ABOVE THE AIRPORT TRAIL NETWORK PLAN
Resident/Trail User Survey Results: Comments

3. On a scale from 1 to 5, please indicate your agreement with the Task Force's criteria for selecting the trails that are included in the draft City of Whitehorse trail network for the "Above the Airport" area:

Seem good – as long as "common sense" is factored in
It appears that there has been balance applied to the setting of these criteria
Seems kind of academic – what's the point
Facilitate commuting and provide rec should be top priorities
Missing: the "out-and-away" concept for motorized trails, take ORVs out of local green spaces, as these noisy machines can be heard for several km around
I can say I feel it is good use of municipal spending money. The trails are already there why spend money maintaining them
We need a safer alternative to walking/biking beside the Alaska Highway or a very muddy ditch
Except for use of Hamilton Boulevard trail as MMU trail
I see no need for any motorized use of trails in this area. The notion that allowing unlimited motorized use on certain trails is necessary to enable the elderly and persons with disabilities to gain access to the outdoors is absurd: I use the trails in the Ice Lake/Paddy's Pond area almost every day, and I can assure you that few if any of the people I see on motorcycles, ATVs and snowmobiles (and on one occasion, in a truck!) are in either of those categories. Practically always, they're able-bodied boys and young men. With hundreds of thousands of square kilometres of public land outside the city on which to run their noisy, polluting and dangerous toys, they hardly need to be tearing up the land in this one urban oasis.
Eight general criteria are useful while the others are less so.
non motorized....does this mean all these trails are accessible to bicycles on one hand I don't mind on the other I and others have had unpleasant experiences as walkers. When we are on bikes we need to call out on blind turns, before we are on top of walkers on the straight and some sort of speed limit....walkers don't always see or hear cyclists approaching and should not need to scramble out of way always and depending on abilities may not be able. commuting important but paved commuter trails being built and our wild spaces should not see commuting trails as a priority.
I find the plan very difficult to understand as presented, however I do not think we need motorized access to our community walking trails and our fragile areas, and I think there's an assumption that motorized access has some right to exist, when in reality it tends to destroy the very things that people who live in our neighborhood want the trails for (peaceful access for walking etc)
This document is not too people friendly! I have a bit of difficulty understanding what exactly do you want me to agree on this big chart. Been a resident for 30 years in Whitehorse of which 15 in Valleyview. Sorry - would like to agree on something but does not know on what?
Why is it that we always assume that recreational motor vehicles must be allowed in such areas? They are having a negative impact on walking trails in the area.
I primarily use the trails to commute to work (and to access various bus stops) so would like it to be a higher priority!
Sorry, it's too confusing and there isn't enough information provided for a quick understanding required to complete a survey

I strongly disagree with the principle "as many trails as possible MMU". With the exception of certain physically disabled persons (who may not be able to enjoy motorized use in any case), everyone can enjoy non-motorized use without disturbing others. In contrast, motorized use disturbs the enjoyment of the trails by all non-motorized users and does so in various ways: e.g., noise, air pollution, creation of large ruts and erosion (dangers + environmental damage). As well, motorized use tends to disrupt the natural environment and wildlife far more than does non-motorized use. The trail policy/principles should reflect this reality by favouring non-motorized use throughout and limiting motorized use to existing wide hard packed trails.

I can't really follow the map to see what is being proposed for change.

I have some concerns with the criteria used, primarily from the standpoint of winter snowmobile use. My feeling is that summer/winter motorized use was very often put in the same category and put under the same criteria, when the actual uses/risks/factors are not the same. Several of these factors include:
Use of trails in Environmentally sensitive areas: several criteria are put in place to avoid trail uses near wetlands, to use durable surfaces, good drainage, to limit erosion, etc. By the nature of winter and frozen conditions, snowmobiles do VERY little damage to the ground beneath them, and this is the whole concept behind winter trail accesses to mining, etc. For this reason, I really don't believe that these criteria should have weighed so heavily for snowmobile use, especially since by losing trails through ESA's for MMU, we will be losing the ability to travel through large travel corridors. My main concern is the Paddy's Pond area.
I consider a solid example to be the fact that I have never seen erosion or other types of environmental damage in that area due to snowmobiles (I have lived there for six years), however, I see MUCH MORE damages and erosion from non motorized users in summer such as the youth with bikes who are transforming trails in the Granger/Hillcrest areas into little play parks with shovels (building jumps and ramps). Following rain events, there is considerable erosion going on in these areas, mud and sand flowing towards Paddy's Pond, etc.
I do understand that in summer, protection of ESA's are important, however winter access to sensitive areas has a proven track record of being environmentally safe.
Proximity to homes: several criteria were used (e.g social sustainability) that try to keep trailheads away from residential areas in order to keep motorized users away from homes. I can understand the concept, however as a snowmobiler I am allowed to take the most direct route to a trailhead according to the bylaw, which puts me on the street right in front of many peoples homes. Where I live in Granger, this means that instead of just entering a nearby trailhead and vanishing from sight (and sound, somewhat) into the woods, I will be riding down the street in front of many, many homes to get the next available trailhead, thereby potentially disturbing those homeowners. When you add the scratching of carbide runners down the asphalt in shoulder seasons, it can get quite annoying to locals I'm sure.
Fostering Co-use - several of the criteria talk about having trails large enough for co-use and fostering this co-use. One important factor, from the perspective of snowmobiles, that I feel was missed is that I think if you asked the majority of people out there, they would rather walk, walk their dogs, or ski on a trail that was packed or groomed by a snowmobile. In my area and elsewhere you can clearly see that trails where snowmobiles drive occasionally are nice and wide, with a flatter surface that allow people to walk side by side and more socially. In smaller (single track areas) where snowmobiles don't travel, the trails are often not much more than 30 cm wide (packed by people's feet), are uneven, and I would argue more dangerous from the perspective of the potential for injuries.
I think you will see many people suddenly missing the quality of trails that they used to have if snowmobile use is removed from many of these trails. I have even had some interesting encounters with local residents who stop me when I'm on my snowmobile and complain, but after a nice conversation with them, they admit that they like having the trails packed by snowmobiles, and that it's a few "bad apples" that they're upset with for speeding or being reckless. This really turns a negative into a positive. I'm upset with those same bad apples, too, and I'm a snowmobile user!
Some of us go further than this by going out to drag a pallet, tire, or something like that to improve the quality for all even more. If these trails are designated non-motorized, we wouldn't be able to improve the quality of those trails.

The criteria are generally suitable for selecting City trails, but the table could be organized in a less confusing way such that ground level criteria are shown separate from the network basis criteria. There should be a distinction between general motorized and snowmobile use incorporated into the criteria since snowmobiles do not cause environmental damage to sensitive areas (when used properly) and they are useful for establishing and maintaining a good trail surface through snow.
I rated this question as somewhat agree because to be frank, I did not find your chart very easy to understand. How do general criteria relate to criteria concerning sustainability, inclusion, diversion and accessibility? How will the primary versus secondary principles be used? What's the weighting? ground versus network isn't at all clear. I think you might have sacrificed clarity for conciseness. Not good if you want an informed public to provide informed comment!
trails should all be accessible for everybody motorised and non motorized groups ...the problem here is to respect each other...I've seen it I have been riding trails for the past 12 years...good luck with enforcing new rules...
- very much support keeping single track trails single track and separating motorized and non-motorized use. will require much physical blockades, human bylaw trail presence and good signage for motorized users so they also know where they CAN go and how
Non-motorized trails users need protection from motorized vehicle trails users. This is because a lot of non-motorized trail users have infants and small children with them.
R&D and Blair witch are suitable single track for MMU dirt bike use
Should be determined on a trail-by-trail basis
Respondent profile: consider including us in the Downtown area who use these trails frequently for visiting and commuting

4. On a scale of 1 to 5, how supportive are you of the proposed non-motorized network for the ATA area?

As a snowmobiler like free multi use access but willing to give
Residents in the south end of Copper Ridge (Winze Place) can't get to the trails without driving all the way through the subdivision – should be a double track trail that can be used for this
Some changes to allow "most direct route" access to motorized trails that already exist
Looks good, looks adequate, no issues
Whitehorse has many responsible users – families and groups whose use of a limited number of trails should be allowed
Trail around the airport should be motorized at least the non-paved section
Again so long as it does not become a spending game. Tourism awareness is not viable goal. A local should get to know the trails and there is not rationale for aesthetics
ATV, mtn bikes and snow machines always have used the airport and always will
Hamilton Boulevard should be NM unless individuals have valid mobility issue use of large motorized vehicles on this paved trail with NM users is dangerous
Allowing residents to access these motorized routes on snowmobiles is important while still allowing some areas to be left snowmobile free.
the proposed park ..paddy's pond etc where is the planning before "city" trails are established...what is a park in this instance.... some trails so long are not available for shorter loop walks ....limited time especially west of Hamilton Blvd I went to one meeting but it really didn't allow me a understanding of plan. I have been forced to provide an answer. I object I am not prepared to answer these questions
a motorized multi-use trail is a motorized trail.
Why is there a motorized trail through a proposed park? Any motorized traffic should around parks.

Would like to see more connectivity with trails network to downtown and hospital and doesn't really like the multi-use trail designation by the Canada Games Centre. I walk between my house and the CGC every night and have often been forced to jump in the snow bank due to snowmobile that ride too fast at night. No fun and dangerous.
Whatever happened to the OCP's proposed park (190ha) for Paddy's Pond/Ice Lake Park? Should we not complete a management plan first before making decisions about trails (especially motorized trails)? Are "proposed non-motorized trails" on the map really non-motorized? I am hearing that that there are few truly non-motorized trails in Whitehorse as snowmobiles are permitted on such trails. How can we call a trail "non-motorized" if snowmobiles are allowed?
Although it doesn't impact me personally, I wonder how appropriate the proposed MMU Lobird cutline trail would be adjacent to that subdivision.
See comments above. I have encountered and seen evidence of extremely disruptive motorized use (summer and winter) in the Paddy's Pond area: e.g., high decibel racing snowmobiles tearing around and almost running down me and my dog; dirt bikes and ATVs destroying trails - making boggy areas impassible, creating dangerous ruts, and eroding side trails; both ATVs and snowmobiles crashing through the bush along single track and destroying vegetation/habitat. This despite the obvious sign at the Thompson Rd entrance saying "No Motorized Vehicles" - they just drive right under it. PLEASE PLEASE adopt rules that protect this precious wilderness space and reflect the desire of the vast majority of users of this, and don't cow tow to a small group of motorized recreationalists who want to impose their desire for high octane recreation on everyone else including the local wildlife.
I have a lung condition that makes it very important I get out and exercise. The trails are softer than the sidewalks and provide an excellent opportunity to do this. However, there is nothing worse than walking along peaceably and being forced into the soft snow on the side due to snowmobiles using the trails. In addition, the heavy smell of gasoline is an environmental irritant that makes it impossible for me to remain outdoors. Get the automated machines off the walking trails and somewhere where they do not interfere with other users.
some of the non motorized trail have been use by motorized vehicle for a long time and there should a bit more trail that allow motorized activity. especially away from housing i.e. quickie, midnight run....these are all use by dirt bike as well as mtn bike and should be included
I believe that the proposed plan from the perspective of snowmobiles is very lacking. Building from my arguments on the criteria, I believe there are numerous trails that should be added for snowmobile use only. These additions will help to keep people off the streets, will allow easier access to areas outside of the core areas, and will help to keep the trails in better shape for all users. In the Granger area, this should include the Wetlands West and East Trails, Hillcrest Trail, Bower, and several others that are not specifically named on the map (I would really like the opportunity to point some of these out to the City on a map since they have no names). From the summer use perspective, I believe the ATA proposal is reasonable.
I am not supportive of the non-motorized network shown in this map because it doesn't provide enough access to/from residential areas for motorized users and doesn't account for the differences between snowmobiles and other motorized vehicles in relation to sensitive areas (perhaps this is captured in the new snowmobile bylaw, I'm not sure).
non-motorized should not ban motorized from the trails they already use or limit access to areas that they have been
recreation vehicles are going to access these trail. anyway i think it would be best to keep as multi use and post speed limits .
Looks good.
Of course, there are other non-motorized trails in the area, but I understand you can not put them all on the map. That is fine with me.
motorised group is losing more than half of these trail...make no sense...
The trails I use the most for walking (Granger Sidehill & Hillcrest) are non-motorized which is nice - I don't mind some motorized vehicles as long as they are careful around walkers & dogs!

- consider the effect of Tank Farm remediation on tank farm, city and Ta'an land. will significantly affect trail access points and user experience. I really really really hope they won't have to cut down all that treasured (relatively) peaceful forest. O
need to keep motorized users (including snowmachines) off our single track and walking trails! Particularly trails near the community, they need to stick to corridors to get them away from the highly used pedestrian areas.
I'm concerned for non-motorized trail users because of those that use motorized vehicles where motorized vehicles shouldn't be.
the more motorized trails there are, the less ohv noise there will be near peoples houses, therefore less complaints. you need to allow them to get away from the houses.
The south side of the airport needs to be motorized as well as the east side of the Alaska highway and south access. We need a MMU connector from the on the top of two mile hill along the highway bellow Valleyview. Right along the highway opposite the post office) To reduce traffic along the Canada Games Center.
Need of speed limit on Hamilton Blvd trail and strict enforcement.
Some of those trails should be motorized.

5. Are there any changes you would suggest in regards to the proposed non-motorized network?

No
What about east side of Ice Lake – a trail discussed in walk-abouts
The proposal so far looks good and should enhance our use of trails and increase our enjoyment of them
Need connection across swamp below Granger so you don't get a soaker – boardwalk would be great please! Also need connection from the trail east of Bower out to highway or across/round swamp at north end
I'd like to see a City trail around Ice Lake to avoid the Ice Lake Road – motorized route
Ensure that motorized users have access to the trails that does not require them to drive all the way through the subdivision on the roads (this is not practical or even possible when the roads are plowed for snowmobiles)
Double wide trails that can accommodate motorized and all others should be used for all – single wide = non-motorized
Should have multi use motorized around airport. Picture opportunities in winter from City side, hard to carry equipment in with deep snow cover
One of the difficulties here, in my view, is that the trail network is already too dense. But I'm not aware of any practical way to keep people from making new trails if any of the existing ones were to be "closed" (whatever that even means). So I'm afraid I can't suggest any change.
This question seems like an aside. There is no map attached to it in reference and the map above does not clearly explain what was selected and what was not. A new map could be circulated that only looks at selected trails regardless of motorized/non-motorized criteria to help the viewer see the connections needed. Non-selected trails should be in another color. I strongly feel the public input you will receive with respect to this question is inadequate and an additional public input opportunity should be provided. The following trails should be added to the network in my opinion: -wetlands west -blair witch -trail from tunnel to granger -snowmobile trail off hillcrest loop to highway along hillcrest drive (winter only) -paddys pond sliding hill -trial from hillcrest to tompson and turner bus stop by elijah smith -trails through the tank farm -trails around ice lake connecting to rock gardens

-trails in mcIntyre area -triangle trail from paved elijah smith trail toward tank farm route to provide opportunity for access to tank farm trail from McIntrye -valleyview trail -trail around paddys pond and connecting loops to trials currently selected. Shorter loops needed.
There are too many for me to discuss here, and I agree with the comments submitted by Peter Long in his survey.
We need to keep as many trails as possible free for walking and have designated motorized trails so that foot traffic is safe, easy and environment protected
Would like to see safer crossing over the Alaska Highway to get to the stair trail on Black. I have been in both situation as a pedestrian with family we have been trying to cross the Alaska Highway in between fast moving cars coming both ways and as a driver where I have had some pedestrian who just almost cross in front of my car. Not good! Not safe.
Why on earth would you allow a motorized trail through the Paddy's Pond area? Are we not being told that the idea is to get snowmobiles and ATVs away from such areas? Whatever happened to the so-called "out and away" trails? (There is one already in existence in the area. We don't need another. The trail plan appears to bring ATVs and snowmachines right next to the Lobird Trailer Court which may not be appreciated by residents. As well, non-motorized users in the area (walkers in particular) may cease using the cut-line due to the increased activity by recreational vehicles.
It's not clear from the map, but paving the trail between the airport/black st trail and hillcrest should be a priority for safety sake.
Would like to see a paved connector trail from the terminus of the around-the-airport trail going parallel along the alaska highway to burns road. This is a huge gap in the existing network!
I have some concern re additional access points to the Mt Mc Rec. area. I'm OK with additional access in the summer. But, during the ski season, my preference is to limit access to the ski trails. This could be achieved by not packing/tracking the proposed new access trails in winter.
KEEP IT NON-MOTORIZED! I wouldn't object to permitting one or two licensed snowmachine users to pack the main wide trails after heavy snowfalls, but such packing should be limited to one or two registered drivers and should be done only with specific permission from the city and under clear rules limiting speed, frequency of packing, etc. I would prefer to pack the trails myself via snowshoe than to have snow machines allowed on the trails other than under a very limited for packing as suggested above.
Make the non-motorized network as expansive as possible. The trails do not need to be paved, necessarily, but they should be clearly marked. In addition there should be (a) more garbage bins (b) more doggie-poo-bag stations and (c) some enforcement of those people who still bring their dogs outside and use the trails as a dog lavatory.
As noted above, winter use should include more trails - including wetlands trail east and west, bower, A powerline that is not noted as a trail on the map, the hillcrest trail, sliding hill, and several other trails that are not named on the map in the Hillcrest/Granger area. I would really appreciate an opportunity to sit down and point some of these out on a map.
There should be a distinction between general motorized and snowmobile use. Many of the trails shown on the map as non-motorized would likely benefit from snowmobile traffic in winter since they would create a wider and more stable trail surface for other non-motorized activities. This would still leave many other trails for non-motorized uses only due to inability to navigate with a snowmobile. Most of the environmentally sensitive areas would not be negatively impacted by snowmobile use on these trails. There is also not enough general motorized access to/from residential areas with this trail system, it would be too restrictive to motorized users and the inclusiveness principle is not sufficiently represented. Most trails shown as non-motorized should allow snowmobile use, and most non-motorized trails that provide access to/from residential areas should be changed to motorized multi-use, otherwise motorized users will be overly restricted and unfairly excluded.
do not limit access to other uses

No - I just want to know how you intend to keep motorized vehicles out of the proposed Paddy's Pond park.
- add the ski club trails on this map (city land, city trails!) - add our little singletrack valleyview forest loop which goes through both city and KDFN land - show motorized access trail to 'wilderness' on this map - is there not one by Lobird? and ho
The paved MMU trail that parallels Hamilton Boulevard must be patrolled either by City By-Law or the RCMP. While driving on Hamilton Boulevard north I've been passed by snow mobiles and quads speeding along the paved trail. Non motorized trail users face significant danger of injury.
doesn't appear to be although it's difficult to tell from the map scale, but it a proper connection from through Hillcrest to airport trail and Black Street Stairs is desperately needed

7. How important is the designation of a City trail at the weigh station to you?

Didn't check off a circle but had comment – only if there's something to connect to

8. Please indicate your agreement with the need for a stairway connecting the airport escarpment to the Millennium Trail via the ball diamond on Robert Service Way:

$0.5 million dollars?? Low tech stairs made of natural materials ie. local wood and stone can't possibly cost this much
I'd rather see this than Rogers Street
This would make an excellent loop. More important than Rogers Street stairs
Not a good use of public funds

9. What approach do you think the City should take with the Blair Witch trail?

needs to be safe whatever is done
talk to the users, they will have suggestion I a am sure
Don't decommission the trail, at least leave it alone.
depends on whether there are adequate mountain bike trails
determine solution in cooperation with CMBC
recognize the efforts of other clubs
Please do not decommission. If you cannot keep them in place, please replace w. similar difficulty
not city liability. policy could snuff tree forts & child-nature self-determined nature learning!
connect bottom north at Hamilton to top of tube.
Build separate City Designated Trail
Leave it alone- The city has screwed up enough!
tough questions due to risk mgmt
Post signage; use at own risk
Tell the bikers to fix the structures or remove them

11. How supportive are you of designating a portion of the Ice Lake Road MMU to connect with the existing MMU route along the Alaska Highway?

Only if there's a non-motorized trail along/close to lakeshore

13. Please indicate the trails that you feel would be suitable as part of a recommended route for snowmobiles through this area:

To allow access to the other motorized trails to the south
It is necessary for Granger to connect to the culvert under new Hamilton Boulevard
Either or would do but sledders should have some sort of route through here
Snowmobiles cause extreme air and noise pollution. They should not be allowed in local green spaces. If they can't get to the hinterland along existing roads, then they should be transported to a trailhead out of the subdivision
Motor vehicles should not go through Paddy's Pond
Wetlands West – probably the best – part of it is under the power line. Although damage to environment (land) occurs when snow machines operate early in the season and later in the spring
I am not a snowmobiler so I do not feel qualified to pick a route
Gravel road is there already so use it
Need a 4 season trail that avoids marsh areas now used by snowmobile access by Paddy's Pond
Bower avoids the more sensitive area of Paddy's Pond
just let them go along hillcrest trail loop or one of them to the highway
ice lake road
The Paddy's Pond area should be off-limits to snowmobiles.
Sliding hill and others that are unnamed on the map.
unsure, but definitely away from the wetland core!
the most sustainable option
no idea where this is referring to
Why place limitations? Majority of riders are law abiding citizens
not sure as I don't snowmobile those routes
Again, at the risk of seeming unrealistic, I really dislike the idea of the community indulging the destructive and intrusive recreational preferences of a few vocal (and, it would seem, organized) residents. I doubt that many Canadian cities would even contemplate motorized use of their public recreational spaces. It's time for Whitehorse to mature beyond the yahoo frontier mentality that thinks you have to create noise and a stink to have fun.
The snowmobile bylaw is flawed....why should snowmobiles be allowed everywhere and anytime. Why do we have to listen to snowmobiles up and down our streets and neighbourhood "protected " areas, the playground, the rink....24 hours a day. Then there is the smell. They are not good for wetlands. There are designated streets trails to get out of hillcrest granger etc. Use them. none of the suggested trails are appropriate. they are all well used walking trails. They are not wide enough and vegetation is eroded by these machines.
Motorized vehicles should not be permitted in the proposed park area.
There is enough area outside these areas for snowmobiles and ATVs
This will degrade an area that could be made into a wonderful place for non-motorized users (walkers). It is a natural area that should be free from motorized use of any kind. Snowmobilers have access to virtually the entire trail system of Whitehorse. What more do they want? They could have access to this wonderful place by just parking their machines and using their legs!
This area is presently too confined to safely allow motorized transportation to travel with pedestrians, cyclists, toboggans and dogs in the area. Enlarging trails to a roadway width and associated alignment would greatly diminish the beauty of the present wooded area.
Re additional stairs between the river valley and the airport: If a stairs were to be considered, priority

should be on the southerly option, in the vicinity of the ball diamonds. This connection would be more useful-linking to the Millennium Trail, the pedestrian bridge, the campground.
See my comments above. The ONLY route that should be considered for snowmobile use in this area, aside from MMU trails, is the main trail crossing Paddy's Pond and linking to an MMU route as directly as possible. All other trails in this area are too narrow and unsuitable for snowmobiles. Although they do not usually tear up the ground, snowmobiles can and do cause undesirable disruption in this park area - ruts, noise, air pollution, damaged vegetation, disruption to wildlife and quiet users.
Motorized use should be extremely limited and should be outside populated areas.
I have a concern about questions 11 and 13, specifically that the ice lake road and the Dyke road are not shown on the maps provided. I feel that this information is really needed for people to make the best informed choices in this survey, and that a revised map and more time should be provided. I tried to contact the city Parks office to get more clarification on this topic, and found out that all relevant city staff were on holidays until AFTER the survey closed! Again, I would really appreciate an opportunity to get this information from someone at the city to find out where these two roads are! As per my earlier comment, I would appreciate an opportunity to point out some trails on the map that are not named. It is not possible to do this on the online survey.
Not sure what the Dyke Road is, but I'm assuming the route is to cross Hamilton Boulevard towards the Lobird area.
not familiar with trail names and at time of filling out survey the info maps were not working
The map is a little difficult to make out. The current routes used by snow machines in Hillcrest are fine by me.
I don't think snowmobiles belong in the Paddy's Pond area because there has been irresponsible use. It's one thing to use snowmobiles in the dead of winter where the ground and cover is protected by snow. It's quite another thing to use them in the spring and make a mess out of the area. I realize that the snowmobiling association supports responsible use - but they need to come up with some ideas on how to manage those snowmobilers who have complete disregard for environmental protection.
I think this issue should be dealt with after there has been a chance to look at both the Protected Areas bylaw AND a chance to work on "parks" that were designated in the OCP. The Paddy's Pond/Ice Park is one of these parks listed in the OCP. We really need to look at what that means and what restrictions or rules or guidelines go with that designation. It will be easier to add a "recommended route" at that time, then take one away if that is what comes out of the "park" process.
I can not agree with any non-MMU trail designation for snowmobiles since I cannot agree with the bylaw as it stands. Many of these machines are extremely loud and annoying, and should not be allowed near residential areas. Limit them to the proposed MMU's only.
The Hillcrest trail is mostly wide and would be safe for snowmobiles etc. to pass pedestrians.
- don't see Ice Lake Road on map. don't know where it is so cannot comment - don't forget the affect of snowmobile, trucks, ATV noise to residential areas and non-motorized trail users. please divert accordingly as possible.
I understand the need to snowmobiles to get out to the south, but strongly disagree with them being able to run all over the area. They are often disrespectful, fast, loud and inconsiderate. Some feel the need to bash a machine everywhere there are foot tracks! i hate them in the fire break area of the hillcrest trail and around the bobsled track, but that makes the most sense as a corridor. Make them slow down, behave and stay only on that main trail!
it is assumed that winter snowmachine activity has no deleterious effects on the land. however they compact the snow so the underlying vegetation is adversely affected. when they travel off trail, they break bushes and tree branches. where they travel over ice, the snow is compacted and the ice becomes thicker, damaging the subaqueous vegetation which in turn impacts the habitat in summer. therefore i am opposed to any snowmachine travel over paddy's pond or any wetland in winter.
Please keep designated route on the Fire road. This is a fragile wetlands area, when this environment is not frozen GREAT DESTRUCTION will occur!!!
I don't know enough about this area to comment intelligently.

14. On a scale from 1 to 5, please indicate how successful you feel the Task Force was in creating a proposed trail network that achieved its network-level criteria:

Better mapping needed to consultation.
inclusiveness... as many trails as possible MMU...not in my view....sure if you are an ATV or snowmobile rider,,,guess motorcycles as well accessibility....sharing of trails where safety isn't compromised. its more than safety its enjoying the outdoors for exercise and mental health in an environment that is conductive to the pursuit in close proximity to home ,time restraints ,youth access public transit access not prepared to select answer
In asking this question, you should provide a link to the document (the criteria) so respondents won't have to stop and go look for it. I think the focus should be on walkability and not on an assumption of motorized access.
Does not agree with some of the multi-use designation trails i.e Canada Games Centre
See my comments above regarding the fallacy of giving too much weight to "inclusiveness" and "accessibility" so as to favour disruptive use by a small group over non-disruptive use by a large group.
I don't believe that proposed network achieves these criteria as well as it could have - some examples are below. My concerns are mainly with respect to snowmobile use, not summer ATV/dirt bike use. "Both MMU and NM routes go to a variety of destinations" - there are large tracts of area that will end up being only NM only. "Some NM trails and maybe connectors between MMU trails" - there seems to be many more NM than MMU, and very little connectivity between the MMU trails. "As many trails as possible MMU" - this does not seem to be the case for snowmobiles, and I think the area would benefit from numerous additional snowmobile friendly trails. "MMU trails to allow elderly and physically challenged people to enjoy outdoors" - I agree with this, but don't believe it's being done. People with physical challenges will have a hard time walking in the winter on narrow uneven trails, but it would be easier for them on a snowmobile track. "MMU routes to direct motorized users away from homes" - as per my earlier statement, I believe in the case of snowmobiles that having people snowmobile longer distances on the street will create more of an annoyance to home owners.
Network level criteria are not sufficiently represented and the principles of inclusiveness and accessibility are particularly under-utilized. Too many trails in residential areas have been designated as non-motorized and will be restrictive to motorized users who want to access other areas from their homes.
not very well advertised
As I said previously, I thought your one page chart was not clear enough to assess how the criteria were weighted and thus I can't assess your success.
somewhat, but not sure they are the correct criteria - or perhaps just not explaining properly. I.e.: what do you mean by sustainability? - long-term maintenance and quality of the trails? the desired experience on particular trails? sustainability of ecological integrity in significant wildlife areas? Perhaps better to measure the Primary principles outlined. - a noise assessment in residential and municipal green areas would be a good periodic assessment. many examples in other urban areas, some by residential volunteers. ex. Anchorage
i strongly disagree with the inclusiveness statement "as many trails as possible MMU"

16. The Above the Airport Task Force recognized that other residents and recreationalists use a variety of names for the area trails. Please let us know if you have any trail name substitutions or suggestions to share!

Perhaps trail number system. Much easier to follow on map - A letter can designate type - M1 multi use - N1 non-motorized etc
"Rock Garden Trail" for trail going from Ice Lake to Rock Garden – seems obvious
The names provided seem fine
Leave them unnamed the whole City doesn't need another Mt. Mac
The trail that runs parallel to Hamilton Blvd, mid-way down the slope toward the pond, is known locally (at least in my house) as "the Traverse".
the name needs to indicate direction, destination have meaning....not abstract not someone's name.....blue green no
Use names that have some meaning, either historically or to the neighborhood, or to the special classification (e.g wetlands)
Note: Re: question #15 . . . How can one rate these as we don't know what will be the final proposal by Parks and Recreation concerning trail designation. Don't see what the difference is between "Trail Upgrades" and "Restoration of damaged trail/areas." City money should go to the meaningful designation on non-motorized trails. We do not need more costly motorized multiple-use trails that are built and maintained mainly for the benefit of the motorized user. Trail names should relate to the specific location, unique aspect of the route, or physical feature found in the immediate area.
Granger Sidehill is called "Sidewinder" by most mountain bikers and runners I know, I've never heard it called Granger Sidehill. My running friends call Wetlands Trail East "Weathertop" with the two rock viewpoints being called "Little Weathertop" and "Big Weathertop" which is in keeping with the Mordor name in the Mt. Mac trails, and is at least memorable. There is a trail dropping from Granger into Granger Sidehill which is called "Ben's Descent." Ask the trail crew, they know which one this is. I can't tell from your map.
- not sure what is meant by "trail upgrades" - I do NOT support 'upgrading' trails to make them more resistant to motorized use - rather, such trails should simply be off limits to motorized users. However, I do support boardwalks/bridges over wet areas
No preference on names!
Get rid of Blair Witch, that movie was awful. Just call it Circus.
- get the school children to name them, or trail users - ex. mountain bikers, ATV users, ACES/ES trail research projects (they already do this) etc. - ask them about their trail planning project up Puckett's Gulch (flowing into/under Walmart zone)
i helped develop/build the trail named 'bower' and have never heard that name before? i thought it was unnamed!
Trails should be numbered. Names could be used as secondary identification.

17. Please share any other comments or suggestions you may have about the ATA Trail Plan:

Make sure people can get to the designated trails via the easiest most direct route
Please inquire with Bylaw to ensure that signage indicating trails cannot be used is in fact correct/applicable. Bylaw has told us we can use the "most direct route" to the trail but the route indicated/discussed with them has signage prohibiting motorized vehicles. That kind of inconsistency causes confusion and community stress

Great to have been consulted. Long process and lots of work
Paved, direct, maintained trails that clearly and directly connect places in a logical, continuous manner like a road designed for cars are very important to making non-car transportation and recreation viable for more of us. Also move stop lines back on paved trails – don't put stop signs on the trail
My biggest concern is the need for a connector route from Winze Place to connect up to the road that crosses Magic Carpet Ride and Sparky. This might require a small rerouting of the trail behind Drift Drive as that ATV's and snowmobiles could use the lower bench to keep dust and noise from bothering residents. The signs behind ___'s house need to come down too – this area is open to snowmobiles (DREW A DIAGRAM)
Snowmobiles should be allowed on airport trail
Thank you for the hard work
Snowmobiles should not be allowed in Paddy's Pond area. Paddy's Pond area is particularly sensitive and needed as a non-motorized local green space. We need more parks and wide green spaces free from the noise and fumes of motorized vehicles (snowmobiles and ATV's). There should be a buffer of at least 0.5 km from houses and green spaces to a motorized trail
The green lines on the map are difficult to see. Also Ice Lake and Paddy's Pond "disappear" into the background colour. The maps are very difficult to decipher – colours blend into one another. I suspect that folks who would like to provide feedback will be frustrated by this lack of clarity. Maps are the most important building blocks and need to be clear and easy to "read". More time spent on creating readable maps would encourage more people to participate. I'm surprised that the map(s) were not given more care and attention. The January 4 deadline is totally unrealistic over the Christmas season. It should have been later in January
Thanks for asking. It is one of the distinguishing features of Whitehorse that we have trails. They connect us and keep us off the highways
It would be great to have the drift loop for both/all of walkers/hikers, runners and tourists who may want a loop trail with a view. Having stairs at the end of the cliffs (at Robert Service Way/baseball diamonds) would also provide an addition to the Millennium Trail Loop. Interpretive signs at the top could have info/traditional stories about ravens, eagles and other birds as well as foxes and coyotes which live around the cliff areas
As noted earlier use of the Hamilton Boulevard trail should be restricted for motorized users. Primarily due to the hazard that mixed use of this trail creates in the summer season. This trail, particularly from Lazulite down to Alaska Highway. This trail is not necessary for motorized users to access summer wilderness and create conflicts with young cyclists and families during this time. Restricted use by mobility challenged individuals in summer is suitable but young able bodied motorized users should go elsewhere
The Task Force designation criteria includes "accessibility share trails where safety isn't compromised". This criteria cannot be met in summer months when ATV/side by sides use the Hamilton Boulevard trail where young children and families are using the same trail. Use in winter is safer as there are less pedestrians on the trail in winter. Consideration should be given the emerging use of side by side vehicles on the Hamilton trail and the significant impact this use has on the safety of pedestrians and cyclists including young and old
I am most familiar with Paddy's Pond ice lake area, south airport trail tank farm area but most of my thoughts I would see applying to area west of copper ridge etc. I don't want to see wild areas over developed . Why bi directional trails...does this mean widening?.harder for wildlife to cross paths in ever diminishing habitat wetlands should be protected with minimum constructed crossings to prevent damage but kept natural. #2 cycling ,birding, plants everything about being in the bush #8No half million $ staircase at ball diamonds. It does get used a safe and simple trail would be great to have a good downtown loop and connector to millennium trail. I don't think I want natural areas converted to motorized or bike commuting.

What is corridor clearing? I want to know how we plan to see designated trail use as designated maintained? because it isn't now.
This is not yet ready to go. Neighborhoods need fuller consultation and Parks (e.g. Paddy's Pond/Ice Lake) need to be designated and created.
We feel a bit left out here in Valleyview as far as connectivity and inclusion
Perhaps we should take a step back and consult more with the communities involved before making such important decisions. Open house meetings that allow discussion with Parks and Recreation staff would be helpful at the initial stage just to see what the community actually wants concerning trails designation. Common sense would suggest we carry out park management plans first before making decisions that may be difficult to reverse when the City finally gets around to establishing the park in question.
This survey is super confusing and not very well designed. Please next time test it out with people who are not familiar with your acronyms, terms and naming. I can't imagine your completion rate is very high and I would hazard a guess its largely due to the complexity of the survey.
Signs in secluded areas are destroyed quickly by vandals. Bridging wetlands in the cutlines with elevated walkways would increase the loop potential between the east and west wetland trails
Thank you for devoting attention to our local trails. There type of initiatives make Whitehorse a great place to live.
Thanks for your work.
Thanks for the opportunity to comment! We use this area on a daily basis (usually dog walking) and treat it like our backyard. I pick up garbage frequently and clean up messes made by vandals. That is a problem not mentioned in this survey: vandalism. Will there be another forum for discussing how to deal with it? There are people who leave garbage and broken glass on the trails, who purposefully destroy vegetation on the trails, who push down trees so that they block the trails, who have fires on the trails, who dig pits on the trails, etc....This needs to be addressed as well! How about creating a Hillcrest/Granger "Paddy's Pond Watch" to try to identify and deal with these vandals?
Please reduce/restrict or eliminate the use of motorized vehicles on heavily used walking trails. They are NOT wide enough and there is nothing that can be done about the poor air quality caused by these vehicles. Maybe time restrictions would work? Also, dogs being allowed to run or dump free is still a problem and some selective enforcement would help. It doesn't have to be all the time - maybe a blitz over a week - but enough to make people think twice before continuing to flout the law.
Thank you very much for the opportunity to provide this feedback. I had no idea that a task force had been put together for these trail designations, and I would have liked the opportunity to provide some of these comments earlier in the system. As a snowmobile safety provider (and representative I guess), it would have been great to be involved more as were other interest groups. I think the primary point for me as a Granger resident are that while I agree with designations for summer, I don't agree with the winter designations. Snowmobile traffic in the area is not high, and has never been high, but I really appreciated being able to leave from my home and travel through the Paddy's pond area en route to other places (no-one just rides around the area, we're all enroute to somewhere else). Also, I appreciate the condition for walking and skiing on these snowmobile tracks - I walk my dogs in the area often and find it much more enjoyable. As noted, I'd like to be able to continue improving the experience for other people there as well. I would really appreciate the opportunity to sit down and discuss some of these things with City staff. I believe I have some reasonable input to provide, and haven't been given an opportunity other than on this survey. I would encourage someone to get in contact with me.
I feel that we should keep the trail systems as natural as possible there is really no need to designate who or what the trails should be used for. We live in a small community with a very small population. Don’t make things complicated.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment but please next time give people all the information they need in a clear and understandable format.
great start. thank you for considering realistically needs of both non-motorized and motorized users and the different experiences we seek in nearby nature. Some uses simply are not compatible.
A NM connection from midnight run or ridge trail to porcupine is essential to allow biking/walking connections to the awesome Mt Mac trail network. a well designed trail across the wetland would be heavily utilized and really appreciated.
there are significant wildlife values within the ATA area. i know the location of a fox den which has been used for at least 20 years. in the summer of 2011 there was a cow moose frequenting paddy's pond. i had a close encounter with her and she was seen by others. this fall ___, who walks in the area frequently, at about noontime in october, saw a wolf near paddy's pond. in july 2003 i found the nest of a Wilson's Snipe and recorded the hatching of the eggs adjacent to paddy's pond. in 2012 a pair of Red-necked Grebes nested at Paddy's Pond. In 2008 the nest of Horned Grebes was discovered. they nested in the same area for a few years. every year for several years, i have led a Yukon Bird Club field trip to Paddy's Pond. this event attracts up to 10 people, residents and non-residents of hillcrest. in short, the green space adjacent to hillcrest is a mecca for many kinds of wildlife throughout the year. limiting motorized trails thru that area is important to maintaining that habitat.
my only concern is the two mile hill crossing the highway and there in no motorized trail head here to safely cross to the other trail systems