

DAWSON PARK AND KINNAIRD RAVINE MASTER PLAN

What You Said
Phase 4: Preferred Concept Option
February 2018

What You Said 1

Open House 2

External Stakeholder Workshop 8

Online Survey 10

Emails 41

What You Said

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

1,121
open-ended
comments

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/dawsonparkmasterplan

1,180
preferences

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

2,301
in-person and online
interactions

350

engaged citizens

Open House

November 21, 2017

E4C, Alex Taylor School Gymnasium, 5-8pm

69 Attendees

Visitors to the Dawson Park and Kinnaird Ravine Phase 4 open house 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: Gateways, Slopes and Trails; Top-of-Bank Parks; Main Activity Node; Kinnaird Ravine; and River Edge.

Finally, participants were asked to comment on their overall support for the Master Plan as well as the proposed park elements and management practices at four activity stations.

Forty-eight of the attendees came from adjacent neighbourhoods; the remainder of attendees came from across the city. Feedback from the event survey reported mixed feedback on the event advertising. Participants enjoyed the layout of the event, the presentation material and the ability to speak to staff with their questions and concerns.

Open House Presentation Boards

Information Boards

- » Need to respect existing infrastructure
- » Why can't we get this info?
- » _____ asked for this and did not receive it.
- » Again: in the future
- » What about the bylaw? 7188?
- » How could this influence the policy when its in the future
- » This will be washed away the first spring/ Waste of time and money
- » We need better connections and communication.end homelessness now.

Design Boards

- » Love the idea of playground but would like to see something more unique.- natural - something like a project at St. Monica or European.
- » Not built infrastructure in the river please. Launch canoes from river bank. Fund staff personal instead.

- » Playground needs to be designed to ensure it does not have hidden sight lines for drug use - homeless will use for drugs.
- » Why are we teaching kids they need "entertainment" in nature? I do not support this playground. - Instead want to see kid friendly eco focused programming(not geocaching) in the river valley.
- » Agree with above - kids okay on their knoll. (knowll is the playground)
- » The current shelter is in good shape. Replacing it is a waste of resources and money.
- » What is the ecological impact of this walkway? How many trees will come down?
- » Grading + bank stabilization?
- » Review this treatment for river watch access.
- » Large boat launch - Lowering the bank? - Will the grading of the bank be low enough to launch a dragon boat? - Replanting of low growth vegetation so the river is visible for water festivals and events.
- » I live on ___st, north of Rowland Rd. and want road access to the park maintained for security reasons.
- » The odd bench next to main trail sufficient viewpoints
- » Meadow in Kinnaird - Why who. This will burn out everyone.
- » Suspension bridge is a bad idea. Would encourage garbage into ravine
- » Agree with above
- » Access points too close. Necessary?
- » Ge real
- » Kinnaird suspension bridge - Seriously?
- » Keep Rat Creek area as natural as possible. Lots of birds there.
- » User conflict - have rarely witnessed user conflict. People in parks not very stressed usually.
- » User conflict - A way to do this: create an enclosed off-leash dog area. Welcome dogs on leash elsewhere.
- » Not just "being in nature" but engaging with it. This matters.
- » Active in winter - it already is.
- » The park should be approached with the right (respectful, ecological) mindset. This matters more than "access"
- » incorporate a needle drop box to minimize waste in parkland? Yes, at least.
- » Where is the winter concept? - the snow and ice? - the trash receptacles. - the ankle deep litter?
- » Is there any alternative to bbq pits?
- » people use bbq pits to burn personal items/plastic garbage, etc.
- » has there been studies on the land that trees could survive? Was a landfill and waste treatment plant.
- » Number and caption your concepts please. This is uplicate of 3rd. Before.
- » BBQ fire pits

- » Like 1C. Needs a formal entrance
- » No gates. Just like the concept on panel +1 Panel # and date.
- » Where are the pecks concept or policy of gates? 24/7 video? Crash bar to exit? Nearby phone & USB port?
- » Provide "gate" to close D. Park @11pm
- » Agree with above
- » I like the enhancements to kinnaird park
- » Why not instead improve bus service?
- » Good to have these trails
- » Not cool. Messes up ? + expensive
- » Good to have better signage
- » I would like signage to use natural materials like pine beetle wood.
- » Speed Bumps Please!
- » Yes! To above
- » Just like street address 10298 89st. Larger more contrast wayfinding
- » Light?Under bridge! Stairway
- » Yes! To above
- » Please instead improve bus service! We don't need more parking lots in the river valley.
- » Not needed. The current picnic area is never full.
- » This looks great, - more parking - off leash - fenced parks
- » Yes to above
- » Glad to see off leash perserved. This is our no. 1 priority.
- » Agree to above
- » Never seen parking lot even close to full.
- » response to above : sorry that is not correct, the parking lot is full very often.
- » Parking lot full often in the summer with dragon boat practices
- » Lot is often full on weekends and dragon boat. Parking over
- » Water featutere sprayers, would make a nice addition to playground.
- » I like the big BBQ for big family parties
- » No covered picnic areas? They are nie for famiy events, bday parties?
- » Keep bbq and firepits in main bldg as well.
- » yes! To above
- » Access to the water for dogs
- » Good idea to above.
- » agree with above, - allows dogs to cool in summer.
- » How far does off leash area extend? Same as now?
- » Gosh of gosh this is awful, wasfeul, digraceful.
- » like it all.
- » Love the idea of natural playground elements
- » This is nice, I like this area
- » Needle box needed
- » Yes to above
- » Yes to above.
- » awesome!

- » Keep this Jasper Ave. Off leash portion + fence for dog training small dogs.
- » 82stParkette CPTED/ on going vegetation (reduce camping)
- » Good ideas for kinnaird park
- » This is not winer. IT is early spring or late autumnLove this concept - just needs tweaks to ensure safe visibility to ensure it does not become place for drug use/illgal activities.
- » Sherif Robertson park is under used - provide more benches, ART
- » No! too much traffic, litter from ravine!
- » No!
- » This is a great walk, alternative 112 Ave. Widen + higher fence along houses.
- » Gate for winter
- » Fix the stink. Its gross.
- » Rat Creek - This doesn't acknowledge the smell. Will what you are proposing reduce the smell?

**Question 1:
Thinking about Park Use & Amenities, do you agree that the plan achieves the guiding principles?**

Park Use & Amenities Map

- » Junction by Wayne Gretzky. Major intersection. Consider for gathering area.
- » Don't restore Rat Creek and leave doggies in he area off leash.
- » Needs emergency phones
- » Would like to keep off leashthe same as now.
- » More waste receptacles please
- » Agree to above
- » Agree to above
- » Parking is in sufficient to accommodate festivals and events
- » More washrooms along the trail might make it more accesible for our elder citizens
- » Maintainaing separation between paved and off leash areas is... prudent!
- » Solar light for winter safety at dog owner gathering place
- » Keep upper off leash trail
- » Retain blue phones or identity other option
- » Off leash requires better water access
- » The break in off leash... is it neccesary? Seems very inconvenient.
- » I would rather keep off leash areas the same as now.
- » Do not like the off leash area changes. Don't do the Rat Creek. Leave as is.
- » Glad off leash isn't reduced much by Rat Creek daylighting - and understand spawning fish are protected.

- » no bridge - no pk spaces. - small neighbourhood - crime incr. - good idea but hot here! C105 Keep off- leash down hill and slow cyclists to make it safe for pedestrians with better signage.
- » So the cyclists are allowed to speed?
- » Why not post speed limits for cyclists?
- » On-leash because cyclists zoom down the hill? How about slowing them down?
- » Signage to encourage bike, pedestrian, dog safety.

Strongly disagree

- » Poor color contrast. Less waste of colors and ink, more end homelessness please.

Somewhat disagree

- » Space to expand parking at existing lot. Should be added right away to accommodate usage and special events.
- » Winter yes. No natural gas heating. Burn dead wood and recycle ashes.
- » Is there budget/ operation considered for trail maintenance - monitory homeless camps

Neither agree nor disagree

- » The proposal looks great! You've really listened to the community. But still concerned that no one has addressed homelessness which has been brought up in all 3 phases!
- » Small parks in winter wont be used
- » winter use requires a large park or sledding hill
- » Does the clean up of rat creek focus on reducing the small?
- » More information needed on how will address homeless population using park

Somewhat agree

- » I like how the park is promoting more actiivities but still accomodating the use of it by current park users
- » Would be nice to have a safe/clean water access for dogs.
- » I like the expensive off-leash area and that it includes paved trail - great for families and dog lovers with mobility issue
- » Find ways to slow down the cyclists.
- » More lighting needed along higher use trails
- » Lights at gathering location in winter
- » I think a good balance has been proposed
- » Slow bikes down. Some/most are aggressive. Boo to bikes

Strongly agree

- » Keep area natural. Clean up rat creek!
- » No suspension bridge.
- » Enclosed off leash dog area/ Wlecome dogs on-leash else where.
- » No suspension bridge

- » Maintain existing picnic shelter + site. Don't replace/expand this
- » More control of cyclist self entitlement.
- » strongly agree with above
- » Agree with above
- » Dedicated x- country ski trails along the river walley would be AMAAAZING (groomed trails)
- » Keep it natural. That means less infrastructure
- » Keep park safe with water, phones. Address homelessness off-leash, x country ski trails great for usage.
- » Keep off leash! Thank you!
- » Natural playground!
- » Maintain off-leash

Question 2: Thinking about Connectivity & Circulation, do you agree that the plan achieves the guiding principles?

Connectivity & Circulation Map

- » existing stairs empty into alley.
- » provide access to Alex Taylor
- » Additional access stairs? At enhanced entrance.
- » Would rather allocate bridge funds to deal with drugs, and homeless in park.
- » Stairs not needed. Paved trail and stairs short distance east.
- » This access point is not neccesarry. How will this impact parking? Potential clustering effects from too many access points in one area. - minor ped. Gateway
- » Bridge to nowhere. - parking. - negative traffic.

Strongly disagree

- » no suspension bridge

Somewhat disagree

- » parking not sufficient for increased usage
- » safety issues re: use of park by homeless/inner city population needs to be addressed.

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat agree

Strongly agree

- » I really like how much space is still left for off leash dog walking
- » I like how there are more access points to the park. I believe this will lead me to walk/cycle more and drive less.
- » Agree with above
- » agree with above
- » Agree with above
- » Agree with above
- » I like the plan and how much off leash area remains

- » Thank you for preserving off-leash
- » Looks great! A little concerned about suspension bridge. Can we really afford it?
- » Design/layout Poor color contrast and legibility. Consider all abilities. Less wasted ink and color, more staff please.

**Question 3:
Thinking about Nature & Ecology, do you agree that the plan achieves the guiding principles?**

Nature & Ecology Map

- » More garbage cans
- » more park rangers + maintenance workers; less machine movers etc.
- » no pesticides in the river valley please.
- » fences and natural barriers - good idea
- » restoration - good idea
- » no pesticides in the river valley please.
- » protecting wetlands - high priority.
- » CPTED - intervention in progress I hope!
- » Grasses - what about the ebatement?
- » Meadow planting in Jane Salisbury will provide hiding place for camping
- » Where did this beach come from? NO BEACH!
- » Strongly agree. Where is the policy? The standards? Specs? Lessos learned from prior initiatives.

Strongly disagree

Somewhat disagree

Neither agree nor disagree

- » Where is technology aspect? Solar panels for washroom etc?

Somewhat agree

- » Keep it natural. Some forest renewal is needed
- » More field trips for schools k - 6
- » River valley parks present great opportunity for gr 1 - 6 education
- » keep natural

Strongly agree

- » keep it simple and natural
- » keep it natural and not required too much costly maintainence
- » strongly agree with key points. Can we also clean up the scrap metal and debris from previous decades.
- » coordination with Master Naturalists? Gr 12 - 72
- » ensure vegetation restored where homeless camps have ruined it.

- » no tree cutback on trails / encourage native vegetation.

**Question 4:
Do you support the Master Plan?**

Do not support

- » I am 100% opposed to this plan. Have never seen a worse plan.
- » Suspension bridge or new a Ada stairs. Where will users park?
- » Same as above
- » NO. Don't like the leash up area @ picnic table, golf course, if dog access is same as now on better would support other changes. Why change so dogs suffer? Bad idea.
- » Suspension bridge - costly build and maintain. - Heavy footprint in a sensitive area. - parking issues for residents in area - security.
- » Agree with above!
- » Agree with above
- » Very expensive and the area has bridges and access across river. Minimal benefit to Edmontonians.
- » Do not support the new roads to Dawson Park
- » Rat Creek on leash
- » Hate is not strong enough
- » Phase 4 is too late. - restoration needs to address damage to vegetation from homeless camps to make park safe.

Somewhat do not support

- » Lack coordination with ETS, DATS & pedestrian wafinding.
- » Suspension bridge is a large expense with few benefits
- » Need a safe place for dogs to access water.

Neutral

- » \$28 mill to bring more visitors: stress, disruption to ecosystem is not amended until phase 3+4
- » Keep off-leash area above highlands. Must clearly address conflicts with users
- » Please keep off leash dog loop!
- » Agree with above
- » Agree with above
- » The visions & concept meets everyone's needs. Need to address the Rat Creek smell please. Not sure if we should be spending money on a bridge... How will you handle the debris from homeless and how can we help them when they build tent communities in the park!
- » Agree, how can we help the folks living in the park?
- » Good plan for all
- » The current park is under maintenance, More rangers needed to patrol. More cleaning operations.
- » Not sure if impact of building stairs down from ADA + 75st given the big problem with homeless camps.

Somewhat support

- » I mostly support the plan
- » Suspension bridge has a good accessibility angle look at the community. I.e. Old folks home
- » I support the plan.
- » I like the plan
- » Lots of great ideas but with no parking the suspension bridge is unworkable.
- » I somewhat like the plan
- » Get it done!!
- » Please keep off leash dog area. I like expansion of building and extra parking and the new road entrance
- » I like how the off leash is relatively the same. Not sold on the susp. Bridge.
- » It looks good.
- » Love that the off leash was kept as is for the most part.
- » Please find a way to clean up the old dump on river bank slightly upstairs of rat creek meeting river bank.

Strongly support

- » Broadly agree! Thanks!
- » Because there is enough room for a dog
- » Love the bridge
- » Yes we need it
- » I like that the off leash will be maintained
- » Agree with above
- » I like the plan! It seems very inclusive of all types of park users
- » fully support. Great improvement to park amenities and rehabilitating ecosystem.
- » Love it! Balanced accessible + connected, natural sensitive and diverse. Like the bridge and potential for Borden connect.
- » I like the addition of the park while maintaining the off-leash dog park as creating easy access to it from the parking area!
- » Love the off-leash decision!
- » Off leash area
- » Mostly except elimination of off-leash upper trail and trail down hill west of capilano bridge

Open House Feedback Forms

What did you enjoy most about the open house event?

- » Nice concept, visual board, online option
- » (What did you dislike or have concerns about this event?)
- » Somewhat organized, U-shaped.
- » Ability to flag proposals with comments.
- » Great graphics and info posters
- » This is the worst I have ever seen. I have lived in the area all my life. This was new to us.
- » Did not like the way this was handled.

- » Learning that the off-leash area is mostly maintained - Thanks for listening! Staff seemed engaged and well informed
- » Informative, friendly staff.
- » The caramel popcorn. - User friendly - Well presented, encouraging. - A good, long term plan.
- » Layout and low-pressure way to participate
- » Nothing
- » The large boards were quite clear and the people facilitating were very informative.
- » That off-leash area will be almost the same for dogs and that we as a community have great park to enjoy. We just need to learn how to share it better.
- » Survey method not completed accurately.
- » I heard about it.
- » Feedback and interaction with city reps.
- » Photos, event hosts mingling and discussing with attendants of concepts.
- » Shows what's happening. Good info
- » How the information was displayed and mapped out.
- » It's nice to have snacks on a cold evening!
- » Easily accessible. Enjoy "open house" concept.

What aspect of the open house event do you think could be improved?

- » Properly advertise! No signage in park about event! Sufficient consultation & advance notice to
- » Number and date the panels please, with revision level, and a caption to encapsulate how the concept is turning into a play. Likewise the reports eg. Environmental sensitivities report, when was it started, when it was completed, who is accountable?
- » At least 25% of concepts 3mo/12mo should be winter, ice, path trampling, snow clearing, sand, mud, salt etc. more computer, readable comment forms for "What we heard" and "the archives."
- » Better notice. How about posting info at the site you are getting feedback on.
- » Signage at the park would have been good
- » Tell the people!!! Be sure a letter is sent to each of us. I am not afraid to speak out. My name is _____ Please feel free to contact me anytime!
- » I feel none of the information learned will ever get to the people at city hall as it will only be word of mouth.
- » Burger and fries? A slide show perhaps?
- » The city needs to do a better job ensuring that residents directly impacted about a project receive the information. I question why this is needed.
- » no
- » Contact via mail residence prior to final stage. Please contact ALL Virginia Park Residence and start process at Stage 1!

- » Double check electronic mailing list. I signed up with my email and did not get an email about the event.
- » Find a better way to connect with the community. If not for word of mouth, someone putting up signs I would not have heard about the event.
- » Keep people more aware about these projects as it is very important for people to be heard.
- » Survey neighbourhoods involved through direct consultation/meetings, not online.
- » Notices in neighbourhood mail boxes or in park. I use it everyday.
- » More cookies!
- » Improved signage. Large sign at Dawson for community roads leading or near Dawson engagement about changes.
- » Just keep it up.
- » More info about the Muttart land development and TOD proposals for stadium would have been relevant and useful.
- » Better advertisement of the event at the location at which it being discussed, with information on the topics of which are being discussed (such as possible changes to off-leash areas)
- » More advertisement. Heard through FB and word of mouth. Didn't see anything directly from the city.
- » Give trophies to your staff. So helpful, receptive and informed.
- » I live in Bellevue and have had no info regarding this project. When info was sent it should state that it directly impacts Bellevue residents
- » Great session and layout - well done! I felt welcomed and there were terrific ways to get my POV shared.
- » Project needs to be pulled and begin again giving notice to Virginia Park Residence about stage 1. Also, ensure feedback forms have a box to go into when they are filled out.
- » No mention of amount of dead fall due to drought and spruce bud worm. Fire hazard.
- » Need to inform/ consult VP neighbourhood.
- » How is it that we don't know about phases 1,2,3? Don't like stairs 500m from existing entrance.
- » As it gets dark earlier during the winter possible adding lights to the main trail (off-leash trail) would be nice, I realize this is a large undertaking and lost of people want to conserve the area and I agree, but I think timed lights will make the area more accessible, create higher foot traffic and make its users feel safer!
- » education @ the grade school level (gr 1 - 6) has great potential for incorporation into natural sciences - great potential is there for guided field trips with a forest focus. The forest education societies in High Prairie, Slave Lake and Peace River are good examples. Teachers simply sign up and hand their class over to a dedicated nature teacher.

Additional Comments

- » No advertising of the open house in Dawson Park itself. Park users need to know.
- » Missed point: A "bad" dog on leash is worse than a "good" dog off leash. We need all dogs and cats to be chipped and DNA profiled at owner expense for forensics and charging back all costs to the owner. Missed point: These trees are over-mature. We need to be planning for controlled burns with all the learning and research opportunities. And burning wood and recycling the ashes throughout the parks systems.
- » I did not notice many questions. Mostly fait accompli and not very well presented.
- » Do not like the road (new road) proposal for Dawson Park. Cheaper to leave entrance and exit as they there.
- » No information to address the garbage and metal that exists along the river bank of the park and most likely buried underneath.
- » Never was contacted about previous phase open houses. We can't even park our own friends and family cars for more than 2 hours! How dare you!! I am 73 years old and think this is adding more crime to the area. Plus devaluing our home!
- » As there is no parking on either side for any parking unless you have a sticker on your vehicle re northland sticker.
- » Object to the suspension bridge. Will increase traffic and security issues in an area with lots of families.

External Stakeholder Workshop

November 22, 2017
E4C, Alex Taylor School Gymnasium, 5:30 – 7:30pm
10 Participants

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

- » Park Use and Amenities
- » Connectivity and Circulation
- » Nature and Ecology
- » 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 to be mailed in at a later date.

Question 1: Thinking about Park Use & Amenities, do you agree that the plan achieves the guiding principles?

- » Edmonton Events Department insists on running hot water for only event serving food. - to promote the pavilion for events or festivals I would recommend having locked access to power and hot water. This would help when applying for permits for events.
- » Please keep as natural as possible, keep the feeling of escaping the city and immersion in nature. - Bring nature back into the park ie. Rat Creek daylighting and encouraging/adding nature species.

- » A path to stadium LRT improves access and safety - STRONGLY AGREE. This is most important to our Cromdale community for recreation/business use. - Like the Rat Creek extension and lookout. Natural, yet provides focus + is true to history of area.
- » It takes away from the natural experience and invites litter into the woods and forest. More natural access is preferable - windup paths and stains.

Question 2: Thinking about Connectivity & Circulation, do you agree that the plan achieves the guiding principles?

- » Great new dedicated vehicle access to Pavilion Park. - This will lighten the traffic along the residential streets.
- » Agree with improving/adding entrances, without a lot of infrastructure
- » Need to encourage stewardship at entrances. With regards to keeping the park safe. Ie. Regards to homeless population. - Sharing info on safe behaviours.
- » Like trail to stadium LRT - Like ADA Blvd Stairs. - Like LATTA bridge access. - Good to have more 'circle' routes for bridges - well done,
- » The suspension bridge does meet goals for access, but is intrusive to neighbors. Such a good idea but not feasible in this site.
- » Conceived about the "safe de curve" space - some of the (?) will still need CPTD intervention eg. 82st paulette and beside the dog park/paulette to the east of the 82st. - The medaows at both Jane Salisbury and Kinnaird/View point - unless well managed (ie trees shrubs that can grow up their will be ??????)
- » Also the level of woody debris/amount of potential forest fire fuel in the Kinnaird ravine is very high. Opportunity for fire ignition is very real. With higher use. - Regarding Heritage value should be elevated rich history over the last 100 year + years.

Question 3: Thinking about Nature & Ecology, do you agree that the plan achieves the guiding principles?

- » Visual access to the river achieved with low lying vegetation used to prevent bank and trail erosion in conjunction with tall shade trees. This would leave the line of site clear to the river. - This is the most important around the gathering and Pavilion areas.
- » no cutback of trees along trails - no huge removal of river bank at new boat launch.

- » Like the idea of moving back toward natural grasses and vegetation, if possible, if feasible, maintainable. - Like the idea of restoring Rat Creek bed - minimal bridge - minimal disturbance.
- » Suspension bridge is too much infrastructure for our little ravine
- » The area is not “natural”. It has been hugely disturbed - mostly - There is no ecological continuity - too many introduced species. “Maintain the natural character” might be a better wording. - We’re in the middle of the city so any natural values are affected. - it works.

**Question 4:
Do you support the Master Plan?**

- » Love Love the trail to stadium stn. Improves, access, safety, and connectivity. - Like better signage at Dawson - welcoming - better access. - ADA Blvd entrance LIKE
- » No suspension bridge - more natural access is preferred
- » Generally - very good - some features are of (?) Suspension bridge seems interesting but may have a significant local impact - safety, security and convenience on ADA Blvd

Online Survey

November 24 - December 8, 2017

271 survey respondents

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.

Thinking about Park Use & Amenities, please rate your level of agreement that the plan achieves the goals of the guiding principles stated above on a scale of 5 – 1? (5 being strongly agree and 1 being strongly disagree).

Strongly agree - 42%

Somewhat agree - 41%

Neither agree nor disagree - 9%

Somewhat disagree - 4%

Strongly disagree - 3%

Don't know - 1%

Please expand on how you feel the plan achieves the goals of the guiding principles for Park Use & Amenities.

- » too many bases covered. proximity to scavenging community will always make me wary, and I'm not the only one that knows it.
- » I don't see how we should be closer to the guiding principles with all these new amenities...
- » I think the plan is hugely flawed. It is also hugely expensive and destructive. The process as well pits user groups against user groups rather than taking ANY time to gather people for coming to consensus or even fully understanding people's interests. Way too much ground disturbance and disruption. Even the creek daylighting is unclear. Is there a hanging culvert that needs to be fixed? Is this for fish? Or just to help with upland storm water drainage? If so can Epcor help.
- » This plan has not involved the appropriate neighborhoods, such as Virginia Park, when seeking initial feedback from the community. As such, the plan needs to stop because the title of the plan should have included the name Virginia Park so Virginia Park residences would know that such a survey is important to them since the bridge is starting in their neighborhood.
- » There is no consideration for costs. i.e. taxes.
- » Parking is not very accessible. there isn't any. either is mobility challenge access.
- » Amenities in the park meet varied recreational needs.
- » The park provides lots of natural scenery, is well maintained in winter and provides many and varied trails for recreation.
- » It gives the public a variety of opportunities to enjoy and use the park
- » There is some nice stuff here but it's just being built for the local residents. Can we afford it? Existing trails are in bad shape in Edmonton due to lack of money. Can we fix what we have please.
- » Many of the new ideas proposed are good ones: formalizing trails; butterfly garden; suspension bridge; daylighting Rat Creek.
- » User conflict must be mitigated. Illegal campers dealt with. Already enough trails and stairs in place that are used for health and rejuvenation. Trails and amenities will be nice to see at the river level, not at the top of the bank.
- » I hike, run and bike this area. While most dogs are fine, there are too many instances where dogs are aggressive and their owners seem to be just as aggressive in saying it's a dog park and should be expected. Often docile non aggressive dogs just clog or block the path and the owners don't seem to care so dog conflict is a major nuisance in this park. The dogs are seldom leashed up in the barbecue area so not acceptable
- » How about asking if a person agrees with the plan. Balance the budget and quit raising taxes above inflation before looking for new ways to spend my money.
- » Appears to be consideration for preserving the natural habitat
- » should expand off leash dog area and put multiple boat launches
- » When reading through the vision for this park area I feel that you are taking it from a natural resource that is available to Edmontonians to an overdeveloped park area. It does need to have paths, benches and view areas enhanced; but PLEASE leave the natural beauty of nature and encourage respect for the area. Please do not make it into another playground with all the amenities provided. The Boat launch should definitely not include motor boats. Any boat racing should be row, canoe or kayak only. With very limited access to crowds for viewing.
- » Increased footprint in the park
- » My concern focuses around fuzzy words associated with uses, rather than explicit definitions. For example, I see off-leash areas in the plan, but no where is this use captured

in the guiding principles. Hence, consider a hypothetical politician or bureaucrat: he/she could easily drop dog paths from the plan without violating the 'Guiding Principles' They have the political cover to do something at odds with the majority opinion I saw on display at the open house on Nov 21.

- » Access and signage seems adequate.
- » Very low impact
- » There appears to be minimal alteration of terrain.
- » I think it keeps the area in a natural state which to me is a top priority, while improving access and use. I love the idea of more public washrooms.
- » I like it because it has a little bit of everything, although I really don't know anything about the history of the park. I am excited to see any extra walking trails that might be developed. Not paved trails, I prefer gravel or dirt. It would be great if the trails could go up and down the sides of the hill, give us a better workout.
- » Not sure what ?user conflict should be mitigated ? actually means in terms of ensuring all interests are represented. Recall years ago this area had few mountain bike trails.
- » WAY WAY too much off leash area. Please rethink this. I am a 30 year dog owner, with an active breed dog, that requires training. I train my dogs, I have run every inch of river valley trail from west of windermere to goldbar for 30 years. I use a leash. Period. Now, I am limited to ON LEASH areas to run. Off leash areas reduce usage of "multi-use" trails, to only dog owners, many of whom do NOT train their dogs, have no control of their dogs. It is at best unpleasant for all others, and worst dangerous. It is not fun, it is unpleasant and reduces access to most of the unpaved areas, the prettiest areas of the river valley.
- » It does a lot of random different things, although I wish you didn't have to add pavement to accomplish this.
- » Yawn. The City Staff seem to ram promoting cultural heritage with every opportunity. Promote the ___ valley!
- » I think that site offer many recreational activities, with the potential to expand more winter time pursuits.
- » More dog off leash areas.
- » I like the rejuvenation and health piece. In addition, the area will be used in the winter months.
- » I feel the ideas are great. I only ask that the structures be built in such a way they are extremely resistant to vandalism or easy to replace or clean. Example that sucks is castledowns ymca pavilion. It is like a mirror finish and when it was attempted clean scratches it to ___ and looks worse than the vandalism.
- » I think that Kinnaird Park should be left as is
- » #NAME?
- » The plan looks OK What about washrooms in the east end of the park?
- » Optimizes proximity to river with water activities/access
- » Not sure I see cross country skiing trails ofr activity in winter months...nor skating area. Walking trails could presumably be used in withter. Is the public art to celebrate the cultural and natural heritage and the layered history?
- » Better entrances
- » Seems to provide a balance of decisions reflecting public and ecological needs.
- » This plan provides for a variety of activities and experiences appealing to a large cross section of the community. With redevelopment of downtown and Northlands it should find a large usage group.
- » Something for everyone - future use/possibilities seems to be thought of
- » in a plan it seems to flow with the nature of the area. Is there a virtual walk through?
- » I would hope the Park includes the NS River. We don't like that it would become a motorized venue. We have been dumped in our canoe because of the waves caused by a half dozen motor boats weaving and swerving at the same time. We have never been back. Also, it is sharing the trail pedestrian and cycling. Some cyclists are agressif and go too fast. Vancouver has dedicated trails in high density areas. It helps.
- » I like the subtleness of the proposed developments and hope they're implemented in the way the plan shows that they respect the natural habitat of our river valley.
- » Gathering spaces, boat launch and fishing area are really good.
- » I don't really see how the plan deals with the idea of winter experiences. Personally, there seems to be a big push in this city to start having more winter experiences. Some of that makes sense to me, like snoeshoeing or X-country skiing, etc., but the fact is, people are not going to come out in throngs unless it is an event or they want to walk their dogs.
- » Wow, it's great to be positive but let's also be realistic. Dawson Park is built on a dump and is characterized by unstable river banks, undulating surface, largely invasive vegetation (Manitoba maple) and the Rat Creek Combined Sewer Outfall. There is a great emphasis on nature, native vegetation and wellness trails next to the collapsing river bank that should be re-thought.
- » In general, I think the plan does a great job of achieving the goals.
- » Generally alright. The access to Stadium Station is great.
- » It's good but God is in the details - some details are missing - like the distance between the new Amenity building and the next public or semi-public washroom at Highlands Gold Club when the Dining Room is open to the public - on 5B at the "Gathering Place" - provide a public washroom

to encourage children and senior citizens - in fact all Edmontonians to walk that far and have a break and keep going!

- » There's a fair amount of stuff being put in place, which is a good thing.
- » plantings, meadows etc. are all nice.
- » I do like what is being proposed. My biggest fear is losing the dog park. my family and I are just one of many families that use the off leash area daily, and all year around.
- » The plan makes Dawson Park a focal point and provides access to other areas.
- » Add more public washrooms and wheelchair access.
- » it likely achieves the goals but i think perhaps those goals are a bit overstated.
- » Some concerns about increased parking in Cromdale Viewpoint about increased parking for dog park and access point on 78 Street. How are you keeping the dog park in Kinnard park separate from the picnic area and play ground? Does the stairs at 78 St give one more access point to our community for the homeless?
- » I like to see an amenity building that can accommodate kayaks, canoes, paddle boards, rowing shells and dragon boats to promote the various water sports. Perhaps something similar to what Calgary has at the Glenmore reservoir.
- » It looks like a great plan
- » it is a beautiful park with great river access.
- » It appears to incorporate all the aforementioned ideals to allow people to enjoy the river valley to its fullest. It will be up to them to partake of what it has to offer.
- » It's a good mix of nature and amenities. As long as it is nurtured and kept in mind going along it will be successful.
- » The use and amenities outlined are all responsibly laid out in the drawings.
- » I like the water bottle filling station, public art, play area, and river access.
- » This is a great space in the middle of the city that I have used multiple times and the fact that it will be more recreational and useable for the common person is a great addition.
- » I think the framework disclosed here provides an excellent vision and plan to move forward with this development.
- » Provides usage opportunities to a broad spectrum of users, from casual walkers to citizens greatly focused on using the river valley for the enhancement of their qualities of life.
- » Looks like it covers everything!
- » It look as though the achievements are there. I believe that building up our natural landscapes for citizen use is well worth it.
- » It covers every aspect of the area plus making the access for everyone to use.

- » it is great to have a park with so many ways to enjoy it for all ages
- » Looks great
- » WORKS FOR ME AS IT IS
- » I think the plan demonstrates increased access which I think means that the park will be enjoyed more often. It opens it up so people will come across it more often, especially the ravine. I love that ravine!
- » Increased access to the river valley and Dawson Park for areas that have poor access now.
- » The plan addresses each aspect of the Guiding Principles. There is a small off-leash dog area included; leash-up in the more sensitive and multi-use areas to mitigate user conflict.
- » The plan appears to encompass everything that I could anticipate.
- » Great amount of areas for all varieties of park usage
- » I love how this city considers everyone in its planning. And I love how the plan for this area puts such a grand and lovely natural space in such close proximity to our gorgeous downtown area.
- » They are reasonable principles for a park.
- » Love how it oens thing up
- » I loved how the cultural and natural heritage theme of the site will be celebrated and reflected in the layered history of the site. I believe the added benefit to the site is the thinking around the park for the winter months, where winter experiences are incorporated. I am a small business owner of the arts and if we could offer small workshops all year around in the park site outdoors wouldn't that be fantastic? For a small membership fee to the city we could offer outdoor items when we want. Does this exist today?
- » Keeping the parks from being overly developed allows the rejuvenation and health benefits associated with being in nature to be realized. It is so important to keep the smaller trails from getting overly developed to let people experience the semi wild aspects of the area. Just being in the trees where it is possible to be surrounded by nature with the potential for hearing and seeing birds and smaller animals is extremely rejuvenating.
- » The plan seems to maintain the natural aspects of the area while upgrading the necessary elements to accommodate public access on a larger and more accessible scale.
- » Inclusive of everyone who uses the park, including dog walkers.
- » allows for a diversity of activities in all seasons there is not much in the way of added infrastructure-- maintaining the natural environment of the park making the paved trail from Rat Creek towards the Capilano bridge a leash up area will prevent a lot of conflict between cyclists cruising down the hill and exuberant dogs running off leash, great that the

riverside trail south of the golf course is still an off leash area-- this also minimizes conflict with wild life that live in the more densely treed area of the park

- » I appreciated all of the guiding principles, although there may be some areas where the principles might conflict.
- » I think the suspension bridge will open the area up to use and enhanced imagination for use.
- » I love it. I walk my dog daily, run, and bike in the valley.
- » Paths and plans seem good if additional policing is provided. More use means the campers will be better supervised and hopefully there will be less drug use in the camps and less theft to the residents above the trails.
- » Continuing the off-leash area is important for pet owners in this community as this has long since been established.
- » Love the inclusion of winter activities

If you feel the plan does not achieve the goals of the guiding principles for Park Use & Amenities, please explain below.

- » lots of great sounding ideas. that must be continually maintained into the future. natural grass includes thistles and burs, which excludes usage.
- » The off leash area is in a completely inappropriate location. Should be down the bank.
- » Some uses don't require the amenities suggested, f.ex.
-lookouts: I hope you don't intend to build decks, which are eyesores in nature. We have the same view without them!
-gathering areas: We can gather without concrete and benches! I'd prefer gathering in a natural place, sitting on logs or stones.
-river access: The river has vastly fluctuating water levels. Natural beaches form in fall. Any amenity is reducing the desired nature experience, therefore not leading to rejuvenation. People want to get away from an urban environment in the River Valley, not stare at concrete, public art, shade structures! Please don't use "growing population" as an excuse.
- » Multi-use trail should not be off leash and off leash dog area too large.
- » No plan for reducing maintenance costs which is an ongoing issue for the city. Why wasn't that a stated goal. No clear baseline data or needs analysis or clearly communicated rationale for hiring calgarians in come in a start visioning so prematurely. The EDBRC seemed to be threatened in the process as did current park lovers who cannot understand why the current design cannot stand. Why not take the 27 million and use it on programing, rangers, maintenance. Or better yet give directly to housing to help with homelessness. I do not have room to explain all the reasons I have issues with this plan. It could build community and our

park system and instead breaks up Community, pits users against users and destroys any habitat left. The baseline info was not honest or sincere. I can give examples.

- » The goals of the plan have not been communicated in the early stages with the communities such as Virginia Park so the goals are not appropriate for the plan to continue. Virginia Park is a quiet neighborhood where access to the river valley is already available so there is no need to list any amenities that this proposal brings as we already have them.
- » The off leash area should be maintained, or expanded. The area allows people from all backgrounds a safe opportunity to get fresh air and exercise with their companions, and in doing so increase socialization for both the person and the dog. It allows many a reprieve from a dominantly isolated living situation.
- » With the unlimited costs to be spent to develop and maintain the park and amenities nothing is left out.
- » Parking is not very accessible. there isnt any. either is mobility challenge access.
- » Public art does not promote being with nature. Nothing on the chart above indicates that you are reflecting the history of the site. You have a dog park listed which automatically causes conflict with anyone not wanting to step in dog crap or be bothered by animals as they enjoy the park. Dogs also are not appropriate for environmental sensitivities as it disrupts natural animal use.
- » the off-leash area is far too narrow and near the paved multiuse to avoid user conflict today. The updated plan does nothing to address this. There is confusion today where dogs are permitted offleash and will continue to be going forward. Making the Rat Creek rest area an onleash area is asking for conflict. Having an on-leash area connect two off-leash areas is not intuitive.
- » I feel that you have to have ample parking as it seems that parks and facilities in the city lack parking which leads to ticketing and leaves a bad feeling with the public.
- » Several of the changes proposed for the Kinnaird RAVINE DO NOT REFLECT THAT there is inadequate parking available for increased traffic brought about by the changes. Also the suspension bridge proposal goes from no where to no where. there is already a bridge and stairs going across the ravine closer to 82 street
- » Do I need all this stuff to enjoy my surroundings in nature? Edmonton is not Vancouver, when its -25 with a north wind blowing at 25kph people will not leave their house to go to the park. Will not happen. Will people drive from all over Edmonton to come to this new vision or are we just doing this for a few local residents? I don't see how conflict with the dog walkers is addressed. Just had an altercation with a young woman last week who felt that as it was an off leash

area her large dog was free to come at me in a threatening manner. I just want to be left alone by the dog people when I am in the park enjoying myself.

- » Unleashed dogs cause conflict with pedestrians and cyclists on the shared use trail. Offleash parks are fundamentally antagonistic to all other uses and should therefore be segregated for the safety and enjoyment of other users.
- » The changes purposed really do not change anything in the core area. Based on mark ups, it is obvious those planning this spent very little or no time at the site during various times of the year. And if so, they most likely did not go beyond the parking lot or during the weekends. Above does not deal with the #1 issue with is safety factor. Drug addicts and homeless
- » Residents that are most affected, especially in Historic Viewpoint, need to be listened to, especially regarding the new proposed staircase at 78 Street & Jasper Avenue. The current stairs into and out of Kinnaird Ravine already give great access to the river, either biking or walking and the trails are easy to manage. A new staircase will not be utilized by many, and will cause undue hardship for the residents in the area who already deal with theft and conflict in the area because of them. Many come into the area by car, not by foot, and the stairs are not use for recreational purposes! There is also very limited parking in the area.
- » These goals seem very bourgeois and do not reflect the significant population that is low-income that frequents the park. They deserve to have their lifestyle and needs integrated into this design.
- » How about asking if a person agrees with the plan. Balance the budget and quit raising taxes above inflation before I=looking for new ways to spend my money.
- » For folks from across the city to be able to access the parks, there MUST be sufficient parking available. Lots of lookouts available, but only one set of washrooms. Need more washrooms.
- » Probably the goals have been met regarding the principles but I do not agree in creating a park that has way too many amenities that will require upkeep and maintenance. Not needed. Maintained trails for all types of users, washroom facilities, refuse containers. NO PLAYGROUNDS. Why? The park is a playground. Stop the children coddling.
- » Allowing off leash for dogs along multi-use trail will result in user conflicts, hazardous for runners and cyclists. This is the opposite of the proposed goal to reduce user conflicts.
- » I'm not totally in favor of the guiding principles for Park use and Amenities as there seems to be a real focus on commercializing the parks instead of celebrating the natural beauty of nature that is our river valley. There should be a very strong focus on the value of nature and the importance of stewardship of our environment.
- » Off Leash should have a greater level of awareness in the Guiding Principles as the majority of users are off leash dog walkers
- » Footprint expands too much.
- » My main concern is that I can walk with my dogs off leash on the paved trail as I have a double stroller. We go here almost every day. Please don't take this away. It's the only offleash area that works for us. There's are plenty of spaces for cyclists that aren't off leash for them.
- » See above -- same thing applies! I'm squarely in the middle of the level of agreement!
- » I think the plan reflects a bias in the types of uses/users towards which goals are directed. example is winter use - there are limited winter users of this park - (based on my observations during daily visits for the past 5 years). Dog walkers are most abundant, followed by a few hardened bicycle commuters. Even the homeless population that is abundant during the summer disappears from November to March. The plan imagines a future (which is good), but perhaps downplays the current reality of usership and thus marginalizes the needs of those users in the future as well.
- » Increase the number of water bottle fill stations
- » There needs to be regulation of the type of boat being launched (speed, noise, etc)
- » Off leash areas in public parks is dangerous and stupid. Our courts are full of cases where dogs bite each other or people. Don't need the head ache and don't think I should have to pay for dog owners.
- » Not sure the off-leash dog areas are compatible with "User conflict should be mitigated."
- » Lighting is not discussed. Not sure how safety concerns are addressed.
- » While I'm not against the idea, I don't think public art in the area is a necessary expense.
- » The plan is good, but parking is atrocious at this site. Dragon boat races, hiking meet up's, dog walkers all in one evening poses a problem. We have been parking at McNally high school and walking down to the park. We even take up parking on the roadway before the park, I'm sure the residents are not excited about that.
- » How do you mitigate user conflict?
- » Off leash areas REDUCE access to trails for people with small children, anyone on a cycle, or who enjoys running, and many dog owners who care enough about their dogs to ensure their safety and health. Find another solution for off leash areas. They are an absolute menace, an abuse of the trails, and make many beautiful areas inaccessible. It is a mistake to think that dogs need to be offleash, and able to run with strange dogs they have never met. They revert to pack behaviour, protect their families. It is nuts to do this. ... Please, at least reduce the area dedicated to this absolute nonsense. Talk to any qualified trainer and they will tell you the same. These areas are a menace.

- » off-leash dog use is antithetical to the maintenance and restoration of natural history. No amount of restriction will prevent dogs going everywhere. It was a mistake for the City to open up off-leash parks to begin with. Ever since, the entire river valley has been a de facto off-leash area regardless of signage. This park will be no different
- » Bullet 4 seems contradictory on the one hand environmental sensitivities are important but if more need for recreation is wanted then the environmental sensitivities takes a back seat. There will always be a need for more recreation but if we do not protect some of the River valley environmental sensitivities there will be none left to protect.
- » I am not sure where the cultural celebration is in this plan. Winter use appears on the surface to be the same uses for summer and winter/ Are there specific winter activity plans? Skiing?
- » I was wondering whether the Park can incorporate a First Nations component, perhaps in terms of adding information on history and culture of First Nations people in the area
- » Does not restrict cyclists enough. They are a danger to pedestrians and dogs as the cyclists think they own the path and are worse than cars on the road.
- » I am not sure user conflict should be mitigated should be included in the principles. That should be more of a goal.
- » I would like some information about the environment there. Like pictures of what type of trees or wildlife that can be found or what some of the plants are.
- » Lack of public washrooms and bike racks - one water bottle fill station !
- » I think the plan achieves the goals of the guiding principles for the most part but is missing a statement about safety (I don't think the User conflict sentence covers that). I lived in Riverdale for many years and I know that street people often camp in the nearby treed areas and there have been incidents where trail users were accosted, so the plan needs to identify safety as a key component and address any issues.
- » -maintaining an off-leash trail separate from the main multi-use path through dawson park would reduce conflicts. Extensive signage and interpretive features can detract from the nature experience. Likewise, the existing "meadow" is an intensively "natu
- » Lacking cultural heritage; public art will not in itself achieve this. Should there be additional infrastructure for festivals (stage? temporary festival tenting areas; clear lines of sights between nodes). Also concerned about access; parking insufficient for larger events.
- » Could use more toilet facilities.
- » I believe that the off-leash dog area along a considerable stretch of the river bank area is too intrusive. Off-leash dogs are just not compatible with bird and wildlife viewing and often cause negative interactions with people who are using the trails and nearby areas.
- » Mostly it seems to but see comments above.
- » Not sure how winter activities will be incorporated
- » Allowing dogs off-leash on a multi-use trail is always a recipe for user conflict. Dogs and bikes do not mix.
- » How does this plan reflect the cultural and natural history of the site?
- » I think you have achieved well - my only concern is off leash areas for dogs - trails and areas - dogs do not always listen to their owners and easily leave their designated area - this leads to uncomfortable & dangerous situations especially for children
- » There would not appear to be any consideration for the development of a social area where residents could enjoy food and beverage service while in the park. There must be some way to bring this about. I understand the aversion to having anyone making money within the park but I do feel this component is being ignored.
- » The main service area is near to the vehicle access. At least one more water area should be designated where bike and pedestrian traffic are likely to be high. Perhaps the Kind park area or rat creek picnic spot.
- » The proposed developments (aside from habitat restoration) are a little too invasive, especially in regards to the amount of concrete pads poured for gathering areas. The river valley is highly regarded because of its untouched beauty, and too much concrete and sidewalk development takes away from that. Concrete is also very high in energy to produce, and there are less energy intensive materials like gravel. Plus concrete creates heat sinks in the summer, driving up ambient temperature.
- » There isn't a lot in the description that recognizes the land as Indigenous territories. Will the public art funding be granted to an Indigenous artist from the area? Who has roots to this land? Have Indigenous groups/communities been consulted on this (and not just in this survey)?
- » The existing paved pathway is a busy, high speed cycle commuter link - it's not realistic nor safe to place a winding cycle path passing alongside a busy amenity node. There needs to be a separate straight, safe, wide-open thoroughfare for cycle commuters. There are numerous anglers that use the riverbank downstream of the amenity building and their activity and access is not a strong feature of this plan. Without addressing this activity, the anglers will set up on the three river access points and docks beside the amenity building. They need their own pathways and use areas. Up to four buses at a time pull-up beside the

amenity node and require room to pass, avoid clipping parked cars and use of an easy turn around. The access road could use a second look.

- » It seems to be lacking a bit in terms of winter programming.
- » I believe the “suspension bridge” is inconsistent with “being in nature” There is a need to connect the community west and Northwest of 82 St. to the Dawson Park - Kinnaird Ravine. There needs to be consideration for neighbours living adjacent to the ravine who will be directly affected by park “improvements” such as “meadow” conditions in Jane Salisbury Park.
- » Provide a gate at the “Gathering Place” into HGC - locked during golf season and open after they blow the dog paths (on areas that keep dogs off the greens of course). Provide a Park Washroom as noted above. Defer the new staircase from the middle gravel trail up to 78 Street about a decade in the phasing - until Homelessness is resolved by housing first! The annual campers have some drug issues and a few come up to rob the homes in Viewpoint - scary to have a break in when only your teen daughter is home! Did you consult the Edmonton Police and the Park Police about introducing this easy access trail? The stairs on the other side are a frequent drug use/drug drop area. No mention is made of increased policing of criminal activity with the access for homeless, and some addicted campers improved by the Plan.
- » I'd like to see something more for winter/colder days use. Something like a dark wall curved to face the sun, so people could bask in the sun even on a cool/cold day. Even wind blockers with picnic tables would be good. As long as the wind is stopped, most days are pleasant. Maybe a skating rink, area, or path?
- » I don't think another playground is required. Kids don't have a hard time finding ways to play in the area already--all without a formal “play space”. This playground will keep them away from the nature space around them. I also don't think that having a playground will mitigate conflict in any way at all. The homeless and the dog walkers will be relegated away from the area, thus creating division that currently does not exist. Please avoid making this too fancy or formal. It is working so well right now with little stress and by not trying too hard. I meet elderly, young families (with very happy & engaged little kids without formal playgrounds), new Canadians, sports groups--everyone goes there already and it doesn't need a whole lot of fancy dolling up and building structures. It will turn into another kinsmen park that is only geared mostly toward young families. I bike there. My son longboards there. We walk the dogs there as a family.
- » Parking around access point on Jasper Avenue and North end of suspension bridge will create problems. Unlikely that there will be a lot of walk-in traffic. Unlikely that the

expensive bridge would make more people use the river valley. Fails to defend the neighbourhoods troubled by alcohol-fueled visitors and homeless.

- » Plan does not have wifi booster towers, as reception in river valley is weak. Good plan with Park use and amenities.
- » Off-leash areas should NOT be allowed, period!
- » some of the concepts are good. others i feel are not warranted. for instance extra entrances to the park. ADA and 75 street already has an entrance. and a trail leading down to the spot where rat creek empties out. there's already a lot of people using that area to smoke pot and sit on the benches etc and i think drawing more attention to it isn't a good idea at this time. also some projects like the suspension bridge seem cool but the kinnaird has little for amenities and that is the beauty of it. it's a great neighborhood spot and we don't get a lot of destination users. we also have no parking lots to sustain that such as those located at dawson and louise mckinney parks.
- » In order to accommodate more people to take advantage of the park expansion, I think we need to improve on parking and access to the park. I found parking is extremely limited around the Dragon boat club during the summer month.
- » you need more washrooms. There are lots of elders that go walk the parks but few washrooms. The plan above only has 1 for the whole park?! This is an issue on all parks, not enough washrooms.
- » It would be great add an additional parking lot along the 82 Street.
- » Off lease dog areas are not compatible with bike riding. I cannot tell from the maps whether dogs will be off leash right next to my bike riding without fencing. If so, there is conflict and I will never bike on this trail. Last year I was about to set off when a woman arrived with a huge mastiff type dog, took off its leash, and I turned around and left the park.
- » No
- » My one request it too have the entrance to the river valley (just off 81 street and jasper Ave. Gravel trail be also off leash and continue to be off lease all the way Down. The city removed the off leash area in kinnard ravine so it would be great if we could have the dirt path going down to the river be off leash also
- » John C. Hall when occupied by renters was the first safe haven for someone being chased or attacked in the park. Now it is vacated and the Parks Dept. offices move in - no one will be there at nights and it is at night that human drug use, beer parties and stalking occurs and coyote attacks occur.
- » ARE COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS PART OF EVERY PLAN? WHY ARE THEY PROMOTED? IS THIS A COMMUNITY PREFERENCE OR A CITY POLICY? JUST WONDERING

WHERE THEY PROMOTION COMES FROM AS WOULD PREFER TO NOT SEE ANY "SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS" DICTATION AVAILABILITY AND ACCESSIBILITY. THANKS

- » This is an idiotic survey. Way too complex for one question. Who writes your surveys? This person should be fired for research incompetence or public nuisance. You introduce 1) examples of recommended uses (way too wordy and yet still vague), 2) a way too complex picture of an "amenity node" (must be CofE speak??), and finally 3) a bunch of overwordy principals. THEN you ask me to rate whether I agree that the plan (??) achieves goals (??) of the principals?? Firstly I don't understand really what you are asking. Secondly, what if I only agree w/ some of the statements or parts of what you are asking... You have one scale to assess the whole thing. What idiot there thinks they are qualified to do survey research?? Really... the entire team that came up w/ this should be fired. Is this how our city is being managed?

Thinking about Connectivity & Circulation, please rate your level of agreement that the plan achieves the goals of the guiding principles stated above on a scale of 5 – 1? (5 being strongly agree and 1 strongly disagree)

Strongly agree - 51%
Somewhat agree - 35%
Neither agree nor disagree - 7%
Somewhat disagree - 4%
Strongly disagree - 3%
Don't know - 1%

Please expand on how you feel the plan achieves the goals of the guiding principles for Connectivity & Circulation.

- » too many ideas to work.
- » Even the premise is not one that I buy into. Who says parks need to be safe. If they need to be safe should we kill the coyotes and beavers that can eviscerate a dog? Should we put in so many sight lines no one could get lost or hide? There is no credible info that says people cannot currently access park. I have two wheel chair friends that love Dawson. The whole process is patronizing and mean.
- » Pedestrian traffic is not in high demand so multiple access routes is not required. There is already multiple places pedestrians can enter the river valley on either side of the proposed entrance so there is no need to increase access points when ones we have are not even used.
- » Parking is not very accessible. there isnt any. either is mobility challenge access.
- » New stairs will provide access to the physically challenged.
- » New suspension bridge will be nice.
- » The Kinnaird Ravine and Dawson Park must be a safe and secure place especially for residents who have properties that have the park system as a border on all sides. The park should be accessible for all, including the elderly and handicapped.
- » Please ensure that all bike trails or ones designated to be used by bikes are straight and not curvy. Commuters do not need to have a winding meandering experience.
- » How about asking if a person agrees with the plan. Balance the budget and quit raising taxes above inflation before looking for new ways to spend my money.
- » Appreciate the maintenance and improvement to paved and natural trails.
- » It will certainly make the park more accessible and bring in more users.
- » It would seem the plan calls for new pathways to connect existing pathways and provide new routes through the ravine/park system.
- » should expand off leash.
- » I feel that you are over developing the park trying to make it accessible to everyone. By doing so you are eliminate the value and beauty of this park. This is area is a river bank and should be treated as such. It is a very special park that should not be OVER Developed.
- » Increased footprint in the park
- » Would ask that signs be posted for cyclist to yield to pedestrians, or be cautious. They wiz by on their bikes like they own the trail. Some come around the corners and almost hit dogs.
- » We still need to park.
- » Appears to provide connections to other trails but not sure how far assistance would be if needed.
- » Links to proposed pathways are there. Access available on North and South par of river.
- » I like the idea of more and enhanced entry points. I also like the numerous trails for differing purposes to keep activities somewhat separate.
- » Ensure natural trails are maintained as a fantastic trail was converted into a granular trail. I'd enjoy being able to continue to use single track trails with my dog
- » It looks good. Many of us access the trail via other running trails or as a destination (either on bus, car or cycle) to run/walk with friends, row etc. It looks great for rowers, lots of access from surrounding neighbourhoods, and downtown. Looks lovely, really.
- » Access to the active transportation network, connection with the North Saskatchewan River, serves the neighbouring citizens, supports a diversity of park users

- » Jasper Avenue was just dug up and the sidewalks replaced. What is this that now it is proposed to change to a "Proposed Paved Trail"? Why replace something that is intended to last 25 years be replaced by something now a bit wider? This is poor scheduling.
- » I would like to see more entrances to the park that even those proposed.
- » Latta Bridge connection is great!
- » There should only be natural trails in Kinnaird Park
- » The plan for getting in and out looks OK
- » Although I feel that the goals will meet the guiding principles for Connectivity & Circulation but how much of extra tax that tax payers have to pay in order to meet this guide?
- » There seem to be lots of ways to connect citizens with the amenities of the park.
- » Many ways to get into the area and use the space. However, for greatest effectiveness, this plan needs to be supported by better transportation planning. Reduce our dependency on cars and improve public transit. I'd like to be able to get this park by taking a single bus; right now I'd need to take three, or two plus the LRT.
- » Access is one thing. Circulation is another. We're concerned with the compatibility of both.
- » Not sure I know what is meant by "...connected with the City's active transportation network through access and trail connections". Does this mean it will be connected to the transit network or something?
- » There should be a variety of trails that are not all 2m wide, paved and wheelchair accessible. Perhaps keep in mind a ski hill with green, blue and black diamond runs. Edmonton is well known for single-track mountain bike trails and the City seems intent on paving them over.
- » It's good but misses a fantastic opportunity for access to a permanent beach on the River. Edmonton was excited about a sandbar beach - but the stoney beach below the 5B "Gathering Place" is permanent - we have walked and waded in it for over twenty years now! It's not shifting sand. It is wide and exposed every year and quite walkable.
- » A major concern would be the amount of homeless people who live in this area. by adding new trails and "safety", do you have a plan to help the homeless who will be removed from the park daily?
- » The trail system is good. The only improvement I can think of would be to replace the stairs along Wayne Gretzky Drive with a switchback trail. This would provide proper connectivity for cyclists across the river.
- » Not sure we need a granular trail on the top of Jasper Ave south side. from 82 St to 77 St. The community are good at keeping their sidewalks shoveled. At some points there is no room for a trail. The bank is one foot from the new curb.
- » wow. that's a lot of trails for such a narrow corridor - not really what i'd imagine for an area that was trying to reconnect people with nature. less trails, more sharing of trails, and more space for nature would seem more consistent.
- » Money is being spent without consideration of where it is coming from.
- » It looks like it would fit a multitude of users which is what it should be for.
- » I love that there are additional entrances going to be more visible.
- » Everything outlined is included in the drawings
- » certainly the connectivity is provided in this plan but I don't think a suspension bridge over Kinnaird Ravine would be necessary. The Aesthetics of the ravine would be lost.
- » It would be nice if it was made real easy to get on and off the 2 river bridges for walkers and bikes. With the Gretzky Bridge, it would be nice to get on and off it right at the water's edge rather than having to go way back up to the edge of the ravine.
- » Based on what I see here, it looks like the plan will do what the goals intend for it to do.
- » Well planned usage of the space in question, in a responsible manner
- » Trail connections to transit are great.
- » more entrances is good for recreation use and safe commute use.
- » The site has many access points to the surrounding communities through an established trail system.
- » Lots of places to access and exit the park.
- » I like the fourth and fifth points related the River Valley system and active transportation network.
- » I think the principles cover the key concepts of safety, accessibility and connectivity well.
- » The new and improved pedestrian access points will be great, especially the ravine trail extension to Stadium Station and the Latta Bridge trail. The suspension bridge will provide a great connection to Borden Park.
- » It looks fantastic, I hope this is done.
- » having many access points to trails encourage more people to use it if it is easy and convenient for them
- » It's good as it is
- » I really like that the plan opens up accessibility to the park and connectivity to surrounding structures, especially streets and the Wayne Gretzky bridge. Most bike commuters will use the paved trails, which won't change that drastically. But walkers will have lots of choice for type of trail and direction. Also, with increased access and the suspension bridge, I have no concerns with the safety of walking down the dark Kinnaird ravine.
- » Much better connections to Jasper Avenue from the River Valley

- » Very impressed
- » The enhanced connectivity increases safety, access, diversity of users, connects to neighbouring communities, and connects to NS River Valley and Ravine system.
- » The Latta bridge entrance is fantastic and will really enhance that area of Jasper Ave. The suspension bridge and stadium station access are also great additions. Today, the park is somewhat unknown and access is hard to find, the new entrances will open up the park to many new users.
- » Trail system looks to be well-developed, with various types of trails that connect often and well
- » I like the LRT connection this is just off downtown of a major city.
- » Park safety might be an issue. I really like to see officers on bikes from time to time.
- » Takes an Edmonton secret and turns it into a community asset
- » The multiple points of access and paving are great.
- » A variety of access points are provided. Access for people with limited mobility off Rowland Rd. entrance.
- » The addition of trails to the area increases the capacity of the park while not overburdening the area. The mix of paved, granular, and natural trails provides accessibility for a mix of activities so more Edmontonians can enjoy the natural aspects of the city the way they prefer. Improved access points and the addition of the Kinnaird Expansion Bridge make the park more accessible from all directions and will certainly promote connection with the river valley and ravine system.
- » The three items below are exactly what this area needs. I am especially excited about the prospect of the suspension bridge connecting the north side to viewpoint park. ? Enhanced connectivity into the park from Jasper Avenue to improve access from adjacent communities ? A suspension bridge and top-of-bank entrances with wayfinding signs improve connections to surrounding communities ? A new trail in Kinnaird Ravine improves the connection to Stadium Station
- » There are good pedestrian/cyclist access points from a number of communities which I think will encourage more use of the park. The suspension bridge will allow more use of the park without disrupting some of the natural areas The improved access under the Latta bridge will make it easier to get from the valley to other parts of the city-- one caution is that the current situation under the Latta bridge is hazardous-- many used needles and a lot of garbage and human waste-- hopefully there will be a plan to prevent/stay on top of this issue. Hopefully if there is more pedestrian and cycle traffic on that trail, the problem will solve itself.
- » I see on the plan the various principles being influential

- » I like the inclusion of the Natural and granular trails. I think having a connection to the Stadium LRT is good.
- » Just more and better paved and granular trails will enhance connectivity and circulation
- » Please make the existing granular trail off leash. Love it.
- » Good connections are made - however the distances have not been taken into account between public washrooms at the entrance to Dawson Park, and the semi-public washrooms at Highlands Golf Club open during winter now - Can a washroom amenity be added to the Rat Creek outflow area? This would encourage use by seniors, children and other citizens along the trail with all these new entry points being away from the public washrooms.
- » So many more ways to access the park. Thank you!
- » Awesome.

If you feel the plan does not achieve the goals of the guiding principles for Connectivity & Circulation, please explain below.

- » the whole layout offers itself to two things only. spot visits and commuters moving through
- » Far too many trails/paths/roads
- » To ensure that Park is accessible to all user groups, washrooms MUST be located adjacent to where people gather such as at playgrounds and wildlife viewing locations. If washrooms are not provided there are a variety of negative consequences: using the Woods/ trails or benches to duck behind or in, time at locations are limited, families, seniors and some individuals with disabilities require more frequent washroom breaks- lacking washrooms WILL make this park inherently less welcoming and accessible to these user groups.
- » Where does one start. Over built. Current access points are very abundant some are just not maintained. So why put in even more and create additional maint challenges, This plan is horrible.
- » imbalance between public access and environmental stewardship--can count five or six areas that would undergo significant tree and brush clearing for access points, plus cutting of "new natural trail." Environmental Impact studies done for Funicular and Valley Line show south facing banks are popular bird nesting sites. Environmental impact needs to be considered. Staircases/suspension bridge??!! proposed for eastern part of park seem to lead from an area that will always have a low population because the area is bounded by Wayne Gretzky, Bordon Park, Northlands etc. Already a good entrance to park at Concordia--why another one a block away? Keep in mind Dawson and Kinnaird are truly "ribbons" of green--we don't want them to become "threads."

- » This plan would not achieve activity in the river valley from residents that would use it, it would only promote crime activity in the area of Virginia Park which is a quiet neighborhood that enjoys the natural landscapes.
- » Bikes shouldn't be allowed all over the place. I would like to take my grandchildren to parks, but everywhere we go, we have to put up with dangerous dogs and careless people on bikes. If you want to race bikes go to a race track.
- » Living in Parkdale, I feel all connected already, with a multitude of options for my daily walks in this park. I really don't see why a gravel trail makes manicured lawn more walkable, or why people need a new trail in upper Kinnaird instead of using the sidewalk skirting the ravine. This trail would destroy the most sensitive slope there, with the least disturbed vegetation. The worst of all is the suspension bridge: Go around the block and use the new or old stairs instead! We walk so we get exercise. The bridge will mar one of the nicest views in this city.
- » Why chop it up. You are making it worse for off lease and bikes.
- » I am supportive of a more connected Edmonton, however I feel that the proposed suspension bridge is going a step too far. In Virginia Park, with our proximity to the river valley we see many people out enjoying running, walking, dog walking, etc and we also see the results of homeless camps and transient folks. I think that if the City is looking to potentially add a suspension bridge, that the city should be sharing studies on the foreseeable traffic increases, including plans for increased monitoring and enforcement of our neighbourhood.
- » several of the proposals are redundant. Access already exists to the river valley by paved trail in front of Concordia and moving the trail an extra block west seems like a waste of money. The suspension bridge takes you from a place with no parking to a valley you can already access from a number of points along the river valley. There is already a concern that this new access will increase the crime rate in the Virginia Park area
- » Homeless people will show up in greater numbers. No mention of security or Policing costs. More emergency phones needed?
- » There is an existing sidewalk along north side of 111 Avenue between 77 and 78th Streets - another paved trail is unnecessary. There is no paved trail on north side of 111 Avenue between 78 and 81st Streets. These were put in as part of neighbourhood renewal for Viewpoint. Mid Jasper Avenue access to river bank will create parking problems since the access point is on a curve. There are plans to develop the grassed area adjacent to 78th Street and this will further reduce parking. Current river valley bank top walk is poorly maintained - begetation on the river bank side is not looked after and will continue to be a problem if plans are not made to maintain the vegetation.
- » The proposed new staircase at 78 Street and Jasper Avenue will NOT allow for EASY access to the river by people coming from the North of 112 Avenue. There will be far too many stairs to climb unless everyone is VERY physically fit! The current access points, especially at 82 Street & Jasper Avenue are great access points for all to use, including elderly and handicapped citizens. Improve those trails with proper signage please.
- » How about asking if a person agrees with the plan. Balance the budget and quit raising taxes above inflation before I=looking for new ways to spend my money.
- » See previous comments
- » We are still very much a vehicle culture and additional parking in the vicinity (e.g., partnership with the golf club on the south side of the river) would be required. As a parent with small kids (strollers, diaper bags, etc), it is often simpler to drive than take transit. Also concerned about safety; currently not so well lit or frequented (or policed for those who currently frequent the sites).
- » A suspension bridge??? What are the cost comparisons with a trestle style (like in Mill Creek) bridge?
- » It's not clear how it will support the low income people who typically frequent the park. Are they simply going to be expropriated?
- » By trying to over achieve the Connectivity for these areas you are impacting the communities around it. Having access points in residential areas will increase vehicle, bicycle and human traffic in on residential streets that are not made to accommodate increased traffic. I also feel that in order to put your plan into operation you have forgotten to take into consideration the stewardship of the land.
- » The suspension bridge does not fit. I think this may be an LA dream.
- » Expands footprint too much
- » Are all the trails lighted?
- » Would be nice if the connections along Wayne Gretzky Drive could be improved for cyclists. The number of stairs requires a lot of dismounting making the connections unusable for commuters.
- » Proposed natural trail (also off leash trail) will have reduced usage ... because you are turning over to off leash dog owners, a small segment of the population, this really reduces access, because other users avoid these areas. Off leash areas make areas unsafe, frankly, they really do. 60 per cent of dogs are ok, but 40 per cent are biting risk, knocking over risk. It is not safe with children to use off leash trails. I have a niece, and I do not take her to off leash areas, we are restricted to using pavement, and the natural spaces are not accesssible. It sucks, frankly. Please, I beg you, revisit this ideology, but also consider this part of the plan for the entire river valley. The natural trails are more and more being turned over to off leash people. Honestly,

I am a runner-planning to train for an ultra, and my access is really restricted. I go late at night, really early--I can't go anytime after about 8 am through 8 pm, because of people with really badly trained animals.

- » Off-leash dogs do not allow for a "safe and secure space" for many who would like to use the park. They should be prohibited.
- » The river valley has never been overly safe unless you are moving fast. Long trails as proposed in this plan give no escape for someone on a walk and confronted on the trail.
- » The Plan is very good, but doesn't mention how people can access it using public transit.
- » There really should be a couple of parking spaces for charter buses. Even now, it's quite difficult to get a bus into the Dawson Park parking area. With the boat dock, there are groups that come by charter bus to go on a river ride.
- » Why does the proposed granular trail at 82 Street just South of 112 Avenue not connect to the proposed pedestrian bridge, nor to the proposed granular trail at the Ada Blvd entrance? Isn't the focus of this supposed to be connectivity?
- » Consider reserving space for XC ski along main paved path, not just informal side trails. The ski-commute should be an option!
- » Cyclists need to be restricted to specific areas of the park. Cyclists and pedestrians do not mix well as militant cyclists think they own the path. Unfortunately the militant cyclists are in the majority and therefore needed to be restricted to path access.
- » I feel the park would be difficult to access from north along Gretzky trail. Like coming from 112 ave.
- » Only concern is visitors from out of town access if they have only an RV I. E. Motorhome
- » Could use more toilet facilities.
- » If all trails are accessible to cyclists, does that mean the trails are wider than single track? I've had some close calls while on foot on river valley granular and natural trails (not just at Dawson, but all parks) when a cyclist comes full speed from the opposite direction.
- » Parks in the River Valley off of Downtown will never be fully safe. Lots of homeless people and drug activity happens.
- » Safety. My guess is that people are worried about the homeless and how unsafe they make park users feel, and possibly people are worried about lurkers. Anything done to improve people's feeling of safety in these situations? Not sure I can think of anything to do about it except ensure lots of points at which to flee if necessary.
- » No mention of how paddlers may connect! What about all the Mtn. Bike trails and their access?
- » I am not clear on parking capacity and accessibility for those with mobility challenges.
- » Has proper attention been taken to ensure wildlife traffic isn't hindered by the pathway? Long open areas where there is large lines of sight is not good for most animals and creates greater opportunities for predators. The river valley is first and foremost a wildlife corridor for birds, deer, beavers, coyotes, the occasional large predator, and many other important species, and while most people never see this use (animals are pretty darn sneaky) the river valley is relied on heavily for travel and sustenance of these animals. The plan does not show a close up view of the proposed pathways, but they should meander so as not to provide long lines of sight, as well as cut across too many existing game trails or makes the areas between trails too skinny. Also try not to use too much concrete/asphalt in path development (see previous comment regarding concrete pads) :)
- » What about boat connectivity and circulation? There needs to be a large open grassy staging area near the amenity building for loading, unloading, etc. Keep in mind also that boats will not only put-in here, but also that boats will exit and/or stop over here so paddlers can use the washrooms.
- » The City needs to use heavy stones to build a stair to go down about 10' where we and the Beavers have carved out the access trail - this is just to the right of the restored Rat Creek (east). It has a swing built on it too which could be enhanced. With stone stairs which will not wash away in the Spring - the public can access it until the City sees it in use and will build a ramp to it. What a gem! I don't understand why the Plan ignores an already existing Beach that lasts from July to October! The actual steps need to go near the note on 5B that says "Lease Up Zone Begins".
- » I'm not scared myself, but I know women/seniors who would never go there by themselves even if they had a dog. I'm not trying to gentrify the heck out of the area, but the transient/homeless crowd certainly comes into play when choosing a place to go.
- » It already has GREAT Vehicular access. No need to waste millions on a part 2 to the waste of money by the Hotel MacDonald
- » don't make the paved trail along ADA boulevard. it is already a little used street and the grass trees along the road would be affected. same with money spent on 'paved trail' west of virginia park lodge. street isn't busy enough to warrant a paved trail. spend money other ways.
- » Costs are not considered.
- » Dogs, runners and bikers usually equate a problem. Is there any separation?
- » The river side gravel trail under Capilano Bridge needs to be upgraded to asphalt all the way to Rundle Park. Having cyclist climb up the valley to continue northeast is very limiting for many individuals.

- » I support the plan however there appears to be only one vehicular access. While the park is mostly for the use of able bodied and athletic residents a vehicular access to the north should be considered.
- » Where the trails are going to be closed, could stairs or alternative access be provided to fill the gaps?
- » No
- » It isn't talked about, but is there a plan around people without other housing who live in the ravine? Will this plan involve extra policing of people who don't have any housing other than living in the ravine. I want to be clear that I see this is absolutely violent and not to the benefit of the community or greater good. If you're talking about connectivity and access, everyone should be able to access the ravine and if communities of people need to live in there, they shouldn't be disturbed. It is not a safety risk to the public.
- » Please make the existing granular trail off leash. Love it.
- » The new staircase into 78 Street Viewpoint Neighbourhood will draw up campers who give these three blocks a great number of thefts each year. Break ins are the main reason the campers like this area as opposed to the hillside further west above Dawson Park and under Latta Bridge - a key drug destination downtown and very unsafe area. Please defer this staircase until the final Phase when hopefully the trails are better used and there is more policing of the criminal activity. The fence around the Dawson Park playground with gates needs to be diamond mesh to keep coyotes from attacking the kids - more than keeping dogs out...It would be more useful to have fence around the playground than along the dog walking path in my opinion.
- » Not sure why the scale is 5-1 and not 1-5. That's weird.
- » Same as before. Dumb survey.
- » Tell me one way you are protecting sensitive habitat.. So many people and trucks and equipment will be in this park destroying reptiles and scaring fauna and compacting flora and mycelium.
- » natural means trees not bridges.
- » There is currently no interaction with the river now. Can't see the proposals helping with anything.
- » The natural character of Kinnaird Park should also be maintained. No gravel trails, no added features
- » There is the protection of the natural and ecology of the park but u have to be aware that when you bring people and animals to the park you can't have alot of rules stopping them from enjoying it.
- » The coyotes stalk us. If I see one on the trail ahead of me, and turn quickly, there will be two behind me - are they considered a sensitive species while they hunt me or lure my dog into a trap - they are very clever. Best that the playgrounds be well fenced with diamond mesh to keep coyotes away from kids who may be playing while Mom is exercising by walking around Kinnaird Park. The pack there is well used to humans and comes very close - they are difficult to scare simply by yelling. Of course smaller people are more vulnerable than larger adults and they are really after the dog for meat.
- » Agree with Rat creek area
- » A plan and the reality usually are two different things. Will the city actually patrol the park, do clean up, etc.
- » How about asking if a person agrees with the plan. Balance the budget and quit raising taxes above inflation before l=looking for new ways to spend my money.
- » You are restoring the natural character.
- » I think that your plans contradict each other. On one hand you want to increase access through adding new trails for connectivity and access. Then you plan to restore and rehabilitate natural systems. It sounds good but I really question the overall plan and how it will be maintain as a beautiful natural area valued for what it is and has.
- » well intentioned, but issue of invasive species is systemic in our river valley and would likely require all of the resources earmarked for just this site in order to address adequately. i would love to see a focus on this before restoration efforts of areas like rat creek commence. the prevalence of invasive plants in the park will continually threaten restoration agendas as those sites will be vulnerable to these species for a number of years. trying to do too much at the same time is rarely a good ideas. take a stepwise approach.
- » Appears to be an ambitious plan which may not be easily maintained. Care for the wet lands and native animal life is needed and needed to be enforced, especially with dogs off leash. Would be beautiful if achieved.

Thinking about Nature & Ecology, please rate your level of agreement that the plan achieves the goals of the guiding principles stated above on a scale of 5 – 1? (5 being strongly agree and 1 strongly disagree)

Strongly agree - 57%
 Somewhat agree - 25%
 Neither agree nor disagree - 9%
 Somewhat disagree - 4%
 Strongly disagree - 3%
 Don't know - 2%

Please expand on how you feel the plan achieves the goals of the guiding principles for Nature & Ecology.

- » a hiding hole for squatters and the poor who want to be close to the charity centers.

- » If the plan appears to be lacking in the future it can always be changed
- » Restoration work is wonderful! The only thing in this Master Plan I look forward to.
- » Although I feel that the goals will meet the guiding principles for Nature & Ecology but how much of extra tax that tax payers have to pay in order to meet this guide?
- » Lots of mixed forest is being maintained as well as spruce. The few natural grasslands are being maintained.
- » I know I'm in a minority here, but I'd like even more restricted activity areas. This area will need a lot of care to regrow, and intensive public activity may be in conflict with ecological goals. I recognize that the plan attempts to balance access and restoration; I simply feel that more area should be reserved for restoration and less for developed activities.
- » The plan would seem to provide for maintaining natural areas as well as utilizing existing disturbed areas for amenities. It is well thought out.
- » How will bug problems be managed ? Will there be spraying for mosquitoes for instance ? Invasive species watch - and again how do you make sure the dogs are kept under control
- » I'm very grateful for the amount of care that has gone into the conservation of the river valley during this development.
- » Nature and ecology are fickle, especially in regard to incorporating mass public accessibility to the area. The plan looks ambitious and I hope it works. I think this map and the boundaries of the rehab and restoration initiatives are important to maintain to make sure the plan is effective. Strictly adhering to the plan while being flexible to accommodate the fickle nature of the area will lead to success.
- » There doesn't seem to be an understanding that at low river flows, people and dogs make their way down the banks and onto gravel flats to throw balls, swim dogs, fish and rummage for dump artifacts. There may well be a formal trail system, but informal access will be created if it is not pre-built into the plan.
- » Once you put off leash dog areas here they will have them off-leash everywhere in the park and there will not be enough enforcement to stop people. Oh sorry. This should be in the box below.
- » I like the idea of restoring Rat Creek and preserving Kinnaird Ravine. The top of bank meadow is also a great idea.
- » projects for most part are good idea
- » I like the idea of restoration
- » Money is no object.
- » looking after the natural elements and all ecological aspects of the park is of tantamount importance.
- » While this map is somewhat complex to read, I agree with any efforts to improve or maintain a natural environment.
- » Love the proposed stream bed restoration and erosion mitigation. These are very important.
- » It is all included in the drawings.
- » Looks lovely. Truly, inspired.
- » How will the sensitive species and habitats in the park be protected?
- » It's hard to say exactly, but it looks like the allotments are fair and well proportioned within the proposed plan.
- » habitat restoration is very important
- » The plan will maintain the natural character, not destroy land and enhance animal growth.
- » I feel the city usually does a good job of concerning themselves with the environment
- » Restoring and daylighting Rat Creek would be amazing! Closing all the little trails that run up and down the slopes will help slow erosion. I like that vehicle access isn't being expanded.
- » It just gets better and better
- » keeping everything natural in the park but still maintained is the best option
- » I think that the plan to manage each ecosystem according to it's characteristics is the key to meeting the principles. The forest of the ravine is sensitive and I like that there will be ways to restrict off trail activity.
- » As a kid, I spent many hours playing in the Kinnard Ravine and I am happy to see it and Rat Creek being rehabilitated. Rat Creek needs considerable clean-up and restoration work. At one time there was a wide area along the creek that was actually large enough in winter for skating and ball hockey. This could be restored for winter use.
- » The plan maintains the natural character (protects wetlands, meadow planting, restricts activity off trails), protects sensitive species & habitats, restores natural systems (Rat Creek, restores native ground cover and plants), rehabilitation & restoration of natural systems (Rat Creek, establishes meadow and native shrubs, restores native ground cover), all within a low impact and sustainable proposals.
- » By limiting areas of disturbance to those areas which have already been disturbed, this will allow for regrowth in other areas
- » restoration to "natural" is useful in an urban environment
- » Nice to restore the natural elements
- » Protecting the natural setting is important.
- » The constant management of all portions of the park will ensure that public use will not adversely effect the habitat.
- » Helping to maintain the eco-system
- » The nature & ecology guiding principles to maintain the park's natural vegetation and structure will continue to sustain the life of the park. It shows how much

Edmontonians have love of the land despite the image of a growing city that has sky scrapers popping up in the downtown core.

- » The trail through Kinnaird Ravine is exceptionally quiet in relation to the traffic noise at the top of the Ravine. The wetland area in this ravine is rather inaccessible and should stay that way. I really feel Kinnaird is a gem and as it is accessible to a very large population living in the nearby condos and rental properties it has to stay natural.
- » Well done. I love that you are working to keep native planting a priority and protecting the area overall. Nice balance between leaving it natural, but also making it an enjoyable space for people to use.
- » I think the plan definitely follows the guiding principles wild life in the ravine is more protected sensitive slopes are more protected by improving access in other places
- » it has been very thoughtfully developed
- » Happy to see more trees and bushes being planted. Score one for Mother Nature.
- » I think the restoration of the riparian area is especially important for ecological integrity
- » Restoration of watershed is very good.
- » Great idea. for restoration, this should also include historical information Centre. What past inhabitants did here. I.e.. Fort Edmonton and previous to that the First Nations.
- » Sensitive species and habitats in the Park must be protected.
- » BEACH BEACH BEACH! Here is a beach that is exposed every year from end of June to end of October - quite walkable - yet no discussion of adding a sand bank or even cutting in some stone steps to access it. There is a swing there and it could be enhanced as well. Some Chained up logs that will float up and down would provide very naturalized seating or could be brought in from the Rat Creek outflow area each Summer for people to sit on - ACCESS to the BEACH has not been addressed in this plan.
- » The yellow sensitive slopes are the areas that clay was taken from to build the existing bike path at the waters edge in the 1950's.
- » Not sure what activity is targeted for restrictions and why
- » While understand off trail possibilities, I think they're ripping the bank and creating erosion chutes.

If you feel the plan does not achieve the goals of the guiding principles for Nature & Ecology, please explain below.

- » native ground cover? the area has been invaded by several irritating plant species, how can they be mitigated, to allow use by people? or is exclusion of people a plan?

- » This is contradictory to the previous images where you are going to destroy the natural and ecological character by installing boat launches and allowing pets to roam free
- » increased traffic in the ravine and increased pathways inevitably will lead to degradation of the natural habitat. Bring more people into the valley farther west where paved pathways and roads already exist.
- » Too much focus on the non natives. You could give up on the caragana and burdock it is here to stay and the bugs have already adapted. By trying so hard is such an ill informed way you are bound to do more harm than good. 'Improvements' in the park (of which I see none) are supposed to be sustainable!!! A meadow is a super labour intensive endeavour do not do it.
- » Best way to sustain park is to leave it as it is. Maintain main trails, pick up garbage, and leave the rest to nature. Native plantings between Braille and Main Trails, as nice as that would be, would hinder trail user movement back and forth between those trails that often occurs to avoid conflicts. Don't see how cutting new trails enhances ecology. Suspension bridge would involve lots of clear cutting in Kinnaird Ravine. Restoring riparian vegetation not as urgent as assessing "the dump" along the river's edge and at least taking out industrial toxins. Restoring Rat Creek a noble idea, but not easy.
- » The plan does not allow residence of Virginia Park the ability to enjoy the natural landscape that they have paid taxes for.
- » The continued catering to off-leash dogs is antithetical to maintaining the "natural character" and to protecting "sensitive species and habitats" and "rehabilitation and restoration of natural systems". No amount of signage restricting access or "leash-up areas" will change the fact that off leash dogs will go where they will. The City has dropped the ball on this in a big way. Short of an expensive multi-year blitz, dog walkers will not leash up, signs or not.
- » It seems counterproductive to me to have a Rat Creek gathering area where you are attempting to restore the stream bed. Would it not be better for restoration efforts to limit social and recreational use of that space, and not include a Rat Creek gathering area?
- » While I like the idea of the plants - especially reintroducing some ancient grasses in Kinnaird Park - the fact is that non-native species like Caragana (native to Asia and eastern Europe) have fully invaded the hillside from bird droppings seed. It will never be possible to restore the vegetation, nor is it necessary with the grassland meadow educational idea.
- » Mother Nature is doing a GREAT job by herself ...
- » I agree with three of the four bullets, but number 3 is a stretch. This is a park in the middle of relatively high-density living space, which will have lots of use and some through

traffic. The extent to which this third bullet can be carried out effectively and without significant cost is not evident to me, nor is it a critical element in this plan. This goal makes sense in other settings and habitats, but I don't think it is practical here, in this specific case.

- » Nature & Ecology, vs. dogs and bikes, If you're for one you're not for the other. It's about time bikers and dog owners pay for all the free stuff that I am currently paying for.
- » Since there is a portion of the park that is off leash, the sensitive area will be overrun with dogs. Additionally, mountain bikers NEVER respect trail signage to stay off the paths. They cause the most erosion and need to be out of the sensitive area completely.
- » Kinnaird ravine and the higher elevation trails are lovely hike but the mosquito problem is horrific. Please clear a bit more vegetation to allow some light in so this trail is more enjoyable. Thanks
- » How about asking if a person agrees with the plan. Balance the budget and quit raising taxes above inflation before I=looking for new ways to spend my money.
- » You cannot keep natural vegetation (especially sensitive species) and restore natural systems and still have it be sustainable, maintainable and low impact. If you could, the area would not need restoring as it would have maintained itself.
- » Do not try to manage nature by "fixing" erosion. Saw the resulting damage in allowing increased storm sewer drainage in Mill Creek that wiped out embankments and caused footbridges to become unstable. Create a park with adequate trails for all types of users and let the rest stay natural.
- » Although it is nice to have more access to Dawson Park I can't see that bringing more people into Kinnaird Ravine, a nicely forested area, will benefit the environment & the flora & fauna there. I think it is overly optimistic to think that bringing more people into that green space isn't going to have a negative environmental impact unless there is real enforcement. People simply do not respect requests not to go off trail, etc.
- » Your plan is pie in the sky. You want it to be accessible and used, while restoring it to what was and maintaining what is. I really think that you need to come down to earth and learn how to be stewards of the land. If you really work on restoring and maintaining Nature & Ecology then do and keep path ways to the minimum. And make sure you have the finances to maintain and care for it as a treasure that should always be value.
- » Will noxious weeds and plants be addressed in the disturbed areas?
- » I worry about the suspension bridge changing the natural character of the ravine. At least it's suspension as to have little direct footprint.
- » I think it covers the principles for the most part but I'm not sure how it addresses enforcement. People have indicated they want to walk their dogs off-leash in the area and if it becomes a more popular place to do that, their may be conflict between animals in the area and dogs; there are squirrels, skunks (and in the past even fox and deer have been known to wander into the area).
- » Erosion is beautiful-the main feature in Dawson Park, the hoodoo area, is a result of it. I sure hope "managing erosion" doesn't involve the building of retaining walls! I wonder what "managing beach" entails? Let it be natural!
- » something has to be done about the garbage left behind by homeless people
- » Let's face it: with more access for more people, maintaining the natural character of the park will always be a "challenge".
- » I wonder if there is some provision for interpretive areas explaining the coal mining aspect of the area since it played such an important part in our city's history.
- » If you want the hoodoos to be preserved, do not encourage people to go near them on the paths. Many hoodoos have been destroyed in drumheller because of too many people climbing on and purposely vandalizing them.
- » I think the plan will achieve the goals of the guiding principles for Nature and Ecology, but this project along side the increased accessibility to the area will make it more challenging.
- » The only concern with regard to protecting ecologically / naturally sensitive areas is that people need to keep their dogs under control. It is very common for people to let their dogs loose even in non-offleash areas.
- » There is considerable "downed woody debris" in Kinnaird / Rat Creek Ravine that has concern for potential forest fires. Also CPTED is required on the north side of the ravine east of 82 St. behind the small strip mall. It's a widely used itinerant camping area and is a security problem and hazard for residents.
- » The offleash park will cause issues with preservation objectives. Irresponsible users will allow dogs into areas where they should not go. This will lead to degradation of the preserved areas. For evidence, just look at how offleash users are degrading the semi-natural forest in the Buena Vista offleash park. Either remove or segregate the offleash use in the park.
- » meadow planting? it is a nice open area. return to shrub and forest may not be best idea. plant along side of river valley to stabilise bank a better idea.
- » I think you could plant more trees, the open areas are under used and I think you could plant more trees in those areas. There are no ball diamonds or anything like that to be interfered with if you were to plant more trees.

- » Be careful, mindful with the meadow area for potential for invasive plants. :) But, I think it's an inspired idea. (look no off leash rant!!).
- » No
- » Details are lacking for what restoring Rat Creek means to users.
- » Places never seem to include natural berries and the like when they say 'native vegetation'. I'd like the river valley to have lots of high-bush cranberries, blueberries, raspberries, etc.
- » I am concerned about trash both new and very old in the river and on the river bank contaminating the area?
- » Does not reflect a first nations involvement or influence.
- » We need to reduce the amount of access points to the Ravine and Dawson Park not increase them! The top of the bank from 81 Street to 77 Street and Jasper Avenue must be left natural to protect a wildlife corridor. This area is used by porcupines, deer and coyotes who travel from the Kinnaird Ravine to the river bank regularly. The coyotes are known to den just over the bank and just below 78 Street and Jasper Avenue.
- » It is Edmonton's desire to have a beach - it has one that's 30 years old and not washed away like the accidental beach sand bar is going to wash away- let's get to it without sliding down 8' of mud - put the staircase in this plan. It is small rocks and very walkable and hasn't moved in the 30 years I have lived here. It goes from Capilano Bridge to Rat Creek outflow.
- » Obvious you know nothing about survey research. From the questions you are trying to ask, I even wonder if you know anything about city planning.

What is your overall level of support for the Master Plan on a scale of 5 – 1? (5 being strongly support and 1 being do not support).

- 5 - Strongly support - 45%
- 4 - 38%
- 3 - 6%
- 2 - 4%
- 1 - Do not support - 6%
- Don't know - 1%

What areas of the plan do you support?

- » no comment
- » Plan is too intrusive.
- » no comment
- » Ecological restoration.
- » Proposed trails and vegetation restoration.
- » I support the restoration and maintenance of the park area as a natural river valley park with a minimum of trails cutting through the park. With little or no impact on residential

- » areas that are on the perimeter of the river bank and creek bank. Entrances should be very accessible with sufficient parking available (already available start or end of trails. Trails should not cut through natural growth anymore that is essential for access. (Start and end of area)
- » smaller footprint amenity building
- » I agree that there should be greater access to the river valley and there should be increased amenities in the river valley. we should wait to see what impact the funicular will bring to increased river use. Increased access to Kinnaird Ravine will dramatically reduce the wilderness feel to the area. I feel you are addressing a problem in these areas that does not exist.
- » Reforestation of the existing area. I see no mention of costing and upkeep for this vision-- am I expected to sign a blank cheque? Lack of realistic planning for 6 months of winter we experience, all the nice stuff in the world cannot change that. How much does plowing the paths cost? We cant even get the residential roads plowed when there is a large dump of snow. People don't like to be cold, especially new comers to Edmonton who don't know what winter is. This plan will not change that.
- » Amenity node, Suspension bridge. Connection to Stadium station. Lookouts
- » The less the city does to the park the better!
- » The main amenity node at Dawson Park, new playground, improved and updated picnic area. Would be nice to have an accessible boat dock and launch. Restored Rat Creek and gathering area would be nice. Planting a meadow at the Kinnaird Park.
- » maintaining small parking lot. new amenity buildings connection with Jasper ave (assuming the issue of homeless camps is somehow addressed, otherwise more connectivity will only exacerbate that issue - which is directly linked to deforestation in this park). suspension bridge looks great
- » That a bike path be paved and in good condition for commuting as well as good access back up the hill.
- » Ecological management and the year- around functionality of the area.
- » sdf
- » no comment
- » Additional access and maintaining the current state of Kinnaird ravine
- » no comment
- » no comment
- » The improvements to the already developed park areas and access to the water. I also like that meadows will be planted & beach area maintained.
- » no comment
- » Restoring nature and wildlife
- » bridge

- » Nature restoration
- » connectivity
- » The walking/biking/cross-country ski trails & nature trails.
- » I support all but I hope it won't be congested with events all the time. My main hope is that the the offleash area remains. Paved and cleared.
- » Our river valley parkland is the best quality of our city, we need to accentuate it and promote its use, year round. Investing long term is critical.
- » These plans overall appear to achieve their goals.
- » Restoring/maintaining natural areas.
- » No comment
- » The river valley should be a place that everyone can enjoy, not just bikers and dog owners.
- » Like that it will be easy to use during winter
- » The new trails, the lookout areas.
- » Preventing dog and human conflict
- » xx
- » The restoration of Rat Creek, & the increased access & level of utility.
- » The enhanced trail connectivity.
- » restoration of ecology and extensive multi use trail system.
- » off-leash areas
- » Most of the areas.
- » Improvements to access while maintaining a natural environment.
- » No comment
- » Restoring the creek The improvements to connectivity to the surrounding communities.
- » The area was fairly quiet. Vehicle access was through a limited corridor. How will this expansion affect traffic for the residents? Is the city prepared for the increase in trash, the homeless, bikers not obeying by-laws, dog bylaws, etc?
- » No comment
- » better trails, more info panels, better access to the water, restoring rat creek
- » the emphasis on preserving the ecosystem
- » 1. Keeping Kinnard essentially the same. Other than maintaining the existing trail Kinnard is special and should be left. The bridge above will be a great addition. 2. Keeping the offleash is essential. I bet at this park off leash is like 60% or more of the users. im concerned about the rat creek portion where you have to leash up? is this to ensure restoration happens?
- » I like the proposed trails and that City staff listened to the strong feedback supporting the existing off leash condition in the park. I like taking the culvert out and opening up Rat Creek. I like the addition of a staircase. I like the river access development and the new (smaller footprint option) amenity building.
- » I am supportive of the design to protect ecological sensitive areas (wetlands/hoodoos).
- » I support virtually all areas of this support other than the off leash usage.
- » All areas of the plan have my support
- » I support the vast majority of the plan. I look forward in particular to the suspension bridge and daylighting of Rat Creek. Many of the amenities I could do without, but there are other users who will benefit from them.
- » I think it will be a good park space but I think that the project is being overthought. Throwing public art, heritage remembrance and buzz words like “restoring natural ecology” muddies the project.
- » i support the trails staying natural gravel that there are more access points from neighborhood surrounding I like the restoration of areas in this park as many areas are degraded and improvement of these would certainly make the park more pleasant.
- » no comment
- » It's great to encourage more use of the park and ravine. And I love the part about restoring Rat Creek!
- » I realize this is categorically in a different neighbourhood but it is adjacent and life does not always follow stated borders. There is a critical and high risk situation of pedestrians crossing 112 Avenue just west of the LRT tracks. Pedestrians prefer to just jump out in front of traffic at this location with little regard. Vehicle traffic is often delayed by the LRT and then by pedestrians who seem to ironically space apart the width of the two traffic lanes, so that once vehicle traffic is free to move, pedestrians stop traffic by crossing. There needs to be a pedestrian subway to prevent pedestrians crossing 112 Avenue at this location. It could connect under the LRT tracks to connect to this park system.
- » I like the connection to Stadium Station as this improves access from surrounding neighbourhoods like Parkdale, Eastwood, etc.
- » All of it, though I do not think motorized boats should be allowed in the river for recreational purposes.
- » I like the restoration of the creek and native grasses along with more entrances.
- » I support the reestablishment of the wetland area. It would be nice if this area also included viewing areas for wildlife.
- » no comment
- » No comment
- » no comment
- » Latta Bridge, Improvments & reclamation at waters edge, limited paved paths.
- » I like the many ways to get in and out of the park and thought to connections with public transit and other neighbourhood amenities.
- » Paths, nature, and dog off leash areas.

- » Nature and Ecology
- » No comment
- » Access from Jasper Ave, creek restoration, suspension bridge
- » no comment
- » no comment
- » I support ensuring the area doesn't lose it's natural beauty, is used by the public and is safe for users. I support the area being used as a boat launch, for festivals & picnics.
- » The connectivity of the plan with locations around and within the area.
- » There is a good variety of trails. I believe they will be well used. I am in favor of good river access for boat trailers and hand launching.
- » The plan should work.
- » It seems that for the most part, plans for the Dawson park and Kinnaird ravine are for anyone to enjoy whether it's summer or winter but areas such as Sherriff Robertson park would only be used by people living in the very immediate area. I can't see myself or anyone I know going out of their way to access a picnic area along a busy section of 82nd street.
- » no comment
- » Boat launch
- » See comment below
- » Improving existing infrastructure/amenities including play park and dock access.
- » No
- » no comment
- » Connection to stadium is a great access.
- » My major concern is do not have high tax to put on tax payers, even 1-2% increase of tax for all these projects are consider high. Thanks!
- » Pretty much everything except I am unclear as to the separation between me and the off leash dogs.
- » I like the new vehicular access location, new amenity building, boat launch, and protection/regeneration of natural plant species.
- » no comment
- » i
- » The trails will be great. I think it will bring more people into the River Valley. And washrooms, etc, will make it more user friendly.
- » Entrances, trails, water fountains, washroom, play ares, lookouts all good. Not sure about the suspension bridge but think it will be a good idea in the long run.
- » The vegetation plan is good as is the improved entrances
- » Protection of habitat
- » I support the connectedness overall (but I do not support the suspension bridge). I'm happy to see the restoration plan for Rat Creek. I strongly support the efforts to recognize the ecological sensitivity of the river's edge and to protect at least parts of it. I would support even greater efforts at protecting the river valley and ensuring it provides a contiguous green space for non-human species.
- » The restoration of natural spaces, as well as the development of Dawson park to allow all types of people to access it.
- » Low impact - natural look whenever possible - respect nature - do not overdevelop ?
- » I am all for improving access and functionality of the River Valley parks but I feel that it needs to be thoughtful and well researched to ensure that the natural current state of the park is maintained.
- » There is going to be a lot of human activity there competing with any natural restoration goals.
- » Not too bad. Think of coffee shop too.
- » Comments already given.
- » All generally!
- » no comment
- » I support the access point developments, the habitat restoration, informative/educational signage, and gravel multi-use trails.
- » aspects that maintain/protect environment and natural elements
- » no
- » no comment
- » lower environmental impact, more walking/cycling access
- » I like the mix of uses
- » Improved amenities are great but overall, the plan has too much emphasis on a utopian natural area, native vegetation and river bank trails, when in fact, Dawson Park is built on collapsing, unstable dump that is crumbling into the river and overgrown with non-native Manitoba maple and garden plants.
- » The vision is a good statement. The "natural character" within the City and close to the City Centre is an excellent focus.
- » In general the plan seems good.
- » 1. Viewpoint upper meadow - but without small interpretive structures - even the educational signage will form a base to triangulate a tarp over for a homeless camper - the illustrated structures will be a magnet for nomadic groups to camp beside making the area unsafe for children when drugs and weapons are involved which the campers keep for their own needs and security. 2. Restore John C. Hall - a beautiful historic home which is the first point of refuge in an attack in the park, and the home needs to be residential as well as museum on first floor - so a park attendant lives there for safety. 3. Dawson Park Improvements are wonderful - but the kids park needs the fence around it to keep toddlers from drowning in river if they get away, to keep dogs out, to keep coyotes out, to keep other wildlife from soiling the sandbox areas so diamond mesh type

fencing is required. 4. lookout in Sheriff Robertson Park - wonderful idea - consider diamond mesh fence hidden in trees as coyotes are seen there too.

- » No Comment
- » No comment
- » I support all aspects of the stated plan. I hope the improved suspension bridge increases access to and use of the park.
- » Please address the homeless situation along with this restoration. Please give them somewhere to go instead of into the surrounding neighborhoods.
- » Bike trails and new trails
- » no comment
- » Trail system improvements and maintenance; preservation and restoration ideas; new boat launch and improved picnic area.
- » I support the increased number of entrances to the park, especially the trail connection to Stadium Station; the entrance at Ada Blvd; and the entrance at Latta Bridge. I am in favour of the continued use of the park as an offleash dog park; and support the need to make an on-leash area around the daylighting of Rat Creek.
- » Emergency phone systems throughout the trail system. Call boxes. That work in rain, heat and winter.
- » you're doing a great job
- » all except a few new entrances, the suspension bridge i am not too fond of, don't like meadow planting as i feel like it's changing that part of the park.
- » Over all, I support the plan. It brings more active people into the park systems that I and my enjoyed for 3 generations. The more people there are, the safer we all are.
- » Better access. Multiple entrances. Renewed amenities.
- » Larger amenity building to accommodate both the dragon boat, rowing club.
- » The approach and vision are good, and welcome. I have earlier expressed some concerns that their lack of specificity provides a 'smokescreen' for planning staff to do what they like, without regard to the public in put they received. This is a potential risk, perhaps not an actual one. However, to prevent this eventuality, I'd suggest that the raw data from public hearings and engagements should be available for scrutiny should detailed planning documents emerge that appear to disregard public input, at least among select reviewers.
- » no comment
- » none
- » Balance the budget and quit raising taxes above inflation before looking for new ways to spend my money.
- » cost for return
- » I like that you claim to be trying to preserve the natural character of the park
- » Additional trail development
- » no comment

- » minimal development of trails, off leash for dogs, washroom facilities.
- » None of it. Bad research design. I won't support any of this because you have not properly consulted me w/ the bad research. It is so bad, it is annoying and frustrating. The survey/ research incompetence and the fact that you are relying on this to make decisions are both aggravating. Hire a professional firm to do your surveys for you please.
- » Rat Creek Eco area
- » The whole plan and process is flawed. Zero support and will do anything I can to stop it and have politicians and others stop it.
- » A Kinnaird trail leading to Commonwealth Stadium okay. Some kind of formalized trail or staircase below Latta Bridge okay.
- » support... Rat Creek area
- » Leave off leash as is please, it ain't broke don't fix it!
- » The public opinion should include the residence of Virginia Park and nobody in this area received notification prior to Stage 4 of the design stage about the plan. There should have been messages placed in mailboxes at stage 1. This plan needs to stop.
- » the area needs to stay nice and quiet minimal traffic
- » Enhances the parks making them more attractive as places to spend time. Good attention paid to environmental issues.
- » J
- » All
- » I like the connection to transit and the enhanced connection to the river
- » Everything the builds on or maintains the natural beauty here
- » no comment
- » Keep the river valley trail system and docking systems strong and accessible. This is the city's greatest natural asset.
- » Any restoration/additions efforts to our parks is a excellent investment. I support all, just please add more washrooms, at least 2 more. You already have one on one side of the park, add one in the middle and another on the other end. Can you also look into putting in outdoor exercise equipment so that the elderly can use it. They are big in Europe, it would be great to have them so that those that use the park in the winter as well can have access to outdoor fitness equipment.
- » Strong ecological focus, lots of natural areas to be maintained and/or restored.
- » The balance among uses appears to be well planned.
- » All of it
- » The cleaning up of the ravine. We have so much green space being used as camping for the homeless.
- » Support of restoration of natural areas and improved circulation or pathways.

- » Extending the playground Wheelchair accessible
- » I think the plan considers many important elements and addresses such a wide variety of needs. I love it!
- » Any kind of conservation and maintenance of areas that have degraded is important. I'm not sure if any of these degraded areas are because of human use or naturally because of rains etc. Whatever cause the problem, I'm glad you are working on maintaining it.
- » Nice compromise between remain a natural space and providing community amenities. Strikes a good balance. The suspension bridge is a cool idea - something new for the city park system.
- » I like what you've done so far.
- » I love your proposed trails and new, open and welcoming access points. I especially like the huge area of off leash dog trails. This is something I would make a special trip down to enjoy.
- » I think the city is moving in the right direction with these plans.
- » No comment
- » All of them.It's very comprehensive and appeals to a wide spectrum of the population
- » I think that the plan is generally well thought out, with consideration both for good through-access as well as a variety of uses within the park. The proposed ecological plan looks like a reasonable path to restoration of damaged areas.
- » I like all the ideas
- » I support all levels of this Master Plan.
- » no comment
- » The whole plan looks well thought out.
- » I like the amount and variety of trails.
- » I support all of it, but especially the reinstating of a more natural outlet for Rat Creek.
- » I love the suspension bridge idea and more access from river level to street level
- » I like the suspension bridge, play area, and natural areas.
- » I specifically really like the actions to support and upgrade the natural environment.
- » It looks great
- » Improvements at the Dawson Park/EDBRC area.
- » I really like all of it.
- » NO comment
- » It values the natural area while ensuring equitable access
- » From what I can see, I think we would frequent this park. The suspension bridge would be an interesting addition.
- » I think the plan will provide a beautiful development and recreation option for the city. I think the plan is also responsible with how we manage the balance between recreation and environmental impact.
- » very good balance to preserve/enhance the environment and natural elements, while encourage more active use.
- » All of them. Seems a very good balance
- » All of them!! THIS is the exact focus and usage I have been waiting to see for the river valley. Solid, responsible and sustainable usage and respect for this wonderful ribbon of green.
- » The plan as proposed appears to give consideration to many potential and existing users and limits the amount of manmade changes which is very important to protecting our river valley.
- » No Comment
- » I support all of the areas of the plan.
- » Edmontonians often brag about the river valley. I think the goal and the plan are consistent with what Edmontonians love about the river valley.
- » no comment
- » Access to the park and protecting sensitive vegetation are particularly important. We have a wonderful natural asset in our city that all citizens should have access to it and the river.
- » all of them. I think they provide a nice balance between restoring/preserving the natural environment and providing access and amenities for the public.
- » NO COMMENT
- » no comment
- » I love it, Great Job!
- » All areas.
- » I love the way it maintains what is already there and decreases the impact on animal life and the ecology. The way this area connects to neighborhoods increases the accessibility.
- » Suspension bridge sounds really cool. Will there be bbq pits at gathering areas and a gazebo?
- » This park and area needs some love and could be so much better than it is. This plan is great, huge steps, in the right direction. Please keep rat creek trail gravel. It's very fun to bike down to the river on. I strongly support encouraging native ecology. I want to see a balance of natural areas (with little development) and accessible areas (especially for wheelchair users)
- » I support the entire vision and concept I especially like the multi use trails and number of gathering areas
- » I support the establishment of the natural areas and focus on different native species.
- » no comment
- » Path upgrades, access upgrades”Gathering, seating and play spaces as well as the proposed suspension bridge are excellent. My “suggestions” are longer but I really do like this plan.
- » My favourite areas of the plan: - Trail extension to Stadium Station - Restored Rat Creek - Improved Latta Bridge Trail - New trail access at 78 St.
- » all of them
- » no comment

- » The location of the trails and the design of the vegetation.
- » I support everything said because if improving the park brings more people to it that is the best thing that could happen
- » No comments
- » All of it. Well thought out and provides multiple different types of amenities to support multiple park uses.
- » Connecting the park to the rest of the city
- » no comment
- » all of it
- » - extension of access to the LRT station; - increased support of winter activity - increased access to the park from the north side of the ravine
- » Better access to Dawson Park from the Enhanced Connection at Latta Bridge is long overdue.
- » Variety of uses for the green spaces
- » All areas. It is a marvelous plan!
- » All areas
- » No comment
- » Pretty much all areas except where interfering with wildlife.
- » I strongly support all aspects of the plan. This is an excellent plan.
- » I support all the new access points especially, omitting any one of them from the final construction would be a shame. Restoring Rat Creek is a great plan too, it will create a nice gathering space similar to the ravine and bridge located at the Wolf Willow ravine. This area of the park and city really needs more eyes to enhance the feeling of safety in the area, and I feel this plan will draw many new park users, especially from residents in Cromdale and Boyle street who may not use the park today. The new access points turn the park from a "Riverdale and Ada Blvd park" into a much less exclusive zone, where ALL are welcome. Of all the different river valley park plans I've seen throughout Edmonton, this one is the best.
- » I like the plan and fully support it.
- » I would like to see the area have more trails, better lighting in order to allow for more usage of the area.
- » no comment
- » No comment
- » It all sounds fantastic.
- » I love the increased access from commonwealth, the restoration of Rat Creek, and the suspension bridge.
- » Concentrate vehicular traffic in one or two principal areas, while encouraging individual foot/bike traffic throughout ? family friendly areas for year-round use
- » It is good to make the park more accessible from the areas above on the north side.
- » I like the redevelopment of pathways, off leash areas, amenities appealing to all ages and abilities. The suspension bridge from Ada Blvd. into the park is intriguing although I can't visualize how it would work. I am familiar with the area adjacent to Virginia Park but as it is now, it is difficult to imagine. Enhancements and amenities are welcomed.
- » no comment
- » The natural elements with nice cross flow of users.
- » For me, I like the protection of natural habitats. Removing the culvert and restoring rat creek is a really great idea.
- » The development and management of this parkland within the increasingly densifying area adjacent to the river will ensure future generations have sufficient parkland.
- » Naturalization/preservation/restoration of natural areas and maintenance/construction of trails.
- » All of it
- » Increases access for persons of all abilities. Ecological restoration. Trying to achieve increasing public use of the river valley.
- » No comment.
- » no comment
- » Being aware of human nature, it would be wise to have these areas under constant supervision.
- » Improved access at many points. Integrated plan for use incorporating environmental management
- » I really like the restoration of Rat Creek, restoration and protection of natural vegetation, and the enhancement of connectivity and development of features at the top of the river bank.
- » I think it looks good.
- » I'm glad you're developing this park in the city, I've biked through this section often and marvelled at the park's diversity of natural landscapes, from hoodoo like hills to grassland to a boreal forest. The suspension bridge link and improvement to the stadium station is a great idea
- » I support all the levels of the plan. It appears a lot of work went into asking the public about their thoughts. As well as the concern for the environment I can't see any part of the plan that I disagree with. I cycle from 66 St NW and 118th ave Montrose area into the River Valley. I've only known of footpaths somewhat like this in Saskatoon, and Calgary but I have to say ours has far more concentrated efforts in keeping a bike lane open. For this I am thankful! Biking has improved my health, and in the winter I look forwards to walking in the various parks.
- » Keeping all the wild and natural areas as wild and natural as possible. Some enhancement to smaller trails is ok but please do not develop them too much.
- » I think the plan is great. It infringes less on nature than some of the planning going on for parks that are further west along the river. I think there is a wonderful balance of nature and amenities in this plan.

- » I am happy to see the vision statement reflects my apprehensions will the master plan from the previous question in the survey. Finding and maintaining a balance of accessibility and restoration and conservation is exactly the kind of initiative I like to support for the community. To me, one of the best aspects of living in Edmonton is the year round access to natural areas. The maintenance and accessibility of the existing parks is excellent and I think expansion will only lead to better things.
- » I'm very happy to see that the off leash area will remain as is and that the main trail will be shared by all users.
- » In general, I think the City did a great job on this plan. I really value the focus placed connectivity to adjacent neighbourhoods (pedestrian bridge, connection to stadium station, etc.). I also appreciate that the plan takes advantage of, and enhances, some of the viewing areas. I generally use the river valley in a passive sense, so I enjoy taking in the great views and slowly walking and absorbing my surroundings.
- » I think that I support most of the plan-- my support for new construction -- ie. the new amenities building-- is not as robust- mostly because with current use of the park, that isn't needed. If the new entrances and improved access points encourage more use of the park, that might be a necessary thing. I have mixed feelings about the suspension bridge-- I can see that it improves access to the park from the community on top of the bank, and it does prevent disruption of the forest and the wild life living in the forest, but I'm not certain it is necessary as there are other good access points to the park in that area.
- » Increased access to the park and interactivity with the river are great. The suspension bridge is a welcome surprise.
- » No comments, other than it looks excellent and what is needed. The right balances appear to have been achieved.
- » Having multiple types of trails through the park- Paved, granular, natural allows multiple modes of travel through the park and varying degrees of "immersion" in nature. The suspension bridge offers a potentially convenient pedestrian and cyclist connection across the ravine.
- » #NAME?
- » The additional access points. The attention to restoring the natural landscape. The nature trails.
- » Suspension Bridge Paths both granular and paved Watershed restoration Enhancement of Sheriff Robertson play ground
- » I love it all.
- » I like that the park will be more connected and easily accessible for many different kinds of people.
- » Kinnaird Meadow grasses with interpretive signs. The trail around the outside perimeter of the entire Kinnaird Park needs to be kept open for winter dog walks. Trails look

great - the Rat Creek pond has not been mentioned and my neighbours and I have shovelled it and skated it too but if the Sheriff Robertson rink stays, I guess it's not needed. Rat Creek bridge - like - can it be lower and closer to creek bed? I like the lookout into the Ravine but it may become a homeless camp or washroom - it looks at the coal slag heap where campers have built a stone latrine. No mention is made of the off leash use of City land at Highlands Golf Club which has signs and plows the paved roads for walkers - so dogs don't go on the greens. This is a huge extension and important connection and meeting place between Dawson Dogs and Highlands dog walkers.

- » Off Leash Area Retaining the natural habitat and ecologically sensitive areas Multi use trails. Main Amenity Node and playground Suspension Bridge is a great idea The additional proposed trails.
- » I support all areas of the plan. It appears that all of the concerns have been addressed at some level in ways that consider the different users of the park.
- » I support continued off-leash area from Dawson Park heading east along river - especially continued access to paved trail for pedestrians/pet owners. My sister has young children and two dogs and needs pavement for the baby stroller.
- » New bridge crossings and daylighting Rat Creek.
- » no comment

What would increase your level of support for the plan?

- » no comment
- » Decrease the manipulation of nature.
- » no comment
- » Less building of intrusive structures in nature. NO suspension bridge. NO trail in upper Kinnaird Ravine.
- » Eliminate off-leash trail and reduce off-leash area.
- » The removal of all connector paths that cut through from one trail to the other. Trying to develop all types of growth areas instead of maintaining what is and making it something to be treasured. This is not an area in which a playground should be added. There are many parks throughout Edmonton that have playgrounds (Borden Park is very close and has a playground, swimming pool and open sports fields and more. A playground should not be added to a natural ecological area.
- » I am supportive of a more connected Edmonton, however I feel that the proposed suspension bridge is going a step too far. In Virginia Park, with our proximity to the river valley we see many people out enjoying running, walking, dog walking, etc and we also see the results of homeless camps and transient folks. I think that if the City is looking to potentially add a suspension bridge, that the city should

be sharing studies on the foreseeable traffic increases, including plans for increased monitoring and enforcement of our neighbourhood.

- » no comment
- » Even more wilderness, less development beyond what is already established there. Smaller fenced off leash area for dogs. I pay the taxes in the City-- the dogs don't.
- » Plan for enhanced security and homeless populations. Means to deal with alcohol-fueled late night noise. Understanding that people will drive to the access points and create parking problems. If the park is off limits at night then some means of ensuring that it is not used for drinking/casual sex/living.
- » Make sure bikes are courteous to dog walkers and pedestrians. I have come close to being run over several times.
- » Leave out all the new proposed access point staircases. All they do is provide a huge headache for the residents of the communities. We would love to see new wayfinding signage be put at the existing access points as few people realize there is already a wonderful trail system with direct access to the river! Leave out the suspension bridge. This too will cause undue hardship for the City as well! (accidents?)
- » i feel like the parking lot is only ever jammed on occasional long weekends and nights when the dragon boat club meets. i accept the former, but would like to see the latter provide their members with private parking outside of the Dawson parking lot...any business anywhere in the city would be expected to do so. i feel the rat creek restoration project will create a lot of conflict, and potentially waste a lot of money if invasives are not first taken care of. off-leash dog folks' primary access to water is just east of rat creek, and now there will be an expectation to leash up, then unleash 50m later - presumably because there is some concern that dogs will prevent restoration efforts from succeeding? that seems a bizarre conclusion - as they are not high impact conveyances like horses, bikes - which presumably will be allowed to roll right through the rat creek restoration area. i see nothing to address the greatest danger i experience in using this park - speeding bikes, which have twice collided with my family members. i'd like to see bike traffic redirected around some of this park - perhaps on the upper bank where they can join vehicles moving just as fast. i would also like to see more receptacles for garbage and more dispensers of dog bags along the trails to promote a cleaner park I'm not certain that the nature trail will draw the audience that is being expected, and i can see significant conflict arising as many dog walkers and mountain bikers use those hillsides frequently.
- » Is the boat launch in a location where the current of the river tends to be slower and calmer? It seems like it is on the faster side. There are no provisions for the homeless and

low-income populations who use the park. The surrounding neighbourhoods have lots of recent immigrants who do not have positive associations with natural and wooded areas. What is being done to encourage them to visit and appreciate the area as we have come to learn to love nature?

- » Addition of washrooms adjacent to all gathering spaces to allow for accessibility for all user groups.
- » basd
- » We do not need anymore playgrounds in the city. There are plenty of wonderful things for children to do in this area without building a formal playground with swings and slides.
- » More work on avoiding user conflict between the off-leash dog park and multi-use trail users, particularly cyclists, is needed.
- » Better off leash areas.
- » no comment
- » Somehow you have to mitigate the impact of bringing more people into the park, which will undoubtedly have a negative impact on the forested/natural spaces.
- » Increase the access
- » More thought for animals and nature instead of building more things for the humanity. Save the planet!
- » increase off leash area.
- » The footprint didn't increase so much.
- » Keeping formal play spaces out and keeping it as low key as possible. Allowing off leash on all or the majority of paved and unpaved trails (THIS is what mitigates conflict--don't make all the dogs hang out in the same place and on the same trails.)
- » 1. Get rid of the off-leash area! People don't want to be frightened by snarling and ill-behaved dogs while taking a walk through the park!
- » Make off leash the priority. Post signs for cyclists to yield and slow down.
- » A long term budget for guaranteed maintenance.
- » More playground space for children would be an asset
- » I have some concerns about off-leash re: disturbing wildlife.
- » No comment?
- » Restrict dogs and bikes. I race cars and pay my own way. Why do bikers think they should be better than everyone else. If they want to ride let them pay. Why not have pay for use dog parks, there is already pay for pay parks for our kids!
- » Lockers or place for putting your stuff while using the trail for pedestrians
- » Less playgrounds developed. Children can play and learn on the trails and meadows, they don't need artificial play areas.
- » More vegetation clearing to alleviate the mosquito situation
- » xx

- » Less emphasis on a romanticized “natural” state of the river valley ? it's been used by people for thousands of years ? & more on utility.
- » Still not sure if the suspension bridge is necessary.
- » If it worked and doesn't get scaled back.
- » more picnic areas
- » I think you would need another major interesting playground area near ground zero to entice the kids to want to come back.
- » Simplify! These maps seem to have too many objectives to achieve. Is it all affordable?
- » additional protection of single track/ natural trails.
- » I'm uncertain about the number of trails and if they will preserve much of the natural spaces. It's hard to visualize the scale of how far apart these trails are and how they will interact with natural spaces.
- » ?
- » A closer look and better understanding of the plan
- » specific plan to deal with the large number of homeless people who live the park in the trees and throw garbage everywhere.
- » reduce the number of paths/roads. it looks like a bowl of spaghetti
- » Somehow to not have to leash up dogs around rat creek - i understand restoration is sensitive but most people are not going to do this so the city should come up with a plan to try and protect the restoration while allowing dogs off leash.
- » The homeless camps in the area are significant and I would like to know that significant resources are tied to the project to address this not only by having an office space for staff and rangers but also by more rangers on the trail system.
- » No Comment
- » No, or very limited off leash areas. What about an off leash, enclosed agility space instead? Please. Off leash areas are not a positive experience for many people.
- » Nothing that i can think of
- » Remove the off-leash dog areas. Off leash dogs are a menace to the natural areas and to the wild species that occupy the park. Furthermore, they are a menace to other park users. There is no amount of signage or regulation that will prevent their use of the whole park as an off leash area. The only reasonable move if naturalization is in fact a goal, is to exclude off leash dogs entirely, and enforce that ban with dramatically increased presence of bylaw patrols.
- » Focus on what the purpose of the park is. Getting people out to experience nature. Public art and heritage remembrance distracts from that. Just focus on providing opportunities to enjoy nature without buzz words or unnecessary add ons..
- » Keeping things cost effective and not building too much infrastructure that future maintenance costs would onerous. Having some definite policy about protection of the ecological(environmentally) sensitive areas in perpetuity and that they would not be 'eroded'just because there is public pressure for more recreation or amenities. Once the ecological areas are gone then the River Valley will not have the things everyone wants and enjoys
- » no comment
- » Better bus access and bus parking.
- » No further comment
- » Removal of the Suspension Bridge and Rat Creek Gathering Area.
- » only allow water access for canoes, kayaks, etc.
- » More entrances. I am not sure how that suspension bridge would work in that area.
- » No Comment
- » no comment
- » No comment
- » no comment
- » Need some convincing on the suspension bridge still. It seems like a component that is very intriguing yet will change the character of both Kinnard ravine and park, and I'm not sure if these will be the best changes. It is likely a positive thing but is a bit of a worry. Perhaps it is the alignment on the park side that I worry about. Could it connect further west to connect into an edge of the park rather than the middle? This would leave the park feeling like more of a spur, which I appreciate.
- » I would want to be certain there are ways to ensure that random camping and drug use are managed. I have participated in the clean-ups in this area and collected a lot of sharps in the past. A strategy to limit litter build up and increase visibility in the park area would help to reduce this presence, and hopefully guide vulnerable people towards services to help them. Secondly, I am uncertain from what I've seen here as to how accessible this part of the river valley will be to persons with disabilities. Please consider more ramps and fewer stairs where it is practical to do so.
- » Restriction of cyclists along dog off leash areas. Cyclists present a clear and present danger to pedestrians and dogs.
- » Nature and Ecology
- » No comment
- » Move the suspension bridge west to decrease impact on Kinnaird Park, keep the park natural as it is
- » no comment
- » no comment
- » More information on how the City will ensure the area is safe for use at night in the winter and how the city will enforce/manage conflicts in the area. People have houses nearby and they should not be “overrun” by users.
- » KNowing how much this will cost.
- » No community partnerships.
- » Perhaps more parking would help.

- » Concentrate more on areas that will be used by the majority of the people, in this case, the pathways and amenities of Dawson and Kinnaird parks
- » no comment
- » Watercraft rentals
- » Ensure Vehicle traffic is not impacted over the Dawson Creek bridge. Hence having access from the Kinnaird Ravine is important. Also have washrooms available through out the park system as not all folks have the stamina to walk the full set of trails. consider the elderly and very young children.
- » Spray park; better lines of sight to river and festival infrastructure; increased lighting at night; enhanced parking in proximity.
- » No
- » no comment
- » More toilet facilities.
- » If doesn't increase tax for tax payers, then I would be more support on this.
- » More separation between me riding my bike and off leash dogs. Is there anything to prevent a large headed creature with big teeth from running at me as I ride the trail?
- » Parking lot still isn't big enough for the number of recreational users, dog walkers, paddlers who use the park in summer. At least you've factored in expansion, but why not just expand it now.
- » I would have to be significantly younger.
- » u
- » More lights. Security?
- » I think there should be fewer off leash areas for dogs. Off leash dogs deposit things we don't want and owners don't even know to pick it up. Hard to keep things natural with dogs doing what they want everywhere.
- » Improve use for winter
- » Do not allow off leash along the multi-use trail.
- » Greater environmental protection. As little development as possible while meeting the other goals for the project. Some explicit discussion about what effects the park may have on Edmonton's transient and homeless populations, who have historically depended on river valley parks for shelter. Where will people who are displaced by this development go?
- » A detailing of how to naturally connect Dawson park to other surrounding parks, such as Rosedale. Detailing and constructing a separated paved path along Rowland Road and up the hill to Rosedale Park would be ideal.
- » Invasive species watches Natural Herbalist involvement Regular Volunteer assessments How about policing issues - will there be bicycle/foot patrols ? Would like to know more about how the dogs will be kept in the right areas - and that they'll be on leashes and undercontrol in all areas How many people can be there at one time ?
- » What I see currently is the parks and ravines where there is garbage and waste dumped and not being cleaned up. There needs to be focus on what is already there before we try to develop outward.
- » Prioritize restoration over recreation.
- » Some indoor facilities
- » Dedicated trails
- » Know greater specifics for how dog walkers and Mtn Bikers are to be included, monitored, and generally required to protect the environment in their use.
- » no comment
- » Less concrete used in picnic/playground areas, as well as a simpler, less-is-more approach to these areas. I'm fully opposed to the parking lot expansion, Edmonton has too many parking lots as it is, and people should be encouraged more to use active transportation to and from the river valley.
- » not sure of the necessity of the boat launch
- » no
- » no comment
- » less driving access
- » Declaration that single track trails would be a part of plans.
- » The plan needs more realistic design for high speed, safe commuter bikeways; a range of trail difficulty and uses; more staging area for boats and multiple buses, trailers; a wide main road entrance for turning large vehicles and trailers; accommodation for angler access; and accommodation for random, seasonal, low flow gravel bar riverbank access.
- » Stronger links to the community in the Vision Statement.
- » The suspension bridge seems unnecessary and expensive. I would favour a reduction in the amount of off-leash space. It's getting hard to go for a walk in the park without being run into (physically) by an off-leash dog not being controlled by its entitled owner.
- » 1. Steps to the permanent stone beach at the Gathering Place, and a public washroom there in Phase 1. 2. Defer the vertical steps to 78 Street and the suspension bridge until Homelessness is resolved somewhat for the campers on the hillside. Add security lighting to key junctions on the trails so a small female can see who is lurking just around the corner of the junction. 3. Commit to restore John C Hall and take demolition off the table. Many older homes have been restored in the Viewpoint area for under \$200,000. Why throw history away!
- » No Comment
- » No comment
- » This does not incorporate all aspects needed to encourage visitors to the park region.
- » Guaranteeing that the off leash areas will not change.
- » no play ground increases
- » No off leash areas.

- » Segregate or remove the offleash park component.
- » Since the current most frequent users of the park are people who walk with their dogs, it would be helpful if there were improved clarity and specificity about the transition between the proposed Dawson Park Playground and the offleash dog trail around the playground. There is small text on one image on one slide indicating that a fence will separate the two areas from one another, and improved clarity would be appreciated.
- » Increase the # of call boxes. Increase parking access to trail system.. Many small parking areas . for city residents to stop and exit to use park. More Benches to have lunches on .
- » keep up the good work
- » turning the kinnaird into a destination area isn't best for the area. it is wild and natural for the most part and more traffic will wreck that aspect. take out the flashy parts and stick to the reclamation (though i don't like the meadow planting) and restoration of the creek etc.
- » Dealing with the homeless. Making it easier for them to find housing so that they don't have to camp in our valley. Discourage the one quarter of them that want to live outside the law, and live off of us.
- » More paved bike trails.
- » No comment
- » See my comment above. It is a good high-level view, but the 'devil is in the details', and this is where the public needs review capability to ensure the process has not been hijacked.
- » lessen the spectrum of the plans.
- » include costs and tell me where the money will come from to pay for the grandios developement. maintenance and upkeep, security,
- » Balance the budget and quit raising taxes above inflation before looking for new ways to spend my money.
- » Not everyone can use it we would like to use it, but we need to drive and park as mobility is an issue. At lease a small paring lot is required.
- » Please stop paving the river valley parks. You are putting in a bunch of new amenities that will further deteriorate the natural character of the river valley
- » Additional viewpoints of valley and greater interaction with river
- » no comment
- » Reduce the amenities. Good idea for docks and access point for non motorized water craft- canoes, rowboats, kayaks. As I stated before, no playgrounds. Lots of benches and picnic tables throughout, not in just an area designated "picnic area" Lots of refuse containers and recycling bins. And adequate toilet/sanitary facilities to stop parks from becoming public toilets.
- » I do not support any of this plan because you are asking survey respondents to answer questions that cram multiple decisions into 3 scale questions. This is not consultation... it's doing a survey to see if you might get some positive feedback. You look like you are doing consultation when all you are doing is checking off a box. This is even crappier engagement than doing no survey at all. Don't bother if you aren't going to do it properly. This space needs proper development... it is often smelly (sewer), it lacks any interesting infrastructure, it is relatively unattractive to families wanting to visit for the day, and it is unconnected w/ the rest of the city making it not much more than a stinky, hidden jogging/ dog walking trail. As a man, I wouldn't even think of going here at night. Probably full of homeless people and drug addicts hiding in the trees on the hill slopes.
- » Off leash in current form add more fire pits and tables in current area deal with the homeless issue and weekend parties in the parking lot before you spend a penny ... make it safe! That is why it has a low user base. If a boat launch .. make it accessible by truck to unload. how many non motorized boats do you see in this area in the summer? almost o. Why .. current and the fact that the river only flows one way ... check out BV Dog park ...
- » Stop. Give us an honest baseline and rational. Start with real consultation that gets at peoples interests and level of commitment. And really I am a city booster. I am in Dawson daily and clean up almost every other day. I do tree planting. I do river clean ups regularly. I love this park and I am a positive person.. AND I am positive I have no support for this plan.
- » Putting environmental sensitivity higher on the list of priorities (instead of at the bottom). Proposing a suspension bridge that would cut a swath through a known bird habitat indicates a lack of regard for the park's natural features; playground unnecessary for this park. Access points overdone (almost as if planners are hearing too loudly the message that the public can't get to the valley, when truth be known the valley has millions of users every year). As Aldo Leopold said, "Recreational development is a job not of building roads into a lovely country, but of building receptivity into the human mind."
- » No need to spend millions on something that is a nice change in the valley area ... just raw mother nature and a Great weekend area for families.... fire stands and picnic tables This project is nothing then a " make work project" out of control. A class project at NAIT would deliver better recommendations. I have attended all presentations and have followed this project closely. Talking to the city workers at presentation you realize they have spent little time at the site and made a lot of "assumptions". Heck,

they did not even post notice of public meetings AT THE PARK. Then I heard the price tag .. \$24 million! then the city employee said "it has a 50% contingency built in" If anyone in the private sector submitted a project with that variance he or she would be fired. A boat dock where only a group of the fittest of people could carry a boat from the parking lot really? do you expect increase boat action? This is a tax payer spend because we have funds .. a complete waste just like what is taking place at Borden Park. This is not "putting lipstick on a pig" ... this project is 'lipstick on the Mother Nature" and it is not required and out of touch. Get a private landscaping company for tenders ... this is a city department gone wrong.

- » Leave the off leash areas as they are
- » As a Virginia Park residence, I will not support this plan. This plan did not provide proper information to residences of the area affected. The plan should have been named Virginia Park since the entrance to the bridge will be in Virginia Park. I do not and will not ever support this plan.
- » no comment
- » No comment
- » N
- » Nothing
- » don't know
- » no comment
- » no comment
- » If I lived closer.
- » nothing else, i think we would have to make this happen and then see what if anything is needed.
- » Improving the connections along Wayne Gretzky Drive for cyclists (too many stairs). Not sure the off-leash dog areas are compatible with other uses.
- » Being well informed of the amenities.
- » No Comment
- » Not to much, I'm for this
- » Ensure signage is clear. This area is often utilized by the homeless. What strategies are in place to monitor this situation to ensure safety of all?
- » no comment
- » n/a
- » I don't use the paved pathway, I belong to a hiking club and we visit the park probably about 10 times per year, will you begin walking on the pavement but then we soon move over to the dirt trail. We do walk up the Kinnard ravine and back. The more enveloped by nature that we can be, the better.
- » Not sure..
- » Humanely relocating the homeless that reside in the river valley during the summer.
- » Not sure my support could get any stronger. I think this is a terrific addition to our river valley and our city.

- » I am completely behind this, there is no need to increase my level of support.
- » No comment
- » Can't think of anything.
- » Minimal parking. The absolute last thing that any park needs is more parking.
- » I feel very positive already
- » I believe the initiatives are all covered.
- » no comment
- » Enforcement! These places get built up, and then forgotten about. The off-leash area needs REAL enforcement!
- » -
- » can't think of anything
- » I think the proposed design is fantastic
- » more natural area.
- » I would add a First Nations component and also indicate how to access the Park by Public Transit.
- » faster access to river crossing bridges away from traffic on the north sides.
- » Some form of partnership with the EDBRC
- » My only concern is if the City has the resources to maintain it and get rid of noxious weeds.
- » No comment
- » Unsure
- » no comment
- » Keeping it both effective and economical. While I like the plan, I am extremely concerned with the spending levels and debt levels of the city. I love having nice things, but I'm not willing to sacrifice the future for something we possibly can't afford.
- » we need more commercial amenities in the river valley - riverwalk, cafes and restaurants. These can be developed in appropriate amenity nodes. Right now too much disconnect and lack of amenities which widen usage and expand how we use our river valley
- » minimize tax expenditure
- » You are bang on from my perspective
- » nothing
- » No Comment
- » I completely support the plan.
- » What are the options on managing invasive plant species? Can you train the goats to eat them? I think goats eating invasive species would be awesome for the city.
- » no comment
- » Nothing, I fully support it. Keep picnic spots for those of us with dogs!
- » n/a
- » NO COMMENT
- » no comment
- » Maintain current pedestrian entrances to the park, in addition to adding the new ones. Maintain current vehicle entrance.
- » No comment

- » Information posts on the trails containing park, animal and fauna information.
- » If you put some ---- art work up like those silver balls I will be so pissed off. I would definitely like to see some maps and maybe distances to other parks
- » no comment
- » if the park area is more interactive for kids - smaller activity areas at the gathering places not huge play structures things that are in keeping with the area that will entertain and educate. bike and walking paths that are graded for difficulty
- » Nothing, this looks great. Make it bigger!
- » no comment
- » "Gathering areas" and viewpoints are most special when there is a sense of discovery, less infrastructure leads to increased ownership. Gathering areas could be less intensive, less expensive. The replacement building should be a lower priority, as the new facility will offer much the same amenity as the existing admittedly worn building. Portions of the plan that offer new value should be completed first. -It would be outside of scope and way outside of the budget, but a high-level pedestrian bridge connecting a cross the river valley would be so wonderful. -With so many improved connection it may seem like being petty, but it's too bad that the connection from the top to the bottom of the park alongside Wayne Gretzky Drive was not considered, along with the connection from the bridge sidewalk.
- » -Amenities for river swimming. -Ensuring the bathrooms are open all year and in the evenings (unlike the beautiful but often closed bathrooms in Borden Park). -Improved wayfinding signs to know where trails go and if they're accessible to wheelchairs and
- » no comment
- » no comment
- » Additional parking lot at the east end. Some benches along the riverside trail.
- » I'm not sure what would increase my support because I already strongly agree to making our parks the best they can be
- » Access to washrooms
- » nothing! This looks fantastic
- » Nothing - I strongly support this park
- » more unpaved bike trails
- » nothing
- » - I'm not a huge fan of off leash areas in places where bike trails are used. But I've ridden through this park many times and never had a problem. I think that is because there is not high traffic of off leash dogs. That's probably because it's not well
- » Asphalt bike trail at Latta Bridge would improve access to the East Side of Downtown from the river valley.
- » Greater use in winter
- » As a canoeist, I would like to see more access points for launching. The proposed restored Rat Creek and Gathering Area would be an ideal spot for a modest small boat/canoe dock/launch.
- » Already a strong supporter
- » No comment
- » Don't like the idea of walking unleashed dogs.
- » I fully support all aspects of the plan, already.
- » I support the plan almost entirely, except I would prefer any dog off-leash area be completely separated from the multi-use trail.
- » No comment
- » Nothing, keep up the good work!
- » no comment
- » No comment
- » No comment
- » Reduce the amount of off leash dog areas. This park can be a very unpleasant walk when you have to remain vigilant for people's ill behaved dogs
- » More trails and lookouts
- » No comment
- » I would like to see an interpretive area re: coal mining in the area if possible.
- » no comment
- » no comment
- » I can't think of anything. It is well thought out. Thank you to the planners who have worked on it.
- » Some indication of cost and source of monies needed to bring this plan to fruition would be helpful.
- » Viewing platforms along the riverside trail would be nice.
- » You have me
- » Expansion of off-leash areas.
- » Removal of off-leash dog area and trail will increase my level of support.
- » no comment
- » This plan fails beyond my life expectancy. May the next generation be in full support of this great plan!
- » still better consideration for access from and link to Stadium station.
- » no thoughts here.
- » I have raised my concerns in the previous fields.
- » My level of support is strong, However the city has just recently been found to NOT have maintained their current trails and that's irresponsible. It takes little maintenance cost to ensure that the trails lasts for generations. The small yearly costs will always be a better use of money than paying for the repairs years after neglect.
- » I support it

- » The suspension bridge sounds exciting. In the past years, having run at least two trail races each year, I have noticed numerous piles of debris from individuals camping out in Dawson Park, along the upper trails. If people are to be encouraged to use this park more, there will be a need to clean up the park and patrol it regularly. With all the encampments visible a lot of people will not feel safe using the smaller trails.
- » I think this plan is great the way it is.
- » I think this is an excellent plan but if anything could be improved for me it would be expanding the conversation around the conservation and restoration of the area. It sounds like the city will be doing its part to restore and maintain the area, but without the public's involvement, appreciation for the area, and adherence to the plan, it could all be for not. A program that helps spread the importance of the restoration and conservation aspects of the park would ensure future generations can enjoy what is being built. I think something as simple as increased signage or advertising would help.
- » N/a
- » I'm not sure that a new building would add much value to the Dawson Park area. The current one doesn't really seem to get much use as it is. Also, if the proposed enhancements to connectivity were to be removed, I would not be as supportive of this plan.
- » a step-wise approach to implementing it. Start with improving access points-- if that does increase use of the park, then consider building a new amenities building, etc.
- » More off leash area
- » No comment
- » Will the suspension bridge be bicycle friendly? Could be a safe connection for cyclists traveling between Jasper Ave and Ada blvd.
- » #NAME?
- » No comment
- » I am concerned about the connection to Stadium station in terms of River Vally Camping. Apparently LRT McDonalds and Bottle Depot create ideal conditions for Camping.
- » Please make the existing granular trail off leash. Love it.
- » As a female who most often uses the park to walk my dog in the evenings. I am somewhat concerned about safety. I know that the city is trying to battle its homelessness problem. This particular park is often a hub for the homeless - tents and needles are too often found off the main trail; easy access to stadium station is most likely to exacerbate this problem. Housing for the homeless and safe injection sites will help deal with this issue. But maybe having some surveillance within the park can help the overall feeling of safety.
- » Canard small interpretive structures will have tarps on them and be used by campers as windbreaks and shelters - don't encourage transient campers in Kinnaird Park. Don't build the stairs to 78 St. - it will increase crime! Build heavy stone stairs at the note "Leash up zone" on 5B dwg. down about 8' on the steep part of the bank to the BEACH. Provide a Parks gate at the western tip of Highlands Golf Club for winter access for off leash dog walkers - and lock it every Spring. Clearly homelessness needs to be resolved more for everyone to feel safer in the park.
- » Overall I think teh plan is great. It retains all of the positive features and uses of the area overall and introduces new features that will draw more people to use it.The only other addition to thew park would be to provide an additional public washroom along the trail system. I really appreciate this off leash dog area so close to downtown. It is very well used and really brings together a number of communities. Overall Well Done!
- » No comment.
- » none
- » Reassurance that it won't raise taxes.
- » Parking for those who can't walk far i.e. pensioners
- » I am a frequent user of Dawson (dog) Park and today was the first I have heard about any changes. I'm not clear on what efforts were made to consult with users of the park, but feel they were obviously insufficient.

Emails

External stakeholders and members of the public wrote emails to the City regarding ideas and concerns for the Dawson Park and Kinnaird Ravine Master Plan during Phase 4 of engagement. The following is a summary of the topics of discussion in these emails.

- » Email from a community member regarding the following topics: project process, level of proposed development, environmental priorities, engagement sessions and considerations for addressing homelessness in Edmonton.
- » Email from a community member regarding the following topics: naturalization between the multi-use trail and the Braille trail as an impediment to pedestrian movement, simplifying lookouts, the desire for nature play instead of a playground, invasive species, reducing access points, the Dragon Boat facility, shoreline clean-up, the overarching vision and wildlife research.
- » Email from a community member regarding access to the sandy shoreline in Dawson Park.

