a different opinion.
- » Hope for the best and wait to see what it will look like."
- » Dont oppose but question the lookouts. The bridges provide good look outs. How many do we need?

- » can't think of anything at the moment
- » "Partner" Squatting!!!
- » Not sure if I like the idea of Pit Washrooms. Portable washrooms yes.
- » I would oppose the remotely located viewpoints, as I believe they wont receive much use. Also the location of waste receptacle should be as close as possible to the other amenities, not on the trail by themselves.
- » Worry about security and use of area by homeless. We have seen an noticeable increase in homeless passing through neighborhood since the bridge was completed. I worry about the security of people using the park.
- » Picnic area will invite too many people. This is a place for connecting with nature and this would cause too much noise in one area.
- » Nothing.
- » Not too keen on having the current footpath along the river's edge developed. It is currently a lovely path, and I am concerned that widening it and making a granular surface will take away from the rustic nature of this park that is different from other, more developed parks like Hawrelak Park. Nice to have a variety of parks with different levels of development, and not have them all clones of one another.
- » Addition of more pavement or removal of natural forestation
- » "what will the winter shelters look like, and do we need this many.
- » a little concerned with the three lookouts fairly deep into the trail - increased foot traffic. trails needs to be shared between pedestrians and bikers"
- » Cut back on the river lookouts as there will be possible collisions with bikers on the path close to the river
- » none
- » None
- » Number of viewpoints and winter shelters seems excessive
- » Paved trails that remove natural trails.
- » As a mountain bike cyclist I am a little concerned about all the single track being turned in to gravel roads. It is nice to have a variety of trail options. Some flowing single track is nice for runners and cyclists.
- » None
- » "Two pit washrooms
- » Just not necessary in a small park
- » picnic shelter and gathering space
- » not necessary, keep it natural
- » Partnerships
- » aka controlling busybodies, keep it natural"
- » Don't oppose anything that enhances access and enjoyment of river valley. I oppose commercial development of river valley
- » "I'm not a fan of the picnic shelter. I could see having picnic benches, but I'm not sure a shelter is necessary at a park like this. Shelters make sense at Hawrelak, for instance, as people drive there for picnics and spend many hours at a site. I'm not sure if this would be useful here because people need to walk in.  
I could see it being useful if educational/research groups were utilizing it, but I still think it needs to be pretty minimal."
- » I am concerned that the proposed group use may lead to the trails being overly busy. If school groups, etc. will be encouraged, how will overcrowding of the trails be mitigated?
- » Not so much oppose but question: Warming huts- it's not a big area. What will they look like? Are they permanent? Part of the beauty of this area is that you feel removed from the city in it. River lookouts/view points- What type of path will there be from the main path to get to these areas? Will the single use tracks (mountain biking/trail running) tracks be preserved or are these going to be widened in to granular or paved trails? Taking away the single track would be a big loss to the area.
- » Lets keep the trails in that area as single track mtb trails and Hiking trails.
- » "The picnic shelter is unnecessary and would be better suited to Terwillegar Park where there is vehicle access and regularly organized events. This would be a better use of funds.
- » Although washrooms are convenient, there is a history of vandalism in the area, and with limited surveillance, will be easy targets. If washrooms are to be installed, the north end makes most sense (not north and south) as there are already washrooms in Terwillegar. This would be a better use of funds."
- » We should limit the number of trails in the wooded area along the river - and make sure mountain bikers stick to the trails.
- » not sure if the winter warming huts are worth what they will cost to operate. personally i dont know many people who would enjoy being out in a park on a day that is cold enough that you would have to stop and warm up
- » My only concern is the pit washrooms - these are often dirty, miserable, smelly disgusting places. I understand that getting access to water for flush toilets would be prohibitively expensive. But anything that could be done to have a clean, spacious facility that could be used safely would be appreciated.
- » At this point nothing.
- » Nothing. I'm all in.
- » I oppose all the proposed concepts. The city has not defined what a park is still using the ancient archaic term. If an urban park say so but do not use the nature



interpretation with trails and winter huts in the same document. There are enough urban parks that can be used for nature interpretation. So far in all the parks present in the city today, there is very little or no parks involved with nature simply because there is no budget or monies that will become available. The typical approach is to start something involving the environment and within a couple of years the budgets to operate and maintain are cut. The best solution is to leave it as a wilderness area with limited access to those people that can benefit. That does not include school groups because of liability issues. Just another dumb masterplan without a future. Anyone who fingers this plan can work should cough up the money to operate and maintain it.

- » No dogs. Dogs should be allowed on leash

### **Which, if any, Access & Circulation elements do you support and why?**

- » Plan to keep people to edges and off natural areas
- » Parking demand concern for Terwillegar
- » Management of natural trails by City of Edmonton
- » Partnership with EMBA to do maintenance/stewardship/education (ERBCC; trail runners group partnerships)
- » Happy that asphalt trail not placed along river edge
- » Some support granular trail offshoots
- » Keep trails shared use
- » Signs and trail markers are good
- » Like that it is linked over the bridges to other parks - great river valley connections.
- » The current trails provide access to most of the area. That just be sufficient.
- » The signs will be a great addition, it will allow those who aren't familiar with the area a clear idea of how to access trails.
- » The paved access is very important and should extend between the bridges. Additional granular trails are useful for those wanting a less busy experience.
- » I like the new natural trails. These will make it easy to move around and be more interesting than more manicured trails.
- » All of it.
- » I like the natural trail, make me feel like I am trekking out in Jasper or Banff
- » I'm fine with any of these elements. I personally do not do anything down there but walking, so they don't influence me too much. I'm sure some people would really like these though! The natural trail collection I do support, as it looks like a nice walk in the woods!
- » I love the Trail loops signs with different options for distances and use.
- » "Keeping existing trails - unique place to explore and glad it will continue existing

- » Directional signs - improves accessibility"
- » I support all of the elements - looks great!
- » We noticed a city maintenance compound in the park. Maybe the access to that compound can be developed into a road to a parking area?
- » I support all access although I think there could be another access to the north west side. (west of Wanyandi)
- » More trail options are always good. The granular loop around the field seems unnecessary.
- » I appreciate the limited impact to the existing natural trails.
- » Limited access in promotes healthier bio system and less human impact.
- » All.
- » looks good
- » There is nothing wrong with the access and circulation.
- » I like the different areas where one can walk or hike.
- » Keeping the existing mountain bike trails without modification. The current trails offer the ability to get farther into the forested areas on moderately challenging terrain, or to stay to the perimeter of the natural field on easy access natural trails.
- » all
- » Trail markings - it will be good for those who are not familiar with the area. I feel that someone would be more inclined to explore if there are better markings.
- » All types of trails are useful and required. Paved for people with road bikes, strollers and who want a nice paved walkway. Natural and granular for those bike riders, runners and walkers as well.
- » Are those million dollar homes okay with this - I dont want to be glared at if I want to park my vehicle then go down into the park with my bike.
- » Location of parking. Consideration of differing abilities.
- » As a graphic designer, I'm a big fan of clear communication. The directional signs/trail markers will help people use the space confidently.
- » They all look good
- » No new vehicle access is proposed which is great.
- » I like the addition of the granular trail, it looks good
- » I just hope there is enough parking at those locations
- » I would love a better bike connection - it's not too far from where I live but I find accessing many points in the River Valley challenging.
- » All looks good. Not changing things too much.
- » The footbridges will be a beautiful transportation addition!
- » Access improvements may increase trail use but, this section is more of a link to more high traffic areas. Athletic citizens use the trail fine. Sadly, everyday people may find it too far between connection points to even bother.
- » "All.

- » Just a question - will dogs be allowed on trails? The Terwilligar dog park is linked and therefore people may want to bring dogs to new park.”
- » “I agree with the establishment of more formal granular and dirt paths, and leaving the paved path to the existing location.
- » I would propose modifying the paths to improve circulation around the field area (granular path around the entire field, rather than half) and I would appreciate additional opportunities to transition between paved, granular and dirt paths in the middle of the park (granular or dirt east west path to join into the existing natural east west path approximately half way through the park...”
- » “The concept of multiple accesses and looped trail as that is a feature in Terwilligar Park that allows multiple type of users (dog walkers, mountain bikers, etc) to enjoy the park without disrupting others with their activities.
- » if gives as well the sense of always discovering something new which motivates revisiting the park.”
- » I like the idea of cycling and mountain bike trails. Can they be set up separately from walking, hiking, jogging trails?
- » Just makes sense.
- » “Support new natural trail connection. Should be done by whoever built Flat Pete, really, they knew what they were doing.
- » Bathrooms & Water at both ends of the park are a great idea.”
- » Looks good.
- » That trail system is the only safe option to get to the west end without a car/ bus pass. All other routes would take way to long.
- » Support all existing paths
- » Everything proposed seems like a good idea.
- » I like it all. It seems to be a good balance between low impact and accessibility.
- » All proposed looks fine to me
- » A good variety of uses for everyone
- » New Trail connections
- » new gravel trails will be nice, while leaving the existing natural trails intact.
- » Because traffic is not allowed down to the park itself, I do like the idea, however, that does limit disabled people's access. Perhaps somewhere in the design there will be mention of this but I haven't seen it yet.
- » I like the idea of parking near Ft. Edmonton
- » Trail plan is nice
- » I support them all, and would love to see informational markers that describe the trees and other natural elements.
- » The on-foot hiking is really good. Very accessible.
- » Cross park connections and trail loops are a good idea.
- » why does it need to be developed more. nothing wrong with the way it is
- » The gravel trail down the hill on the north side of the river needs to be improved. It is always washing out when it rains. It should be paved with a drainage so h on the hill side.
- » Addition of more trails to give more options for those hiking, observing nature or cross-country skiing.
- » A lot of the infrastructure already exists and access makes uses traffic routes already established. No
- » More parking
- » walking, enjoy the surround area
- » I support leaving the existing natural trails as they are, any further development will take away from the natural aspect of the park.
- » None.
- » New trails appear to be well placed and of good distance. Directional signs are good.
- » The cycling, and x skiing.
- » Trails
- » again all of them
- » Looking good. Can't wait to use
- » It appears you could get lost so signage to direct a person where they are heading is very important.
- » Like the trail system that allows people in, but keeps cars out.
- » Support all as they are necessary for optimal use of the park.
- » Nice variety
- » New trails are a great idea
- » None,leave wild.
- » the accesses are limited and thus parking is a problem from the west. You should look at going through the ravine in the country club golf course if that is possible.
- » already enough parks in the city - wasting tax dollars
- » This area is not very accessible at present. I think the access and circulation provided is a good fit for this area.
- » Support all - would want signage to be useful but not in conflict with the naturalness and solitude of the existing park. Same with resting areas - thoughtfully placed but do not take away from the natural elements, quiet and solitude.
- » walking for less noise no pollution no cost no parking space great activity for all ages
- » I opening it up it allows more access points. Also it would seem that people who have limited mobility would be in a better position to take advantage of nature
- » i support the plan because it is mapped out nice
- » Accessibility options.
- » None.
- » Bridges and trails are good for mobile patrons.

- » I support keeping this as cost effective and natural as possible. The parking areas are fine and make use of existing facilities which I like.
- » Keeping the trails the same as they are.
- » I strongly support the restricted access to vehicles and the limiting of parking to the existing lots at Terwilliger and Fort Edmonton.
- » Natural trail areas.
- » More access, more parking are all good. Need more picnic/bbq/firepit/seating in this area of city parks. Unless Terwilliger park is more developed which I believe there are loud vocal opposition, but really needed it will provide greater, easier access.
- » Looks great
- » Trails.
- » Horseback riding currently happening on some trails in this park - assuming this will be restricted?
- » The use of natural trails is a good idea. I also like that the paved and granular trails have been kept away from the river and naturalized areas (they tend to attract a less conscientious group of users). Finally, it's nice to see a complete lack of access for motor vehicles.
- » I have a disability, so improvements to the accessibility of the park are important to me
- » I support the minimal additions of trails and focusing on trail markers.
- » The types of signage are all very helpful. The trail markers on the natural trail will be crucial to keep people safe. Signage to get people to the trail on the west sides would be helpful as well.
- » all are good, but there will also be pets on the trails so consideration should be given (on leash)
- » I like to know where I am going and clearly marked signs telling me where I am and how to access the park. I hope that if I am parking in any of the lots there will be good signage letting me know where to access the footbridge to the Park. I also like that there are different trails to take.
- » "Lots of signage, directions, trail markers, maps.
- » Will the xc ski loop be groomed?"
- » "I like the varying lengths of trail loops.
- » Resting points are important and it's nice that they are throughout the park.
- » Amenity locations seem adequate."
- » Increased access; trail loops
- » This seems quite well thought out. Encouraging use of a physically active nature.
- » It's one of the few "natural" areas that isn't marred by a parking lot. Please keep this area as natural as possible. There is already parking on the other sides of each bridge.
- » I like the multi-use aspects of the trails and the consideration for different seasons. The new granular trail loop in the center of the park is a nice addition as well.
- » I like the cross-country skiing and snow shoeing options proposed for recreation.
- » Not a lot of options so I support the existing access
- » Cannot express enough thanks for the consideration of the natural trails (mountain biking singletrack in the area), and the preservation and extension of the natural trails in this park.
- » Hire a professional Mountain Bike Trail Builder full time .
- » retention of the MB trails and connectors between trails that will allow bikes to move off of the heavily hiked natural trail.
- » "Mountain biking trails are great. Ski trails are also good, just not sure how they connect throughout the park.
- » I love the idea of cross country skiing throughout the park. A substantial trail network would be great (2 km with hills)."
- » The proposed access and circulation elements look great. Inter-connectivity to adjacent parks (Terwilliger/ Fort Edmonton/etc.) is important for those that want to lengthen the distance of their activities.
- » Mountain biking
- » Natural trail connection from Flat Pete to Logarithmic.
- » Maintain all existing single track trails
- » Anything for the off road biking.
- » Restrict these elements to existing paved and gravel paths, leave the rest wild
- » I am particularly excited for new mountain bike connector trail. As well as alternate routes for bike and pedestrian traffic to provide options for all activities and improve congestion
- » "The proposed granular trails are short and easy to maintain, therefore are lower cost and will be a great cross country skiing experience. The improved wayfinding is appreciated. The natural trail experience that is offered in this park, and throughout Edmonton is second to none in a City of this size. The natural trails offer year-round recreational opportunities. These natural trails rival experiences in mountain parks and make Edmonton a livable city since it is so far away from the mountains. Trail runners and mountain bikers rely on this system of natural trails (single track) to train have developed a community around these trails."
- » Increased winter usage is exciting
- » New natural trails. As I mountain biker and EMBA member I always support new trails and collaborate efforts.
- » Again seems to be little impact to existing, however can only comment on access I would use.
- » I bike the singletrack through the park 2-3 times a week year round. Adding the connector between Logarithmic and Flat Pete will decrease bike traffic and congestion along BDSM.
- » I would only ever access it from Terwilliger Park so have no opinion on the other access and parking areas

- » seems good.
- » Access is enhanced and no motorized access has been proposed
- » The natural trail connector is a great idea to keep biking and foot traffic separate.
- » The proposed accesses and circulation is fine for those who are physically fit and can get out and walk. You have missed vehicle access, and parking and a way to let those who may not be as fit to get to the park and enjoy. I am sure you would like them to support this with their taxes though.
- » Neutral
- » ---
- » I like the areas for mountain biking and the trail markers will be a nice addition.
- » Trails and trail markers
- » Trails look good to me.
- » I LIKE THE IDEA OF AN EXIT FROM THE WILDERNESS TRAILS TO THE MAIN PAVED TRAIL.
- » creating access to the area for visitors with varying abilities is great. Amenities to keep the park clean is also a good idea, resting areas limited to granular paths as the natural trails should stay “natural”
- » Preservation of existing MTB (natural) trails. Potential for x-country skiing.
- » No.
- » Connections across the park are improved through the introduction of new trails is definitely needed.
- » Access seems good. Trails extend the river valley trail system. I look forward to the day when the trails are continuous from Devon to Fort Saskatchewan.
- » For Edmontonians to access the river valley recreation sites the new LRT needs to run along the river valley. The LRT could stop at the Fort Edmonton foot bridge.
- » “The only opinions that matter should be from the residential areas adjacent to the park. All other opinions about access should not be considered.
- » City planning should only be addressing these areas. They should also demand participation and push for community involvement. Surveys delivered to all residence.”
- » ONLY bike and foot traffic
- » I like that the variety of trail lengths and trail types allow for a variety of abilities to access the park, while maintaining existing natural trails for those who want to get away from larger groups of people and experience nature in a more personal way.
- » The new naturalized trail to reduce the interactions of bikers and hikers
- » An access south-west of the Edmonton golf and country club needs to be created off of the existing nature trail.
- » All - great plan to open up the park to a variety of activities
- » The trails and their multi use, different distances, for all skill levels is the best way of doing it. It will maximize the use of the park and it will open it for better use in the future.
- » I think the signs would be clear.
- » Access to the river?
- » I support all of this plan
- » Cross Country Skiing!!!
- » I like all of the proposals.
- » I support the addition of the new trail paths to provide more quality use of the park.
- » I like it all. As a regular user I like the idea of upgrading the access to the forested area.
- » Will the City actually track a X-country ski trail in this park? That would be wonderful (after some more trees have grown in because right now the wind rushes off the river down the wide open space in the winter and it is a very cold place to be).
- » I like that there will be paths through the forested areas and signage marking distances to other areas in the park.
- » Amenity locations and trail loops
- » Great that more trails will be added for more difficulty levels. A trail for every rider, walker
- » New natural & granular trails
- » Existing access is sufficient
- » existing natural trails have been grandfathered and there will be a new natural trail. I also like how it suggests parking at Ft. Edmonton and not on the east side of the footbridge. Keeping minimal traffic on the east side of the footbridge is a key to safely accessing the footbridge from either the paved or granular trails around Ft. Edmonton Park.
- » More signage
- » I like the new natural connectors. More access is very good.
- » I support the untouched single track.
- » All bar the amenities which are not necessary
- » This is an excellent plan, very well thought out. As an avid mountain biker I am pleased to see the city preserving the natural trail network. Great job!
- » Natural trail access
- » I support the existing and planned natural trails as I believe there is a large mountain biking community that uses these trails sustainably.
- » “I support using the existing parking and the location of amenities like the pit washrooms.
- » Trail loops are nice for different walking options.
- » I also support having interpretive signage”
- » Connection of trails. They will be a great addition to create options for movement through the park, keeping it interesting and the users choice.
- » all of them
- » Support access for recreational users
- » The new natural trail connections will help separate mountain bikers from walkers in high traffic areas.

- » Signage is good.
- » I like the cities plan.
- » A robust and expanded singletrack forest network for mountain biking and walking
- » Having the new granular trail as a cross country ski loop is nice but needs to be longer....
- » Access looks improved, with the improved visibility, usage should increase.
- » I think the proposed signage looks good.
- » I like the natural trail. Looking forward to checking it out...
- » Looks great
- » I always access this park by bicycle. It has all the amenities.

**Which, if any, Access & Circulation elements do you oppose and why?**

- » Trails near bridge: should not have mountain bike access - erosion, sensitive vegetation (native understory) damage. Area is preservation zone.
- » Openness of areas that are sensitive: introduce Rangers to monitor use/access to sensitive areas
- » Need maintenance on new trails i.e. granular
- » New granular trail loop - you can make loops with existing trails
- » More trails need more maintenance
- » Could address conflicts in trail use
- » Can see increased pressure on the Terwillegar parking lot
- » EMBA would like the opportunity to work on new natural trail
- » Why continue to approach the top-of-bank as manicured?
- » Granular path and natural trail connection - neither are needed. There are enough pathways in the area.
- » The granular trail from Woodward Crescent to the Fort Edmonton bridge MUST be paved. It has been shown on City of Edmonton trail maps as paved for over 5 years, and yet it is still an eroded gravel path. It is incredibly frustrated to see it now "amended" to a permanent gravel path in this plan. This access point is crucial to any wheeled park users in southwest Edmonton North of the river. This includes disabled users, inline skaters, cyclists, summer cross-country ski trainers etc. I can't understand why after all this time it still remains an overgrowing, eroded gravel path. The alternate path from the Fort Edmonton bridge to the top of the river bank in Wolf Willow leads to a set of incredibly steep stairs, this is an unsuitable access point for most wheeled users. The Woodward Crescent path MUST be paved. I cannot support this plan unless the Woodward Crescent access path is paved.
- » None.
- » I do not quite understand the small section of new granular trail coming out of and going right back into the same piece of paved trail on the right of the map. But I trust that it has some sort of reason or purpose that I do not know.
- » It takes my kids a lot longer than 8 minutes to get from the Terwillegar parking lot to the bridge on foot. That's the closest and easiest entrance for small kids, or folks with mobility issues. I wouldn't use the other two parking access points unless I was on a bike or another mode of transport
- » New granular trail loop seems excessive - do not see its purpose
- » N/A
- » The granular trail from Wamyandi way needs to be paved. It is impossible to bike down on a road bike and very hard with a stroller to use due to ruts and wash out deterioration.
- » none are opposed
- » On occasion, the city has taken existing single track mountain biking trails and opened them up and straitened them to make "new" natural trails. I can't tell from this map if this is plan, but if so I would be STRONGLY opposed to this route. If it is truly a new path running parallel to the single track I think it would be great.
- » We need more paved elements.
- » Would like some sort of parking lot. I would assume residents will not be keen on street parking in their neighborhood
- » The inability for physically challenged individuals to use it.
- » none
- » This depends - If the current trails along the river valley are maintained as they currently are, and not widened, then I have no opposition. If the current trails are widened, I think this is a bad idea as there is a demographic (trail runners and mountain bikers) who use that current system and the loss of those trails would be a negative impact.
- » None noted
- » The river side of Granular trail loop is redundant and will lead to further soil disturbance and maintenance costs. Eliminate it.
- » "parking at north is street level only - have you asked the residents if they oppose this?"
- » Why would someone park .5 to .8 KM away and walk down a steep slope to visit the park.
- » Spend the money on somewhere that is accessible"
- » none
- » None
- » I oppose any large construction project simply because no one appears to be fighting for a spot to reach this section of the valley. People happily travel to this spot already because they are athletic enough to do so. Making it "Easier to access" may actually promote laziness to some degree.

- » Signage should be mounted above head level, to allow visibility, but minimize the potential for vandalism, which has been experienced on many of the river valley path signs currently in place.
- » All. Waste of tax dollars.
- » I didn't realize a foot bridge from Ft. Edm is planned, my only question about parking at Ft. Edmonton is will there be adequate parking to serve both the Fort and Oleskiw? If not, are there plans in place to expand Ft. Edm parking?
- » N/A
- » I'd be a little skeptical of any granular paths. They tend to be really terrible for cyclists and pedestrians. Natural paths are better, almost always.
- » I wish that all paths were made wider. People tend to walk in large groups in these areas, and it makes it extremely difficult for a cyclist to navigate through.
- » The existing granular trail that climbs up to Westridge/Wanyandi Way parking area is prone to erosion and gullyng with each hard rainfall - this trail should be assessed and constructed in a way so that this is not a continuing issue.
- » The granular path up to Oleskiw. This needs upgrading, in winter and spring it is near impassable if there is melt and other than mountain bikes it is very hard to bike down to the park from the neighbourhood.
- » Lack of acknowledgment of the sand bar area. More people will be accessing it as traffic to the park increases and it needs to be protected. I don't mean block it off but educate people about it and allow them to access it in appropriate ways that won't damage it.
- » All proposed looks fine to me
- » seems like a long hike just to get to the park
- » No
- » Pedestrians and cyclists to do mix well together - not only do they travel at different speeds, their proponents ages tend to be disparate. This city has too many joint pathways where cyclists try to move pedestrians out of the way
- » none
- » Too much access to naturalized areas isn't a good idea. Leave it natural!
- » Limit bike use to trail on west, away from river. People who are trying to hike and watch the river will be putting up with speeding cyclists constantly.
- » There is nothing here I would oppose.
- » None.
- » why does it need to be developed more. nothing wrong with the way it is
- » Other elements are fine
- » Again, there is nothing about the access and circulation elements I oppose. I do hope that there are provisions made to ensure there are ETS public transit services to the park entrance as well as across the river where there are footbridges which people many want to use to enter the park from the south side.
- » Not an opposition, but are the access points accessible by public transportation..
- » There is no accommodation for vehicle access. Need to walk into park. This doesn't make the park accessible to anyone who has trouble walking but doesn't use a power wheelchair.
- » Don't really see a purpose of the granular loop.
- » All these proposals. They will destroy the natural ambience of Oleskiw.
- » Would like to see granular trail to top of hill be paved.
- » Nothing really
- » None.
- » none
- » need a lot more directional sign in the 'natural' trail area
- » Excellent ideas
- » This isn't clear if you have to pay to any of the entries for parking. Eg Ft. Edmonton - do you have to pay to go to Fort Edmonton in order to park to go across the bridge to this park?
- » Oppose none.
- » None
- » al leave wild.
- » Accesses are very limited and very steep
- » NONE
- » "Will there be access to the sandbar?"
- » Access from Parking is a concern."
- » nothing
- » i don't oppose anything
- » All of them
- » Need for closer access for vehicles so people with limited mobility can still enjoy the amenities and natural surrounds.
- » There is a need for better access to Fort Edmonton footbridge - eg acway to connect public transit along Riverbend road to shuttle buses that can take people with limited ability down to the level of trails and footbridge
- » If there is any plan to put in gravel trails where the natural trails are I would change my opinion to strongly oppose.
- » Lack of parking. I believe there should be more parking.
- » Fort Edmonton. The walkway from Fort Edmonton parking lot is far away, it encourages driving down a steep narrow road by car drivers to find closer parking, and narrow road is well used by walkers, cyclists and car drivers drive too fast in this area, cyclists and runners dart out from the paths. People pushing strollers are wider and need to use the middle of the gravelly road because it is less gravelly and smoother. Car drivers don't creep they drive like normal road.



- » It looks like there are too many trails that have mountain biking and hiking together. I am not sure how wide these trails are and may be a source of user conflict and rutted trails.
- » “Monitoring of those who should not be on certain trails..
- » also have found dog walking/ free running to be issues that I do not see addressed.
- » Often a sign for these things is just not enough. Could use more citizen monitors.. at least”
- » The cross-country ski option seems quite limited--how useful will it be?
- » none
- » none
- » None
- » None
- » None.
- » Parking - in addition to multi-use of Fort Edmonton Park parking and Terwillegar park parking, can city exercise right of the way to get direct access into the park for vehicles?
- » Parking - further details required.
- » ALL of them.
- » Not sure why the need to put a granular trail right beside an existing asphalt trail.
- » There should be more wayfinding maps within the trail network. Consider potential high use rest points and ensure there is an overall map of the park and its amenities. It will help people better track where they are and where they need to go.
- » I oppose the park access at the north end of Woodward Crescent (Wolf Willow Ridge) development. The slope is too steep for people to use and it would be unstable.
- » None
- » None
- » Hiking on the bike paths
- » none, these all seem like a good idea
- » More skate skiing tracks would be helpful.
- » I don't think the granular track is required with so many other routes available.
- » none
- » Lack of cross country skiing, I think this would be a great area for it.
- » Need to have vehicle access and amenities for those who are less fit that the proposal would envision.
- » I think there needs to be better access to the park from the east side of fort Edmonton foot bridge
- » The granular paths seem to be right where the deer feed? The meadow shouldn't be disturbed as most of the forest/ tree paths are already in place and dont seem to affect the animals. Should place some single track on the west hill bank. Break up the back and forth bike traffic on the river side.
- » “I WOULD LIKE TO SEE ADDITIONAL EXITS TO THE MAIL TRAIL FROM THE WILDERNESS TRAIL
- » SIGNED ACCESS FROM RIVERBEND AND PARKING.”
- » Access to x-country skiing trails is not great.
- » All
- » How would people who do not drive access this park
- » The only opinions should be considered is from the residence who will be directly affected by the park users. Why do I feel this way because city planning failed to talk to the residence who are directly affected by the LRT planning. The opinions of people who are not affected by the plan were making the decisions. This is not sad it was ignorant.
- » na
- » Directional signs to keep flexibility of routes
- » None
- » “Entrances are at the ends of the park, none in the middle.
- » It would seem better to have at least one entrance in the middle of the park for better flow.”
- » nothing to oppose
- » Partner Squatting!
- » My only concern is for people who don't know the area well that the signage show the difficulty involved in certain paths. Easy, Moderate, Difficult. In addition signage from major access points that show people how to get back to major roadways.
- » I would appreciate more cross country ski trails. One small loop without any access to it, via skiing, makes it a very undesirable and difficult spot to visit.
- » Not too many new trails to maintain the sense of wilderness. It would be good if the proposed 'gravel' trail could be wood chips, easier on the feet.
- » Nothing.
- » Not too sure about encouraging mountain bike use. I expect mountain bikers will make their own trails, as is the case now. However, with more use, I expect that the naturally forested parts of the park will suffer as more mountain bikers use the park because some will seek to blaze their own trails.
- » none
- » None. Looks good.
- » Pavement of natural trails.
- » the amenities which are not necessary
- » It is not specified on the map if the new natural trail will be multi-use. The pictures show walkers on the new trail, and bikers on the old one that runs along the river. It might be helpful to specify one trail for each use as the current one is heavily used by bikes and is quite narrow.
- » none
- » I worry with signage and way points on the existing natural trails (does this mean the single track?) this area will become too groomed and lose the features that make them

good trails for trail running and mountain biking. I would be more supportive of signage along maintained granular trails and paved trails.

- » “Given the access points, this park is naturally limited to those with decent level of mobility. Adding trails seems unnecessary, especially extra gravel trails adjacent to the existing paved trail.
- » Not sure why a new connection trail is required in the forest. If the existing riverside trails was just a bit better maintained it is sufficient.”
- » Do we need the additional new trail in the forest? Not much place for wildlife if we do that....
- » None
- » Wilderness area with limited options, less expenses and maintenance and best for wild
- » Looks great

**Which, if any, Natural Asset Management elements do you support and why?**

- » Improve species biodiversity in the River Valley - even if it is not what was originally there
- » Improve experience in River Valley
- » Open meadow: different class of fauna. Has value. Keep.
- » Remove thistle first.
- » Scaled-back approach from earlier suggestions appreciated.
- » Establish benchmarks for success
- » Prioritize removal of noxious weeds in forest areas first: they do more damage there than in the field
- » plan seems to be well thought out to maintain natural areas and educational opportunities.
- » Managing the erosion and sand bar is good.
- » I like the majority of the plan, but I'm skeptical of the “erosion control” aspect along the slope below Woodward Crescent. If the path along this slope remains granular, erosion will continue and disrupt trail use. This could easily be rectified by paving this trail, which is the ONLY access to Oleskiw Park from the North bank that doesn't have stairs along the way. It is CRUCIAL that this path be paved to allow access to ALL park users.
- » I like the restored vegetation throughout.
- » I especially like the “no access to the sandbar” idea, although a canoe/kayak launch would be appreciated.
- » I strongly support all these option. Everything that deals with conservation whether it be the trees or wildlife
- » I support keeping the area as natural and undisturbed as possible, as much as I would love firepits and picnic spots, the wildlife and health of the ecosystem come first.
- » “REINTEGRATION OF STREAM - HECK YA Restoring vegetation with sight lines in mind - excellent idea, views here are great”

- » I support all elements, as I appreciate the focus on restoring and re-naturalizing the vegetation.
- » “It will be a great idea to support the ‘natural’ elements in the floodplain! Edmonton residents should be made aware of the possibility of a river overflowing its banks!
- » Too many homes have been constructed in areas that can flood or slide in some watersheds!”
- » I support all as they look to enhance our natural environment in the best possible ways.
- » I love the effort to re naturalize the rivervally
- » I appreciate that the space is going to be re-naturalized, the wetland protected, the sandbar protected, and reforestation of the trails
- » Love all the trees! We need trees!
- » All.
- » looks good
- » The use and upkeep of indigenous plant life.
- » It has been estimated that a mature tree provides 5 tonnes of Oxygen a year whilst removing 2 & a half tonnes of Carbon (The CO2 - chemical composition)
- » all
- » I believe this park should be maintained as a natural area rather than a built up park like hawrelak or rundle.
- » Sounds good but depends on implementation. If vegetation is meant to be in intermittent stream bed it will come.
- » I do think a human beach on the sandbar would be great! The west end has some of the nicest water in the river!
- » Keep people off the sandbar. Restore the forest habitat with the goal of enhancing wildlife movement. Protect the wetland. Create a buffer from the golf course. (Ideally, someday the golf course itself will be ecologically unsustainable and may be folded into this park space.)
- » I trust that all the natural assets were well examined by professionals, and that their recommendations provide the best plan for protecting Edmonton’s ecological health and long-term stability.
- » Looks natural and aesthetically pleasing.
- » I like the idea of new trees and a more natural landscape. Blocking the view of the fenced yard to the west of the paved path with trees is a great idea. Establishing the stream will provide a more interesting landscape.
- » natural
- » Definitely need to worry and control erosion and protect the sandbar
- » To keep most of its natural state is very important.
- » All of them
- » Encouraging the aspen to regenerate would be great. Make sure this includes getting rid of the fencing and the log decks.
- » All supported!
- » Naturalizing damaged areas & slope stabilization are my favorite and fondest elements of the plan.

- » return of wetlands, a place for wild animals and birds to call home
- » Anything to mitigate flooding and maintain the natural filtration aspects of the riverbank.
- » Again, question: how do you “manage” a sandbar - and what does this cost v/v leaving it alone (as it naturally is over time)
- » “Controlling erosion is quite important as it affect the quality of the trails which affects accessibility and maintenance costs
- » Managing wetland is also very important to ensure survival of ecosystems
- » Control of invasive species is another important element for maintaining the area”
- » Everything but wetlands.
- » All of it! It sounds beautiful.
- » Keeping the forest intact and growing more is a great idea.
- » The overall plan and the ongoing projects could be a good way to educate the users of the park.
- » I especially support the management of invasive species!
- » Love the idea of re-naturalization of the space.
- » All. It looks beautiful.
- » All proposed looks fine to me
- » Manage erosion on slopes
- » “I like the fact that you are not going to provide formal access to the sandbars, they are there if anybody wants to go down and enjoy, but the more natural we can leave it the better.
- » I am very pleased with everything I am seeing.”
- » It sounds wonderful. I can’t wait to see it.
- » Great emphasis on natural setting
- » So far, this is what makes me the happiest. I’m glad there will be a lot of nature being left to it’s own devices. The fact that the sandbar won’t have formal access is excellent as is the fact that the wetland will be kept.
- » All of them. This is great to ensure sustainability of the park.
- » No activity or formal access to the sandbar. But given the currant craze for beaches in the city controlling “informal” access may be challenging.
- » do not develop any more, leave it as is
- » Everything is fine. Access to the sandbar should be provided
- » I am glad to see there will be more parts of the park turned into forested areas.
- » wetland, attract birds
- » I would really like to see the area along both sides of the paved trail re-forested. Currently it is a little barren, and open, particularly on hot summer and windy winter days.
- » Great to see restored/re-naturalized forest/stream/vegetation.
- » Restore forest buffer; presently it looks desolate.
- » All of above
- » all most all of them
- » The plan is going in the right direction
- » My worry would be to meet up with a coyote or something like that to put a person in danger.
- » “Returning the park to more natural setting agrees with me.
- » Now how about groat creek and Mill Creek.”
- » The plan looks great
- » This area should be left wild.
- » It’s not all about natural areas and we should have access to the river bed as the accidental beaches seem to be popular. With all the natural areas we have they seem to have limited use and seem to be hard to get to.
- » Just leave it all natural stop wasting tax dollars
- » Strongly support all recommendations. As proposed they support the existing elements of the park but also enhance (and restore) them. Love that the open field will be maintained -
- » the rest of the design except not clear re the sandbar usage
- » Through access for wildlife.
- » nothing
- » Areas like this need to be preserved as they are dwindling with the increased desiccation of the city.
- » i support because it is a protected area and i think this is important to have these
- » “Natural vegetation - Yes.
- » Invasive species or introduced species - No.”
- » None
- » Excellent balance of walking spaces and yet mostly natural vegetation.
- » NAS needs regular independent reviews to prevent squandering (we all know how unionized muni employees are like.. ;-))
- » I support all of the points listed above. It keeps it more natural and is a cost effective way to maintain the park, and improve the small areas requiring re-naturalization.
- » Reestablishment of the stream through the park.
- » “restricted access to the sandbar.
- » re-naturalized stream”
- » Encouraged growth of Aspen forest.
- » natural asset management is nice
- » Looks great
- » Like that it is promoting a diversity of natural ecosystems. would like it to only be managed as far as is needed to keep it from becoming a place for noxious weeds.
- » better protections BUT ONLY when others do not go into these areas - how are the restrictions going to be stringently enforced..
- » Seems like good effort going into restoring the natural aspects of the park and keeping it natural
- » All of them. The more forest and wetlands, the better.
- » I strongly support not including any formal access to the sandbar. The less accessible the riverfront is the better, there is enough pollution in our river already.

- » Reforesting and maintaining streams and wetlands will make this a wonderful destination for both humans and wildlife.
- » sand bar is good
- » I support all of it, but have to admit I would like access to the sandbar to get closer to the river.
- » Naturalization
- » I like that the plan is to keep it natural!
- » All seem to be well thought out and responsible.
- » I would like the area to heal itself. Let things grow naturally where revitalization is needed.
- » Good diversity of vegetation and increased proposed vegetation management systems.
- » The beach use should not be encouraged as proposed. Like the proposal to plant more trees along west edge to hide the golf course
- » I support the open field management
- » Hire a professional Mountain Bike trail builder .
- » sounds like a good plan, I like the support for wildlife connectivity.
- » Looks good.
- » I support all of them. In regards to the sandbar, although no formal access, access should continue to be allowed as people enjoy this sandbar for sunbathing, swimming, etc.
- » Strongly support all Forest Restoration efforts.
- » all of them. We visit the river valley to enjoy nature so managing it is important
- » No access to the sandbar. Which prevents litter onto the river. Erosion slope to help preserve.
- » Glad to see further management
- » No impact to existing mountain bike trails and keeping the natural feel. South shore restoration a bonus as well.
- » All. Well planned.
- » I like that the sand bar will not be an official beach as it will attract too many inconsiderate people, noise and garbage
- » Support all, however would like to see planting of spruce understory so that forest succession is established prior to end of lifespan of the aspen.
- » I like all of them, the sandbar is already fairly popular and upgrading it would make it safer and easier to access
- » While natural areas are desirable they should not take the place of people places completely. We need a balance between natural and groomed so that the people of Edmonton can enjoy and not get too hung up on preserving or recreating natural areas. My experience would be that if you leave an area alone for a while mother nature will rehabilitate it at very little cost.
- » Allowing trees to grow
- » Looks ok. Keep the erosion down and the streams flowing naturally.
- » Keeping the existing natural trails undisturbed.
- » Support all but the sandbar restriction
- » None
- » “Plan looks good to me. I could easily check ““Strongly Support””.
- » Need to protect the poplar and aspen from beavers.”
- » I like the plan. It seems that the planning department is on the right path to satisfy public requests. Glad to see the sand bar is not going to become an accidental beach.
- » ONLY bike and foot traffic
- » I support all natural asset management elements as I believe as much of it as possible should be improved, re-naturalized and preserved.
- » Whatever natural aspects that can be maintained or brought back is important. Having natural areas that can be enjoyed and viewed is important.
- » I cant provide any constructive criticism, sorry.
- » I like that the wetland area will be protected
- » need to maintain nature with minimal intrusion
- » I'd like to see more formalized manicured, and intentional beautification. Less naturalization.
- » I support all of the listed natural asset management elements.
- » Love to see it going as natural as possible.
- » No comment.
- » Reintroduction of native grasses and increasing the amount of forest are positives.
- » I support re-forestation efforts to create shaded areas and I like the idea of an intermittent stream.
- » Reforested area and existing wetland.
- » Leaving access limited to sandbar on eastern shore
- » “I trust the City has done it's research. From what I've read, it appears that the trees & plants the City is planning on putting in are beneficial to the area.
- » Any chance Saskatoon trees could be added?”
- » All, a perfect plan
- » There is no disturbance to the eastern forest.
- » Looks like good things happening here.
- » I really like the re-forestation and naturalization of the park
- » All, keep it as natural as possible
- » I support everything proposed. Excellent plan to support/ enhance the natural assets of the park.
- » Wld be nice to explore access to a “beach” in Edmonton
- » I support the low-impact natural approach.
- » I support limiting the access to the sandbar as well as managing invasive species and protecting the wetland forested area, to improve wildlife connectivity.
- » Support all
- » All seems reasonable.
- » “This park has strong potential to remain and increase being natural. This can be a significant natural area well within a metropolitan city, which is an asset difficult to put a value on.

- » There are many parts of the river valley being developed for access and increasing pedestrian traffic. Let's leave this one as undisturbed as possible."
- » "Agree with protecting the wetland and renaturalizing the fields.
- » Also strongly support getting rid of noxious weeds and brome."
- » It all looks good.
- » I like the sand bar. I hope it does not become a magnet for abuse.
- » Preserve our nature
- » Looks great!
- » The city is doing the best they can to return the region to its ecologically natural state.

**Which, if any, Natural Asset Management elements do you oppose and why?**

- » Current and past management of invasive species is not effective - need better methods - specifically mulch
- » Need management of existing woodlot i.e. removal of trees for suckering
- » What does re-naturalization mean?
- » Costly - can the City manage long-term?
- » Need a good public messaging strategy
- » Brome removal very labour intensive. Why here? Very difficult to do.
- » "Eco-Island": Kill invasives and plant aspen + shrubs. Easier than herbacious
- » Mixed wood zone rather than grass. Xone in Edmonton
- » "Bud Brush" / "Dog Bean" / "Canada Buffalo Berry" / "Saskatoon" (Low shrubs instead of grass option?)
- » Sowing native grass and try
- » Not undertake turning of soil/brome
- » Let reforest by natural suckering rather than active. Cut aspen and will sucker!
- » Staged closing rather than wholesale closing for long time
- » Plan not designed as ecological corridor, is detrimental to use by wildlife
- » Restrict human use in certain areas of River Valley (Preservation Areas)
- » Will take years to grow stock of native plants to restore the forest is admirable, there is the cost of ongoing maintenance. The City is not doing a great job of that elsewhere in the City, this is just adding more expense to the City budget. Other than paths, let the area go.
- » I like the majority of the plan, but I'm skeptical of the "erosion control" aspect along the slope below Woodward Crescent. If the path along this slope remains granular, erosion will continue and disrupt trail use. This could easily be rectified by paving this trail, which is the ONLY access to

- Oleskiw Park from the North bank that doesn't have stairs along the way. It is CRUCIAL that this path be paved to allow access to ALL park users.
- » People will almost certainly go to the sand bar whether you want them to or not, and it would be prudent to plan for this.
- » No canoe/kayak launch.
- » No chemicals please especially those ones that will greatly harm the wildlife
- » I have nothing against helping the forest!
- » Seems like a missed opportunity to not have formal, safe access to the sandbars near the Terwillegar footbridge and the Fort Edmonton footbridge as people are starting to use the river more.
- » Sandbar could be interesting place to open up, unsure why this is not taken into account/opened up
- » N/A
- » none are opposed
- » I do like some elements of the open field. It can be very majestic at sunset.
- » Worried sand bar may turn into another "accidental" beach. Humans still are not aware enough of their garbage and human imprint on the environment.
- » We need to do a better job with landscaping maintenance overall.
- » none
- » I would hate the City to spend money on this.
- » None.
- » None
- » none
- » I don't agree that the park should be mowed much, if at all. It is a waste of money and takes away from the natural aspects of the park.
- » All depends on details.
- » none
- » None
- » Access to any sand bar. This is a fast flowing river and can be dangerous. Improving access also improves chances of inviting poor decision makers into a potentially dangerous situation.
- » Waste of tax dollars.
- » Wetlands = mosquitos. Edmonton does not need more mosquitos.
- » N/A
- » More people will be accessing the sand bar as traffic to the park increases. People need to be educated about it and allow them to access it in appropriate ways that won't damage it.
- » I would prefer at least limited access to the sandbar.
- » All proposed looks fine to me

- » Not sure whether “naturalized field” is sensible, given that ticks tend to prosper in such environments
- » none. All Good ideas
- » none
- » “What will maintenance be on the field? should be allowed to be kept very natural/ long.
- » Plans for control of invasive weeds?”
- » None, I'd be a fool if there was anything!
- » None!
- » do not develop any more, leave it as is
- » Would like to see it a little more open with less encouragement of aspen reforestation
- » Access should be provided to the sandbar
- » not access to sand bar. great for fishing or gold panning
- » Nothing really
- » Utilize the sand bar!! What a wasted opportunity.
- » None.
- » I oppose the vegetated slopes because the city does not put enough elms, ash trees etc. in They use to many eergreens
- » None
- » I would like to have access to the sandbar
- » None.
- » none leave it alone!
- » Concern re sandbar that is currently used by people to enjoy the river
- » nothing
- » allow for access to sand bar
- » i do not oppose anything
- » All if them
- » none
- » Letting nature grow how it wants.
- » Poplar forest. Poplars drop sticky seed pods and later release the fluff that gets everywhere
- » no need for reforesting west of trail, you can't see the golf course down in the valley. It would have been better to build the trail right beside the golf course fence and I presume property line this way there is more usable public, natural or developed park space for the public. The barb wired fence is not unsightly, it is a reality of private space beside public space. reforesting is a waste of money in this situation
- » None
- » None
- » People are already accessing and enjoying the sandbar. Seems it would be better to manage the area if there is a formal access provided. This can be closed when necessary with an information/teaching moment provided in explaining the reason for temporary closures.
- » I would like access to the sandbar. I understand why there is limited access but without a decent trail I (due to age and bad knees) I cannot get to the river.
- » None.
- » Only spaces where pets could leave mess are an issue.
- » Further clarification on what is meant by re-naturalized field, is it grasses, clover, thistle?
- » “Sand Bar should be allowed for use, possibly a beach without doing excess curation/management since it should not be a heavy cost burden to the City.
- » Also, boat launching/landing points for people wanting to travel on rafts in the river should be added. This will increase accessibility to the river”
- » Any restoration that would involve an extended closure of the park is something I would be opposed to.
- » None
- » none, these all seem like a good idea
- » none
- » Restoration of the forest buffer if it is going to cost a lot of money
- » None
- » Good position to the forest area is dead fall from softwood. Let the pines in.
- » More sight lines to the river. It is the best part about this City.
- » Edmonton should be utilizing the natural elements of the river better, like a formal beach on a sandbar and with washrooms and better access this could be incorporated nicely...
- » All
- » na
- » Formal access to the sandbar. If safe, this area could be another city beach area
- » “I wonder if just having poplar and aspen trees as native species is limiting.
- » Do we not have more native specie trees that could not only change the look and feel of the park, but bring back more of our historic natural environment to the park.”
- » why not allow access to the sandbar?
- » N/A
- » I do not like letting “Mother Nature” take over the park.
- » I don't oppose any of the elements, but I am not clear on why the field was not targeted to be also an area to be “encouraged for growth of aspen forest”. Does the “re-naturalized” field provide better natural value than forest?
- » You should consider some form of access to the Sandbar. This area will be accessed whether formal access is provided or not as it is historically used evry year.
- » Should be a better way to get to the sandbar
- » none



- » I have never been to the sandbar, but it seems popular. I hope usage there does not become a problem without formal access
- » Would be good to provide better access to the sand area and river
- » none
- » My only concern would be whether the population of coyotes would increase. These are already numerous and dangerous.
- » Let it be. It is great the way it current is.
- » Looks great.

**Which Phasing Option do you prefer? Please explain your selection.**

- » Option 1 is too expensive and there is no guarantee that it will work - I worry that the ongoing cost will be high to control the invasive species.
- » I only support Option 1 for the erosion and sandbar. The rest of the costs of ongoing maintenance to make the area "natural" I totally oppose.
- » Both options involve spending way too much taxpayer money. Millions of dollars to make a natural area more natural? You have got to be kidding me. Taxes are already too high. I don't believe, for a second, that the estimated cost will come close to the actual cost. The city can not manage its way out of a wet paper bag. Stop the insanity.
- » Soil erosion prevention is better with that one. I don't like the picnic area suggestion though.
- » I support Option 1 because I would like to see the invasive plant removal completed to keep it from spreading. I would also like to see the park "completed" rather than dragging this effort on over the next 10+ years.
- » I much prefer option one. I believe that we should do things right the first time. Make the best park possible the right way so people can enjoy it in the future.
- » If you are going to do it, move on it and get it done. If it is phased in, it may never be completed.
- » Anything that will not harm the wildlife I support it
- » money is better spent on infrastructure...road repairs
- » I picked option two, but I am a bit torn. I like the idea of being able to use the trails and picnic area sooner, however I do not know the danger of this invasive species. I want what is best for the park since deep down I know that is the right thing to do, \*sigh\*. But I do really want to have a picnic since it is the only nice park I know close-ish to my house, so if the invasive species issue can wait and if it won't cause that much damage then I support my decision of option 2. Three years sounds like a long time to wait for the first option.
- » Leaning towards large-scale, but not enough knowledge to make a decision.
- » Better to get it out of the way sooner
- » Better to get it all done at once, rather than pushing potential issues into the future, especially if later smooth bromo removal would include any use of harmful herbicides, etc.
- » Lower cost and quicker usage.
- » If we spend money on a flood plain it could easily be 'washed' away without notice!
- » Overall it seems the project will be completed in a more environmentally sound way. Removal of weeds, faster rehabilitation time, less cost.
- » Get the invasive species removed. Do it right.
- » Less human traffic will allow area to rehabilitate itself quicker and healthier.
- » "The cons you have are very misleading and looks like you are trying to push option 1. Looking at the proposed costs, option 1 has a greater overall cost, with a greater up front cost, and a 3 year no access period.
- » By that criteria alone, option 1 isn't viable."
- » It provides more options for engagement and better planning.
- » shorter timelines are better
- » There is nothing to attract people to the park. Might as well take it slow and do things when appropriate.
- » The pros outweigh the cons.
- » Construction Vehicle access will be required so doing as much as possible in either option will reduce the time this happens. Soil compaction being the main problem along with promoting additional run off routes that could be detrimental.
- » removal and control of invasive species has a higher probability of success, lower cost over time.
- » Get in and get it done, it will be more expensive to delay with inflation and potentially other expenses taking precedence over park rehabilitation
- » "Does not require park to be closed for 3 years. Option 2 allows for construction of trails and amenities earlier. Looking at total cost options 2 looks cheaper.
- » Option 1 total cost: 12.1M
- » Option 2 total cost: 8.6M"
- » PV of the costs for option 1 is less than the PV of the expected costs for option 2
- » Never works too resource intensive. Let O2 go and hire silviculture experts. The trees if cut will sucker in where they should be. Continue mowing field to leave that open for those users (people and animals that like it) But forget about trying to restore. Get it done and get out. Let community groups trial some supported restoration if they ask but otherwise science tell us these projects are endless and far too resource intensive. Teach people to appreciate "white mans footprint" teach them uses.

- » The brome and creek decided it for me - those resources need to be revitalized and repaired from the ignorance of the past and invasive species.
- » There is no need to rush this process. I believe this park is more valuable understood as an investment in the city's long-term ecological sustainability. This park should not be a "fun" destination as some of the other river valley parks are. So it makes sense to me to spend more to do the work right from the start and manage public expectations around the space. While option 2 is cheaper, I suspect this is a false economy, and the city will end up paying much more in the longer term. We need to understand rehabilitation as a long-term investment -- a future public good.
- » "I don't have the expertise to definitively judge which option is better, for the public or for the land itself.
- » I feel like Option 2 provides more opportunities for incremental progress and immediate benefits, which I feel are safer with today's political and environmental uncertainty. Call me pessimistic, but a three-year commitment sounds risky right now.
- » That said, long-term planning is the only way to get us out of the problems that shortsightedness has gotten us into, so if there is strong expert support for Option 1, go for it!"
- » You state that option 1 is a great short term cost while option 2 is a great long term cost. Yet I am not seeing a good short term cost option presented for option 1 and option 2 does not appear to cover additional costs for dealing with the brome areas. What we need is a better break down to know how much extra work will be created with each option and long term maintenance and upkeep costs for each option to make the best decision.
- » I would at least like to see washroom installations started earlier.
- » Before you renovate area let usage decide if park amenities should be upgraded. To spend millions and get 1000 visitors per year makes no sense.
- » both have pros and cons, I'm unfamiliar with the risks of leaving the smooth brome so I can't speak to if that is a must do as far as park rehab. But to me it seems like the installation of the amenities has a greater chance to disturb the newly re-naturalized areas in Option 1, so it might be better to do all the installations first, then naturalize the area.
- » I prefer that a large section of the park won't be closed for 3 years before it is usable.
- » I leave it up the experts which way would be better. Love to use the park sooner, but is that just selfish.
- » That the park be closed for a minimum of 3 years seems excessive. I wouldn't want to lose that access for that long.
- » Less disruptive to user, and a better approach to naturalization, in my view.
- » GET ON with IT!
- » Phase 2 has too many long term problems.
- » Option one leaves fixed structures for later. they likely aren't needed anyway. Traffic monitoring may be a good idea before doing anything to major.
- » "Option 1: no guarantee smooth brome grass will not return anyway.
- » What is it with removal or smooth brome? Could there not be an option to just control it from spreading beyond the park (ie spend money on containment TO the park, rather than fighting it in the park constantly)?"
- » Controlling the invasive vegetation for the long term health of the park is my preferred course of action. The park access is a new opportunity, and establishing it properly at this early stage is the highest priority.
- » It is important to remove the invasive species even if the process take longer
- » Makes sense to get the work done sooner than later. While cost is high off to the start I see it being better for conservation of the land.
- » Go with the less expensive option - unless council is willing to pay for the extra out of their own pockets. ... I don't think so either. Now is a good time to emphasize: Set a target - rehab and budget and at the same time develop monitoring targets and mechanisms to make sure they're being met. Then monitor what is going on - not like the transportation dept, waste dept etc.
- » Just seems like the best option for the long-term.
- » As long as the existing paths are maintained, I don't see the problem with doing it all at once.
- » Short-term pain for long-term benefits. If the money is to be spent, it is best to do things well and correctly at the outset.
- » If it needs to get done get it done sooner than later.
- » Like the idea of having the community help in the naturalization projects. Don't like the idea of closing off large parts of the park for 3 years
- » I think that in order to do it properly (naturalization, steep slope management and re-forestation) Option 1 is better as it allows more time for the work to be done in a better way in the interests of long-term enjoyment of the park. Long-term maintenance would be cheaper also by using Option 1.
- » Cost\$ difference is too much- still allowed to use the park
- » Removal of invasive species at one go preferred = else you;ll need goats as at Rundle
- » low cost faster
- » Visitors can start park sooner.
- » Generally speaking long term lower cost is my preference
- » Losing access to the park for 3 years is undesirable but so is lack of containment for an invasive species.

- » I realize option one is the most expensive, but at the end of the day I think it is the one that will best suit the needs of the park. Start with a clean slate, do what you need to do, and get out. Only ongoing maintenance will be needed after that.
- » I think a phased naturalization is a better idea. It will be too costly to do the large scale.
- » "Better to get it done and over with.
- » Any plan to leave a space to renaturalize itself, without planting?"
- » I really like the idea of large areas being closed to the public while the naturalization gets a foothold, and I really like the optimism of a one time clearing of invasive species. I also really like the idea of putting in the buildings and things, and then letting nature get on with it, instead of going in and making a huge mess building things part way through the process.
- » Short-term pain for long-term gain.
- » Given the difficulty of getting rid of the smooth brome it would be best to hit it hard from the start.
- » how about option 3. Let nature take its course and leave as is
- » Option 2 is the only reasonable option. Option 2 is a ridiculous option that seems to be favoured by the survey makers. You cannot close part of the park for 3 years, nor does it make sense to hold off on shelter, etc. for years. There is no rush to naturalization
- » This can be done over time
- » Move quickly to naturalize the park. Delays often mean things don't get done when there are budget restrictions.
- » Cost, and greater chance of success in removing the smooth brome.
- » Just do it getting it all done makes more sense
- » less closure
- » three years for one development, slow
- » Controlling the spread of Smooth Brome and providing rehabilitation of the landscape as a priority seems like a more cost effective means of maintaining the current environment. If the Smooth Brome were to spread to adjacent parks, I think the cost to control its spread would further increase. I think the work can be better managed without having the public traffic in the park as the Smooth Brome is controlled and rehabilitation takes place.
- » "The field has been dormant for several years and there has been some change, I believe in 2009 it was still being used for hay.
- » Plus I don't have the confidence in the City of Edmonton to manage the large scale re-habilitation efficiently."
- » These proposals will destroy the natural ambiance of Oliskiew.
- » Just seems like the more complete project. Can see more delays in option 2.
- » It permits the cost to be spread out.
- » There is more chance that the city will put more ash, elm trees than evergreens as they realize the benefit of the shade aspect
- » Just get it done. Don't like the cost but...
- » Property tax increases have gotten way out of control. Governments should provide basic services and necessities as opposed to continually increasing taxes to pay for pet projects and unnecessary and costly ventures!
- » Don't know enough about vegetation to know which would be the better plan.
- » The extra money is peanuts in the city budget.
- » Shorter timeline for rehabilitation and removal of invasive species.
- » Everyone seems to be in a hurry to get things done. Those who will enjoy the final project will wait. Take the time to close the park and "do it right". Mother Nature doesn't happen over night.
- » Cost of project and quicker use
- » Option 2 seems less invasive.
- » leave it alone and let nature do its thing
- » I like the lower initial spend. Phase two could be allowed to stretch over 2 yrs at \$3M per yr if needed.
- » Although closure of large areas of the park for 3 years is disappointing, I feel option 1 is more efficient - faster in the long run and easier for those doing the work. The other option is a longer protracted process that is more disruptive in the long term.
- » Fight invasive species whenever and wherever we can.
- » "Initial cost is a factor
- » Enjoyment and use access sooner is another factor"
- » Ongoing removal of weeds is a never ending process that will just waste thousands in tax dollars. Better to get it all done in one push; spending more in the short term, but saving \$ in the long term. Yes, it would suck to have to park closed for 3 years, but at least there would be public Access throughout those years & and when it opened again, it would be in the best possible condition
- » I would be less impact as well as cost spread out
- » both options have equal pros and cons so it is hard to choose
- » "I'm in favor of Option 2 because it proposes installing the washroom immediately or soon, rather than waiting three years. Access and use are being encouraged. Visitors need toilets! or they'll "go" in the bushes.
- » Encourage armies of volunteers to cull the smooth brome. Make it a community challenge or a grade school challenge. Give the students who are studying environment sciences a living laboratory for invasive species management."
- » Leave it alone
- » "I appreciate the cost factor for option 1, but also think that Option 2 allows people to be part of the process.

- » seeing the development over time will help people appreciate what the park evolves into in the end.”
- » This is a long-term investment/usage property, therefore it is better to improve as we grow it. The on-going improvement of the naturalization process can be adjusted as needed as we develop it.
- » I am ok if the city spends a little more on the initial project IF it reduces the yearly maintenance as drastically as shown in the phasing options. I support option 1 only if the city will actually stick to a budget and not go over. If the goal is to remove the smooth brome, then it needs to be done all at once due to its invasive nature.
- » More natural park compared to any in the city.
- » the complete closure of the field for 3 years for renaturalization is a great idea allowing removal of invasive species. For any renaturalization process to be successful, restriction of random human activity is important. Any random access would inhibit the process.
- » Shorter timeline
- » “Option 2 is less money. Can use extra money to redevelop Oleskiw or Terwillegar for more picnic/bbq/firepit/shelter with easier access.
- » Reforestation not needed on west side, it only helps in reducing natural light discouraging later 9-10pm night usage in summer evenings.”
- » Best option for removal of invasive species, less ongoing disruption in area. Lower long-term cost.
- » I support minimizing use of some of our river valley parks to re-establish native vegetation.
- » Timeline less issue that disruption of native life and want all brome removed in one sweep - less is like nothing,
- » I find this a difficult comparison. Option 1 seems more attractive in some ways, but there are confusing contradictions (eg. option 1 promises full use of the park sooner, but also names a 3 year period where large areas are inaccessible, option 2 is labelled as greater cost long-term, but the cost amounts included above add up to a lower amount on option 2--I assume that phase 2 goes more than two years although this isn't included in the graph above?) I find the outlines unhelpful for comparison.
- » short term cost, shorter timeline for rehabilitation
- » Option 1 allows a more thorough removal of invasive species. It also focuses on naturalization first, which is more important than amenity development.
- » Sticking to a short term plan is easier and more likely to be successful. Once the park is open to the general public it will be incredibly difficult to keep the naturalization process going, because people like to explore beyond the indicated paths.
- » I believe this is the right way to complete this task...the city needs to focus on completing task the right way the “first” time
- » Enables some use of the park while ongoing rehabilitation and naturalization is happening. People see the development in progress and have more input into some of the details. There's no big rush to get this done but it is important that it be done.
- » pretty pricey for limited users
- » No closure
- » Get it, get it done. Not thrilled by the apparent cost, but prefer this if long term cost of Option 2 is actually much higher.
- » Both have good and bad points. I feel this decision is best left to the experts. I think removing the brome right away would be good so that it is gone and does not spread to any other areas. One is more expensive but all in all I think I would go for Option 1.
- » Removing the invasive species all at once sounds like it would be easier to manage and more successful. I think ultimately the environmental scientists and naturalization experts should be the ones to decide which option is best.
- » It seems to get the complete job done. Option number 2 seems like it will leave behind some problems and likely lead to some new ones (spreading the smooth brome to other parks). Let's complete the job properly the first time!
- » community involvement and opportunity to improve the project as it proceeds.
- » Provides the necessary time to adjust planning if necessary.
- » “There are a number of elements I don't fully understand.
  1. brome: what are the impacts on the area's natural species? Are there any other impacts to consider
  2. erosion: how quickly is this eroding and what are the impacts of erosion
  3. Trails: I don't want to see any new trails”
- » Don't believe the numbers, single phase should be cheaper than more phases ongoing over more time. Why does the graphic show 11.4M + 0.775M for option 1, and 2.4M + 6.2M for option 2?
- » Though it is a higher upfront cost, long term it will be cost effective. Better to deal with invasive species all at once since ensuring it does not spread into phased naturalization is very difficult and potential most costly. Though access for space would be more limited, in large-scale rehab, this area is not as heavily used as other areas in Edmonton which makes it a better candidate for large-scale rehab. Better to do it right for less money and shorter term so that more people can enjoy it sooner than to risk piece-mealing the work and risking having to re-work completed areas.
- » lower cost
- » Nothing too drastic so we can also enjoy the park while work is going on
- » allows for trails and amenities to be constructed sooner
- » As I am not a resident of the area, it is unlikely that I would use this area for anything but mountain biking.

- » although the cost may appear lower, ongoing efforts to remove invasive species and disrupted access is not worthwhile to drag it out.
- » I do not support the closure of the park for 3 years. If the natural trails along the river (Flat Pete, Logarithmic) in addition to the paved trails are still kept open, I could support this idea.
- » Three years is a long time for the park to be closed. Perhaps it's possible to plant the trees (reforest) the west bank under phase 2? And I have no knowledge of smooth brome and why it needs to be removed - other than that it's (naturally) invasive and will cause problems...
- » take the naturalization easy
- » both seem equally disruptive for use, but necessary.
- » Cheaper and park remains open
- » More cost-effective in the long term.
- » Hit is hard and up front. This city wastes too much time drawing out projects which then tend to run over in time lines and budgets.
- » Less impact on users and little change to space.
- » Will removal of the smooth brome guarantee that it won't come back? And if not, what is the work required to keep it at bay.
- » Get it done in one go rather than years of disruption. It is very annoying how long it takes for projects to get done in this city.
- » Seems more in keeping with the natural aspects of the park
- » Park has a nice nature feel already, keep as is and slowly improve. Would not like a 3 year closure of a large area of the park... if its on schedule...
- » See previous comments. I think there is enough natural areas in the river valley. Home of this park can be natural but other areas must be accessible for picnics, recreation etc. I do not agree with spending a lot of money to create a natural park with only a few users.
- » Permante fix makes sense but also want to devolope trails
- » Photoradar out every day. Spend the money the Shaw conference area is a bust.
- » I don't want to see the park closed for 3 years. I also like the idea of community involvement in Option 2
- » "ID LIKE WASHROOMS SOONER THAN LATER.
- » BUT IF THE EXISTING OATHS MOSTLY REMAIN EITHER OPTION IS SUITABLE."
- » get it done right the first time.
- » Phase removal/replacement of invasive species with native species seems like it would be more work than doing it all at one. But, it seems to make sore sense to do all building construction before naturalization work, in case the building disturbs the naturalized area.
- » Council is full of low functioning adults
- » Opportunity for public involvement or volunteers involved in small-scale naturalization. Closing the park to the public for an extended period of time is not appealing at all.
- » Option 2 cost less (not more) as listed in pros and cons, at least given the information given. I like the quicker timeline for use.
- » I don't use the park presently. I do want to go check out the existing park. But I am a firm believer that the residence in the area that use the park should answer these questions. With that being said maybe put surveys in a box at the ends of the park at the access points. Those will be filled out by the actual users of the park.
- » ONLY bike and foot traffic
- » If management of smooth brome is to be done efficiently, then closing the field is the best solution in the long term. Also building amenities and trails before the filed is fully naturalized leaves the possibility of damage to the field by users (e.g. ignoring signs, etc.) Limiting the need for ongoing maintenance is also of benefit. There are currently no amenities and so a delay of amenities will not be viewed as a loss, it will simply be status quo and users will continue to use the park as they have done since the path and footbridge were completed.
- » Would like to see the washrooms built as soon as possible
- » Realizing that there is an invasive plant that needs control, I am in favor of the large-scale rehab. This is best for this part of the environment and more cost effective.
- » more use of the area during the redevelopment
- » Cost and timeline
- » "If we are going to do this lets do it right the first time.
- » Spend the time and money to do what needs to get done so when it is opened, it is opened.
- » Nobody likes having something opened and then closed and opened and closed, just do it and then open it up for every bodies enjoyment."
- » community can participate
- » makes more sense - less radical intrusion
- » "The 3 year timeline for the field closure and no additional amenities is too long. Option 2 also provides opportunity for greater community involvement.
- » I feel that more information is required though for proper judgement. Including: the impacts of not entirely removing the smooth brome (i.e. what actual risks to the environment does brome cause), the total costs of option 2 (the costs above make it look like opt2 is \$8.6 mill, but contradictory listed as more expensive than opt1 which is \$12.2 mill), and the likelihood that the brome will spread (will opt2 lead to costs outside of this project?)."
- » Not sure I understand why phase 2 says greater long-term cost as it looks like phase 1 is costing more.

- » I do not want my access to this area closed for an extended period. I use this area several times a week as part of my lifestyle.
  - » For natural areas, slower is better as I believe it will yield a better, longer lasting result in the long run.
  - » "I like that the large scale rehabilitation removes all invasive species at once. I don't like the 3yr time line.
  - » I like that phased naturalization keeps the cost of the project lower."
  - » Git er done
  - » More people will use the area if the city decides to put more effort into creating a space for everyone instead of a niche group of people
  - » strongly oppose to have large areas of the park closed for a longer amount of time.
  - » Personally, I mainly use the single track for mountain biking, so having part of the park closed for 3 years doesn't affect me. This option appears to be cheaper as well.
  - » Go big or go home! Make it natural
  - » Option 1 seems quicker, cheaper, and more effective. There isn't much activity in the field that would be disturbed.
  - » Go big get it done right.
  - » I like that it will make the park available sooner and seems like a cheaper option.
  - » Only because it is cheaper. \$10.6m is way overkill for a natural park, not a good use of tax \$
  - » This option seems to have a greater payoff in the long run with full removal of all smooth brome. Option 2 does not fully address this, which may lead to issues later on. I believe it is beneficial to address this properly from the start.
  - » If brome can be successfully removed by option 1, I would select it. However, I don't know enough about naturalization to pick an option. If it could easily come back and take over again then I'm not sure if option 1 would be worth the cost.
  - » I don't want to have large parts of the park closed for anytime, I use it regularly to commute to work.
  - » "lower long term cost
  - » more effective removal of invasive species
  - » trails still appear to be available for use during construction"
  - » Keeps that river valley area more natural.
  - » It is a difficult choice. Costs and timelines difficult to weigh. Good pros/cons assessment. Slightly prefer option 2.
  - » Gets rid of noxious weeds and brome with less ongoing costs.
  - » better to spend now then to save a little now and spend a lot more in the future. short term pain for long term gain is best
  - » I don't think the smooth brome is enough of an issue to justify the increased costs and closure. I think maintaining access to the public is important to keep the park useful.
  - » Better to bite the proverbial bullet and take care of the problem! We can wait a couple of years. Removing the brome will be difficult either way but if we will have to wait in the future, anyway, might as well do our best to remove it right now.
  - » Prefer large short term cost to ongoing costs associated with phase 2
  - » Third option: leave it for wildlife and keep the humans out. There are enough areas in Edmonton that are tailored to urban playgrounds. Opening this area will only cause a shift in the homeless population. Who is going to police it. Invasive species. That's a joke. It all comes back in time especially when the money is not present or a council has different ideas
  - » New growth is safer from wild fires
  - » Less expensive and the park remains open.
  - » The first option seems to be longterm gain for short term pain - the opportunity to do the naturalization process correctly - invasive plants are amazingly resilient at coming back if not properly eradicated.
  - » I strongly support the more expensive phased approach, because if you close the area for three years, you would have to spend the money you "saved" on marketing and promotion to let Edmontonians know that the park was available. When something shuts down for more than 3-6 months in this city, the citizens treat it like it is dead and never existed in the first place.
  - » I support the limited development plan phase 2 due to the cost and timeline
  - » Phasing Option 1 looks unrealistic - phased approach could be better
  - » Consider costs - one time funding may be easier to attain than long-term operating costs
  - » See challenges with invasive species creeping back into the park
  - » People would be very turned off with Phasing Option 1 - park would be closed
- Which, if any, areas of the plan do you support and why?**
- » Appreciate the attention to concerns + detail reflected in plan
  - » Overall good for all
  - » Need education to inform that brome and other invasives need to be managed/removed
  - » Important to get community/stewarding groups involved - manpower and sense of pride in the park
  - » Provide simple information that people can reference and help out
  - » Increases education and understanding of the area - sense of ownership



- » I support the protection of the wetland, increased trail signage and different types of access, and the winter warming huts.
- » No comment
- » I like it all.
- » Maintaining the current paths
- » It all looks fantastic and will be a much welcome addition to a section that needs to attention.
- » improve access and paths
- » erosion prevention
- » I support the plan except the lack of sufficient paved trail access. If the Woodward Crescent trail were paved, I would support the entire plan.
- » All
- » Strongly support the naturalization, trails, connectivity.
- » Closing the park for 3 years to rehabilitate it.
- » I support anything that will not harm the environment or the wildlife and trees. At the same time people will enjoy in the longest period of time
- » None due to costs.
- » I think I made all of my points clear in my earlier answers.
- » no comment
- » o
- » I use this space a lot for running and biking, all year round. It would be nice to have some development. But it's hard to access, and I don't think it will ever be an extremely busy park
- » Naturalization, Programming the space, maintaining trails and sight lines
- » No real comments. This is fine.
- » The focus on forest growth as well as making it more usable in the winter meets my wish for the city to both minimize development and encourage use of Edmonton's natural assets.
- » no comment
- » public washrooms
- » I support the naturalization of native species in area as well as stopping the erosion on the steep bank. Native species are best for our environment and stopping erosion will help stabilize bank and anything growing or built near it.
- » Naturalization and new trails
- » Rehabilitation
- » I appreciate that they are prioritizing naturalization and not over developing the park.
- » no comment
- » no comment
- » All of it - beautiful!
- » the concept and intent is great, I have concerns about the team's ability to pre plan and execute.
- » no comment
- » no comment
- » The trails and connectivity.
- » Washrooms
- » No comment
- » It is a good idea and will benefit Edmontonians in several ways.
- » new forest growth and trail connections
- » No comments
- » All. I am for the building of amenities that would encourage Edmontonians to be outside.
- » In general, it's a very good plan. I would caution administration not to develop the area too much. It's a nice section of land as is.
- » No comment
- » no comment
- » Minimal "furniture" far better than original plan
- » I have commented above where I felt needed it - but in general, I support the plan.
- » As specified, I support the restoration of this space. I support slow, targeted, focussed rehabilitation.
- » It's a well-considered process for encouraging free outdoor activities in an environmentally-conscious way.
- » I like that the park was more oriented to naturalization and actual use and not the fluffy art installations that have been proposed in other parks.
- » picnic and forest growth - support learning and nature
- » na
- » More natural feel with no vehicle access, washroom amenities, naturalization and tree planting
- » None
- » The plan supports a balanced approach to park development--improving usability and access, while preserving a natural space
- » no comment
- » I like the lower impact improvements, this park will benefit, however as access by car is somewhat limited, it will likely not need to be on the same level as other parks
- » No comment
- » I totally support the whole project
- » no comment
- » Naturalization, path connections
- » Support all.
- » I am happy about the washrooms & footbridges.
- » No comment
- » reforestation
- » No
- » Minor changes to support increased use of the area
- » All except brome grass control. Seems very expensive; is this necessary?
- » .
- » I support the complete plan, and would prefer more holistic vegetation management, rather than having the chance for return of invasive species.

- » Naturalization of the area , multiple trails
- » The park will be nicer to visit with amenities being set up for various abilities
- » none
- » Naturalization of Parks provides better green spaces
- » N
- » All but winter installation.
- » Restpoints, viewpoints, gathering areas, and picnic spots. Every park needs them.
- » Keeping the Mountain Biking Intact.
- » I like the majority of the plan. I want the project completed quickly but would like more opportunities for community involvement. Maybe there could be a hybrid of approaches where tree planting and garden development could happen along side larger scale and faster development.
- » naturalization
- » pit washrooms, new trails, and winter area
- » no comment
- » Trails and Option 1
- » I like the vast majority of what's being proposed. This area is vastly underappreciated and with the new connection to terwillegar park, it should be improved.
- » I like all aspects of the plan as it stands now. It is well thought out and consideration to public and ecological interests are well balanced.
- » no comment
- » naturalization plus "simple" access and use
- » no comment
- » leave the park as is
- » naturalization is good
- » It's good
- » Apart from multi-use (peds and bikes) all areas
- » All good ideas
- » All areas
- » ?
- » All, very natural with minimal enhancements to increase enjoyment of the river valley year round.
- » I have liked everything that you have shown for the park. I think it will meet everybody's needs, it will remain natural with only small areas being fixed up.
- » whatever works best for the city
- » i support all
- » Naturalization, and the maintenance of the sandbar and stream
- » I support it all, I think it's a really well thought out plan.
- » This makes the park far more accessible, walkable, and useful to citizens.
- » Having low impacted amenities will help bring people to the park
- » Getting rid of the brome grass and rehabilitating the frostd areas.
- » none
- » generally reasonable concept
- » Benches, washrooms, naturalization plan are ok
- » Planting more trees and naturalization of the park for general enjoyment of a natural space inside our city.
- » naturalization
- » Naturalizationof the area, low impact usage, washrooms
- » Walking trails
- » all
- » not enough parking
- » no comment
- » no comment
- » The trail connection will be nice to bike through
- » no comment
- » No comment
- » The reforestation west of the paved path.
- » nc
- » None of these proposals. They will destroy the natural ambiance of Oliskiew.
- » trail development
- » Plan seems to be envoronmentally freindly. Clearer, easier park access and markings will make it better to enjoy using park. Keeping it natural is great. Washroom will be great, don't have to pee in the bush!
- » Additional park space with services is always a good thing.
- » All of them.
- » Naturalization, trails and rest stops
- » no comment
- » all of it because the city might actually preserve green space
- » no comment
- » Like them all
- » Washrooms and basic shelter
- » hope to walk the trails during the summer
- » The return to naturalization
- » I support all areas of the plan
- » All of it, I have biological science and renewable resources background,
- » Complete it sooner rather than later
- » no comment
- » picnic areas
- » none
- » The naturalization.
- » New forest growth and naturalized field and intermittent stream - enhances what are the richest elements of the park as it exists today.
- » no comment
- » Spend good money now for long term gains.
- » no comment
- » All. Makes the expense of the two bridges finally worthwhile.
- » slope stabilization and replanting of native plant species.

- » No comment - love the idea
- » I support all areas of the plan
- » mix of natural and programmed
- » neither
- » I like the access and the preservation of the natural areas
- » no comment
- » The Washrooms, naturalized field and winter installations
- » I support the rehabilitation as a whole because we need nice parks to enjoy
- » Accessibility. Variety. Native vegetation. Preservation of a wilderness in Edmonton. Expansion of Edmonton's "Ribbon of Green".
- » None
- » lots of multi-seasonal trails. opportunity to experience the natural aspects of the river valley
- » No comment
- » Trail system
- » this property needs improvement to increase the value of downtown area.
- » I support this plan because it seems to be focused on minimal work, keeping the area natural and cost effectiveness. The City seems to go overboard spending money when it's not necessary. Nice to see support for keeping costs low.
- » naturalization of the area
- » Support the upgrading of additional trails
- » I support all of the plan, sounds like it will be wonderful
- » Keeping it natural
- » The renaturalization of the stream and field areas.
- » no comment
- » New Aspen forest growth
- » washrooms and development
- » All areas
- » support for native planting and revegetation
- » no comment
- » Don't know
- » keep it natural otherwise it is just a human-version of Nature and not Nature itself
- » greater access, linked trails and facilities.
- » Naturalization
- » none
- » no comment
- » no comment
- » I strongly support the effort to revitalize the area using a low-impact approach.
- » Parks...Edmonton has lots of parks and we need more
- » I'm very happy to see that this park will be accessible but not overdeveloped.
- » good ideas and usage plans, just have to get people out there and using it
- » I support the installation of washroom facilities, increased trail access throughout the park, better signage and the naturalization of plant species.
- » No comment
- » Pretty much everything except the south pit washroom (due to maintenance complications long-term only)
- » I like the naturalization of the park and enhanced uses
- » Like the access. I can easily drive to Fort Edmonton, park and access Oleskiw Park.
- » increased granular and natural trails allowing access to more of the park. Increased naturalization.
- » Re-naturalizing the area and eliminating invasive species. The addition of pit toilets, benches, and new trails. Not being an off-leash area.
- » no comment
- » community and educational partnerships
- » no comment
- » No comment
- » Ecological impact
- » Allowing area to reforest and re"grass" itself
- » no comment
- » NA
- » Benches are good.
- » New trails and better naturalization management plans
- » the low development level, not many facilities other than washrooms and benches
- » I am vehemently opposed to picnic and gathering areas
- » The preservation and extension of the natural trail network in the area
- » New natural trail - mountain biker
- » Anything to do with more trails for mountain biking and hiking
- » I support hiring a full time MTB trail builder
- » Primarily the expansion and retention of the trail system
- » The amenities
- » Any time multi-use public space is improved it's a win win for everyone. I support all aspects of the project.
- » Maintaining existing mountain bike trails because they are important to the community and support physical activity and access to the park.
- » particularly support additional connector naturalized trails
- » No comment
- » Maintaining naturalization and minimal vehicle access
- » Keep all single track trails
- » The new path connecting bike paths.
- » No comment
- » No comment
- » I really like the addition of new trails and paths for mountain biking, biking and foot traffic. The addition of waste receptacle and washrooms is a terrific bonus as well.
- » The trail connections and new growth development
- » The plan mountain bike trails for safety reasons.

- » It is great to see the preservation and enhancement of the natural trail experience throughout the Park!
- » general concept
- » Naturalization and multi season use is crucial in this city
- » As a mountain bike I use the natural trails all the time and the paved trail once in awhile. So I support any efforts to maintain and upgrade any parks or trails on our city
- » Natural trails added or existing remaining
- » Single track bike trails are important to retain in the plan.
- » The connector between the two singletrack routes would go a long way to reducing congestion along the river. I do like the effort to naturalize the park but the City needs to be realistic about the cost to remove the brome if there is a significant risk of the invasive species returning.
- » I like the addition to the singletrack biking trails and the fact the trails are being left alone.
- » Basically everything. We need more people to enjoy nature
- » The new natural trails, the reforestation, and the invasive species cull.
- » Preserves lots of nature
- » I haven't found anything in the plan I don't support
- » New natural trail connection
- » I live in the area and felt it was sad that it wasn't more developed as it's high usage area
- » Washrooms, rest areas, trails.
- » Trail connectors for biking
- » All
- » Winter shelter are great and easy.
- » I like the idea of the new connector trail to help alleviate congestion on the trails with walkers and mountain bikers.
- » washroom, drainage, naturalization, trees west of multi-use trail
- » The lack of disturbance to natural trails.
- » I think a more usable space is nice to have.
- » I support most things
- » MAINTAINING NATURAL PARKSPACE WITH ADDED AMENITIES
- » all areas seem to address most visitors to the park and open up the area for more people. The new natural trail connector will be especially nice.
- » Natural trails for mountain biking and hiking
- » Preservation of MTB trails, potential for x-country skiing
- » None
- » no comment
- » I support all areas of the plan. It will be nice to have this addition to the river valley trails and park system.
- » preservation of natural areas
- » I support keeping the park natural. I support multi use paths both asphalt and granular.
- » This project is a waste of money
- » Washrooms and restoring natural plants
- » Bike and foot traffic
- » I am excited at the prospect of reforesting and re-naturalizing the land, while allowing users to enjoy it in a variety of ways. A variety of landscapes, forest and prairie would be an asset to the area.
- » Pit washrooms and new connector natural trail to help visitors enjoy the area
- » When I walked through the park last week, I was in need of a washroom so am glad to see two sets proposed.
- » winter installation and picnic and learning area
- » the multi use paths
- » rehabilitation of the area and increased usability
- » washrooms and benches
- » all areas
- » all of the aspects, I support
- » maximize natural areas
- » Cross Country Skiing!
- » no comment
- » I support the addition of trails and proposed remedial naturalization.
- » Like the timeline and design of park.
- » no comment
- » I am with a small group of horse riders who have been going over to Oleskiw for the last 10 years. We would like to continue riding there and support keeping as natural as possible so one washroom would be good but do not support the picnic area as it will get overrun and the surrounding ground will become destroyed.
- » no comment
- » Naturalization is a good thing, as is the creation of washroom facilities.
- » I think this is a great way to give Edmontonians more access to the river valley. I think it's important to have bathrooms accessible to visitors. I like that there will be different loops to hike/walk varying in length to appeal to a variety of people. I support re-forestation efforts to create shaded areas.
- » The trail connections & rehab of native vegetation.
- » All
- » Really like that the city cares about the people that uses this space.
- » no comment
- » Preservation of natural spaces (ie. Trails, marshlands, sandbar, etc.)
- » no comment
- » no
- » new pit washrooms
- » we value the preservation and extension of the natural trail network in the park
- » Naturalization
- » New natural trail, keep existing natural trails
- » Plans that support mountain biking singletrack
- » Improving the natural area and access is good things.

- » Natural
- » I very much support the re-forestation, naturalization, and leaving of the current single track alone.
- » At present, the park and area are under-used. There is a lot of potential in this area to expand beyond Terwillegar.
- » Keep all of the natural trails. They are what make our river valley great.
- » The proposed expenditures, just keep is simple. Generally the plan is on the right track but somewhat overkill
- » No comment
- » Greatly appreciate the single track mountain bike trails being maintained with access and connector trails being added.
- » I strongly support this plan as it maintains/enhances the natural trail network. Again, great job!
- » Natural trails
- » I support the plan because it doesn't disrupt the existing natural trails, and the proposed natural trail is minimally invasive.
- » Interpretive signage, forest naturalization, trail loop option, bathrooms
- » Connection paths for moving through the park, forested areas for wildlife connectivity
- » Glad you are not touching the natural trails used by mountain bikers.
- » No comment
- » pit toilets, new natural trail connectors, elimination of invasive species
- » Trails
- » Washrooms, new forest growth, granular trail connection
- » winter warm up
- » Naturalization and low impact development.
- » Continued renaturalization
- » Washrooms, shelters, protection of natural areas and ridding of noxious weeds
- » .
- » I like the increased access point and signage, I like the trails and benches.
- » No comment
- » I like the increased accessibility and the restoration of the natural habitat. Both will increase park usage and (hopefully) appreciation.
- » no comment
- » No comment
- » bring the park back to as natural as possible while making it usable.
- » No comment
- » Blabs
- » Love the winter installations
- » none
- » Edmonton has limited natural area. We must respect this and treat it accordingly

- » Looks a great way to Utilize the river valley
- » It has all the amenities this park needs

**What, if anything, would increase your level of support for the plan?**

- » Homeless not likely issue; bush parties likely
- » Could promote research and have controls (i.e. naturally occurring forest growth)
- » No point spending money for something you're not sure will succeed
- » Many think the brome is natural anyways
- » Is this the place to spend \$10 million? Other areas in the city are higher need for spending
- » Education! Educate on what is invasive and why it's an issue
- » Follow up - what's happening right away? i.e. farming equipment that's in the forest - will it be removed?
- » I wonder if the City could look at making the beach accessible and useable? I realize this is difficult given the location of the park, but parking on site would be huge!
- » No comment
- » Instead of my taxes going to this, I would rather have a bus route in my neighbourhood!! The new Bus Network plan eliminates ALL routes through Oleskiw, Wolf Willow, and Westridge. Who thought that was a good idea???
- » on-going education before the park is open to keep communication paths open
- » Leaving it as natural as possible. Don't need picnic areas, learning areas, the winter installation is ridiculous. Terwillegar is a perfect spot for all of this (if you must), just leave this area NATURAL.
- » Maintain access to trails during construction
- » A FAR lower cost.
- » removal of picnic areas
- » If the Woodward Crescent access path to the Fort Edmonton Footbridge were paved, I would whole-heartedly support this plan.
- » N/A strongly support
- » It is missing an opportunity to reach and interact with the water.
- » More cross-country ski trails in wintertime. A canoe/kayak launch should be constructed.
- » I strongly support the plan
- » If costs were less than half.
- » If they put in fire pits!! I am not sure if those are also included in the picnic area, but they should be.
- » no comment
- » O
- » I strongly support the plan
- » Focus on accessing the river/waterfront
- » not sure

- » Assurance that the area will be well maintained, e.g. garbage pick-up on trails. Would also be interested if the shelters/installations make use of local artists.
- » no comment
- » flood plain education.
- » Yes because I believe we need these natural areas that are people friendly within our city.
- » As it borders with Terwilligar, I think this are should be Off Leash for dogs
- » Not enough activities in the area.
- » Keeping the access to the natural trails while the development of Plan one is underway.
- » no comment
- » no comment
- » Good maps and signs and education signs to help people understand why we need to protect these areas.
- » Clear cost estimates and project timelines.
- » if the city stuck with plans and council was consistent in decisions.
- » no comment
- » Develop amenities
- » Reduced cost
- » No comment
- » The parking provided does not leada to heavy usage or could lead to damage by unknown and seen people over night. Have the Indigenous people been consulted? Has a Boat launch been thought of as this would require vehicle access and parking? What is to stop people trying to park at the Golf Club and make their access on foot?
- » no comment
- » No comments
- » If it could be done on the same time line but cheaper.
- » For administration to speak specifically to thier plans for the current trails (single track). I do not support the loss of these trails as they are.
- » No comment
- » no comment
- » More science and more consideration of holistic sustainability. More budget for interpretation and work programs
- » I think it is a valid plan, this is not an easy process and I rely on teh fact that input has been weighted and absorbed as needed.
- » I would like to see lower-impacce decisions. For our own good, not every space in the river valley should be taken over by joggers, strollers, mountain bikes, and other intense activities. Some spaces need to be left largely alone.
- » Is there any way this project can also be used to support Edmonton's homeless/transient population? Things like comfortable, welcoming rest area and public education and support for non-damaging sleeping and loitering?
- » Better cost analysis of the naturalization plans.
- » no comment
- » na
- » signage should indicate that 'natural trails' have bikes on them and that all users should be aware of one another and to respect all users.
- » Delay improvements until usage is realized. It has been opened for two years and attendance is non existant
- » NA
- » no comment
- » nothing, I think it's good
- » No comment
- » Not sure
- » no comment
- » Nothing
- » Be cost efficient!
- » Removal of invasive species.
- » No comment
- » more information on naturalization of the area
- » No
- » Keeping it as natural as possible. People use the river vally to get away from the city so don't make it resemble the city.
- » Smooth brome grass issues - see previous page comment.
- » .
- » Addition of a granular path at the edge of the field on the east side, and a connection between the natural trails and the paved path at the middle of the park.
- » paving parking areas as most users will access the park by car
- » Some larger trees planted in the field area along paths to increase shade.
- » Nothing
- » The plan seem solid
- » N
- » Knowing what winter installation actually is
- » CLEAN, modern washrooms with new plumbing, running water and drinking fountains.
- » If there was a commitment to maintaining the single-track for mountain biking in particular.
- » More interactive and interpretive areas. Could those be incorporated into the lookouts?
- » increase naturalization of the river valley
- » a walking bridge across the river.
- » a skatepark
- » improvement/sustainability assessment of granular trail up to westridge/wanyandi
- » Improvements for access from Oleskiw.
- » I don't like how the sandbar is being represented in these plans. People will be accessing it, now more than ever before, so it needs to be included in the plans in order to protect it.
- » Groomed trails for cross country skiing.
- » no comment



- » nothing
- » no comment
- » leave the park as is and also your record of maintaining parks is abysmal.
- » improved access to the site
- » No
- » Debiking - city gone biking mad
- » Get it done soon
- » Continued commitment to maintaining existing mountain bike trails.
- » ?
- » nothing really.
- » The more natural you can leave it the better. Currently I walk through the trails that were made by fellow Edmontonians, not the trails that were built by the city. Try to avoid building trails on purpose whenever possible. The more natural, the better. Make some wiggly trails for people to wander through and enjoy having the trees and bushes close to them, not wide open like the paved trail.
- » nothing
- » nothing comes to mind. this is an excellent scheme for river valley rejuvenation at this site
- » Limited bike use
- » Assurances that the sand bar and wetlands will be protected for the future.
- » No comment.
- » faster redevelopment and cheaper
- » I am already in full support of the plan.
- » leave as is
- » get rid of ridiculous quick naturalization plan
- » Pave trail down the hill and make access available to the sandbar
- » Ensure there are security cameras along the trail to ensure public safety.
- » no comment
- » No comment
- » Naturalization
- » do ii all
- » more parking
- » some vehicle access
- » no comment
- » Community involved keeping of the park
- » no commet
- » No Comment
- » Adjust or remove the granular loop.
- » nc
- » Leave the park as it is.
- » Paved trail to top of hill
- » River access/viewpoints is always great. Keeping washroom clean. I don't really think it's possible, but another trail entrance down to park would be nice.
- » Better access to the water, including the sand bar
- » None.
- » Increasing access via another bike accessible path on North side of park besides footbridge and Wanyandi
- » no comment
- » more trees
- » no comment
- » An area for cross country skiinh
- » remove as much cost as possible from this project!
- » no comment
- » Less people more nature
- » An early start.
- » Getting public more educated and allowing schools to participate in the project, or clubs involved
- » More access to sand bar
- » leaving this area wild as it is a flood plain
- » access and view of the river
- » nothing stop wasting my tax dollars
- » Lower cost or better spread of cashflow. I prefer option 2 bot w phase 2 spread over 2 or possibly 3 years.
- » Assurance that the new trails - and built structures - do not take away from the natural beauty and serenity of the park.
- » no comment
- » None.
- » no comment
- » If it did not cost tax dollars. If a philanthropist came forward is there any way to increase access to the sand bar while still naturalizing the rest of the park?
- » No comment
- » I support all aspects completely
- » nothing
- » nither
- » Possibly a public presentation preferably at City Hall
- » no comment
- » None
- » getting it ready to use as fast as possible
- » A second picnic/ gathering area. More shelters.
- » Nothing, leave it alone
- » Perhaps find ways to provide shuttle services for people with limited mobility
- » Name the park after former Mayor Jan Reimer!
- » No comment
- » I need more technical details of the plan
- » A closer look at spending tax dollars wisely. Odds are many people will never use this park anyways.
- » unsure
- » Would like to see retention of more grassland in the park, rather than all the reforestation
- » complete support
- » Don't like the new granular trail

- » Ongoing commitment to maintain the natural environment of the area.
- » no comment
- » More toilets
- » more development for picnic/bbq/firepit/shelter, no reforestation, increasing access.
- » Fully support
- » Fewer mountain biking routes.
- » no comment
- » Don't know
- » monitoring; wildlife protection
- » A clearer implementation plan, not needing to close large areas of the park for 3 years ( but open to a clearer implementation picture to help understand the needs)
- » Trails connections maintained to access the park from other river valley communities
- » lower costs
- » no comment
- » no comment
- » I would feel more confident in the plan knowing who is directing the naturalization process. Botanists and other environmental scientists need to be leading this part of the project.
- » The quality of our parks
- » A picnic area/rest stop by the Fort Edmonton bridge. It's a natural place to rest if you're on the bike trail going from the west end through the fort/John Janzen/Keillor road route.
- » less cost to implement
- » More information on how to manage waste with increased traffic and proposals for group picnic site.
- » No comment
- » Not much. I like this proposal quite a lot
- » N/A
- » Not sure, I do not have enough knowledge about plants, forestry or engineering to know what might work better.
- » No comment
- » Sand bar access.
- » no comment
- » sand-bar access
- » no comment
- » No comment
- » personal use of the park area
- » Don't put in any new trails.
- » no comment
- » NA
- » Less formal construction, don't need structures.
- » Doing the larger scale short term plan and determine use options for sand bar area. Also increase wayfinding options in the centre of the park.
- » cannot be increased, I support it strongly
- » Getting rid of the picnic gathering space. It will attract all kinds of unwanted things and homeless in summer.
- » Additional natural trails
- » No comment
- » Mountain biking
- » Full time professional trail builder
- » its probably as high as it can be
- » Mountain bike trails are kept as is or expanded. Cross country ski trails (2+ km with hills)
- » None
- » Nothing, the plan looks very well done.
- » n/a
- » No comment
- » Nothing
- » More single track trails
- » More bike oppurintieis
- » No comment
- » No comment
- » I already strongly support this plan but more additional mountain bike trails, quicker timeline and lower cost would all increase my support.
- » Pit washrooms.
- » The City working with EMBA would be a huge benefit to both parties.
- » No comment
- » lower costs
- » More skate skiing options to encourage activity in the winter
- » I fully support the plan. I just hope when adding natural single track trails the city will keep collaborating with EMBA for construction and maintenance.
- » I support it!
- » A focus on ensuring preserved/improved single track bike trails and connecting them to adjacent park areas.
- » I always support the development of more singletrack!! But this plan looks well thought out and as someone who uses the area all year round, I support it.
- » I would like to see more track set x-country ski trails that are marked as out of bounds to other users so they don't get ruined. I would like to see a trail throughout the park and into T Park
- » Preservation of nature, while maintaining ease for user and habitat for wildlife
- » Off leash dogs are already a huge issue in this area. If there are plans in place, other than signs to control this, I would have greater support for this project.
- » no comment
- » Forest succession through spruce planting
- » cross-country skiing path, especially with winter warm up huts
- » The time frame
- » Provide access for vehicles, provide for those less fit, have some groomed ares, have some picnic areas. In other words provide what normal citizens are likely to use.

- » Adding in more intermediate( blues trails) single track trails
- » More access for biking
- » Single track on the west bank.
- » To make sure the natural trails are preserved and open to Mountain biking as well as allowing the cycling community to help maintain the natural trails.
- » less development
- » The addition of a drinking water supply. There are very few options in this area of the river valley trail system.
- » The price tag is obviously troublesome.
- » if there were more sight lines to the river. It is the jewel of our city.
- » SOONER WASHROOM ADDITION
- » if it could be done faster and cheaper...;) )
- » N/A
- » Grooming of x-country trails
- » None
- » no comment
- » A shorter timeline.
- » better access for the general public
- » not sure about the dimensions but I hope they are more user friendly than majority of the paths in the city.
- » Nothing
- » More aboriginal installations
- » MORE bike and foot traffic
- » ensuring that the existing natural trails along the river stay as is for those who wish to have a less structured and manicured experience with nature
- » Nothing. Looks good
- » No comment
- » more viewing areas with seating
- » Smaller budget, limit development to trails and benches only
- » more amenities, entrance in the middle of the park
- » no comment
- » no comment
- » access to river
- » providing a safety element, like police presence, safety community officers or community watch members
- » less intrusion to achieve objectives
- » Less Naturalization!!
- » no comment
- » The inclusion of more cross country skiing trails would increase my level of support. This is because the current plan does not provide a practical amount of trail and has very poor access for skiing.
- » Issues of security need to be addressed.
- » no comment
- » I would support use of more natural footing on pathways - wood chips for example. Gravel is hard on human feet and horse feet.
- » no comment
- » Clear signage indicating that this is not an off-lease park plus ENFORCEMENT of the bylaw, which does not happen now.
- » Drinking water fountains and /or a place to fill a water bottle perhaps near the bathrooms.
- » potentially parking on west side of river so I can walk dog from there over to terwilleger. Would mean less driving and more walking.
- » Water stations (drinking fountains and/or taps for water bottles).
- » If this was already put in motion
- » no comment
- » Fewer developments (ie. Buildings, paved and granular trails)
- » no comment
- » no
- » no comment
- » we value the preservation and extension of the natural trail network in the park
- » Water fountains
- » less viewpoints
- » A bike park.
- » Keeping access to the beach open during development
- » More naturalization
- » If only one washroom was built and one warming area. Make the area as natural as possible.
- » I like the Phase 2 approach that maintains availability of the park.
- » More natural trails
- » Simplify
- » No comment
- » Drinking water being available in the park would be ideal.
- » Nothing comes to mind. This is an excellent plan.
- » All looks good
- » No comment.
- » More information on who would use the picnic shelter space, no winter installation
- » I strongly support the plan
- » concerned about park becoming too busy. Please ensure that the paved trail connecting terwilleger to the Ft. Ed foot bridge remains open.
- » More defined single track running and biking trails
- » water fountains
- » No access to river
- » Less disruption to single track/mountain bike/trail running paths in the area. Signage in heavily traveled areas, paved paths, and entry points to the area only.
- » I like it all
- » Removal of picnic shelter, one set of washrooms and building new gravel trails.
- » No. Comment
- » Already strongly supportive

- » .
- » I don't like the pit toilets, but understand why they have been chosen.
- » No comment
- » I can't think of anything. Maybe some sort of educational component such as guided trails with educational plaques along the way.
- » no comment
- » No comment
- » no comment, more details?
- » No comment
- » Blabs
- » Nothing?
- » if you state it is a wildlife area, for environmental research, such as long term wildlife monitoring. In fact the best plan is for the city to stay away from designing ,implementing and operating anything that has to do with the environment.
- » I could volunteer
- » Looks great
- » Finish ahead of schedule under budget.



# 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 Topics:**

- » Email regarding use of the natural surface trails in the park and the desire for a pedestrian-only trail.
- » Email regarding the use of all trails in the park and the desire for use for horseback riding.
- » Email regarding recreational use of the natural surface trails and impacts to native and invasive vegetation.





