

Phase 3 Public Consultation Summary

Draft South Saskatchewan Regional Plan



SOUTH



ISBN: 978-1-4601-1864-1 (Printed Edition)

ISBN: 978-1-4601-1865-8 (Online Edition)

Printed July 2014

Overview

Alberta's Land-use Framework (LUF), released in December 2008, sets out a new approach to managing our province's land and natural resources to achieve Alberta's long-term economic, environmental and social goals. The LUF establishes seven new land-use regions and calls for the development of a regional plan for each. The *Alberta Land Stewardship Act* supports the LUF and establishes the legal basis for the development of regional plans. Regional plans reconcile provincial policies and set explicit regional outcomes and objectives.

Regional planning is part of the Government of Alberta's Integrated Resource Management System (IRMS). The IRMS supports responsible development of the province's resources and realization of its desired outcomes. The system is founded on setting and managing to clear policies and cumulative outcomes (through regional plans), providing assurance and a monitoring and measurement system to measure the achievement of outcomes. The system is dynamic and adaptive as necessary to reflect new information and also collaborative – achieving desired outcomes requires working with stakeholders and partners. The approach considers the relationship between all of the activities, along with natural events and the challenges facing a region, and sets the stage for robust growth, vibrant communities and a healthy environment over the next 50 years.

Regional plans are developed in consultation with Albertans. The Alberta government's Land Use Secretariat (LUS) oversees the development of each regional plan and is responsible for reporting and monitoring the success of the plans. LUS provides policy analysis, research and administrative support to the regional plan development process and leads the Government of Alberta's regional plans consultations. The secretariat works with a larger regional planning team, representing the Government of Alberta ministries and agencies, to develop regional plans for Cabinet approval. The draft South Saskatchewan Regional Plan (SSRP) was developed over two phases of consultation starting in the Fall 2009 with aboriginal people, a wide variety of stakeholders, municipalities, government and the advice of the South Saskatchewan Regional Advisory Council.

From the October 10, 2013 release of the draft SSRP through to February 28, 2014, the Government of Alberta collected feedback and input through multiple stakeholder and open house sessions in 21 cities, towns and farming communities throughout the region, in the adjoining Red Deer Region and in Edmonton. The consultation progress also included an online workbook (also available in hard copy), written submissions and several special interest group meetings. The input and feedback collected during Phase 3 of public consultation will be reviewed and considered prior to the approval of the South Saskatchewan Regional Plan.



Consultations

The South Saskatchewan Regional Plan (SSRP) was developed with the input and feedback of Albertans through a three-phase consultation process:

Phase 1: input on the issues in the region

Phase 2: feedback on the advice from the SSRP

Phase 3: feedback on the draft SSRP.

South Saskatchewan Regional Plan Phase 1 consultation public and stakeholder input sessions were conducted in 16 locations across the region between November 30 and December 10, 2009. The purpose of the input sessions was to:

- Provide the public and stakeholders with information about the South Saskatchewan regional planning process; and
- Gather input on topics in the SSRP terms of reference.

In March 2011, the South Saskatchewan Regional Advisory Council (RAC) advice to government and Phase 2 workbook were released. In addition to completed workbooks, written submissions were accepted up to December 21, 2012.

SSRP Phase 2 consultations were carried out between November 6 and December 6, 2012 and had two key objectives:

- Review the Regional Advisory Council's (RAC) advice with representatives of key stakeholder groups throughout 17 communities in the region and in Edmonton, Red Deer and Drumheller to ensure all groups had the opportunity to take part within convenient proximity to a session(s);
- Seek input and feedback on RAC's advice according to the following questions for the five key topic areas:
 1. Vision/strategic land-use principles;
 2. Healthy economy;
 3. Healthy ecosystems and environment;
 4. Healthy communities; and
 5. Land-use direction/management intent.

In October 2013, the draft SSRP and Phase 3 workbook were released. In addition to completed workbooks, written submissions were accepted up to February 28, 2014.



For Phase 3 of the SSRP consultation process, public and stakeholder input sessions were conducted in 21 locations across the region between November 5 and November 28, 2013. The purpose of the consultation sessions was to:

- Provide an overview of the key components of the draft SSRP including the proposed conservation areas, provincial recreation areas and public land use zones;
- Invite feedback on the draft plan through six discussion topics:
 1. Regional vision and outcomes;
 2. Economic growth;
 3. Biodiversity and conservation;
 4. Integrated management of public land and stewardship of private land;
 5. Advancing air and water quality and enhancing watershed management; and
 6. Strengthening communities, enhancing recreation and cultural opportunities and inclusion of aboriginal peoples.
- Provide information about the approval process and release of the final plan.



Consultation Methodology and Locations

Open house sessions for the general public were held between 4:30 p.m. and 7:30 p.m. in the same location and room as each stakeholder session and were advertised as Community Conversations.

Stakeholder sessions were conducted in each location over a five-hour time period, 9:30 am – 2:30 p.m. In each community venue, a series of panels providing background information about the LUF, ALSA and a high level summary of the draft SSRP were set up. Government employees were in attendance at all sessions. The LUS representative provided participants with an overview of the regional planning process and the draft SSRP with regular breaks throughout the session so that the consultant could lead group discussions according to a set of guiding questions:

- Where do you support the draft SSRP information and why?
- Where do you have concerns and why?
- What is missing?

All Albertans were encouraged to review the Draft SSRP and provide their feedback by completing either the online or hardcopy versions of a workbook called Discussion Guide – Draft South Saskatchewan Regional Plan Workbook, A Workbook to Share Your Views with the Government of Alberta. In total, 1,529 full or partially completed workbooks were received in the two formats, the majority of which were submitted electronically. A separate report entitled Phase 3 Workbook Summary – Draft South Saskatchewan Regional Plan is available from the LUS in hard copy and on the website.

In total, 1,571 people participated in the 21 Community Conversations (Stakeholder and Public Sessions). Turnout was particularly high in and around the larger cities in the region: Lethbridge had 356 participants (71 stakeholders and 285 public attendees), Calgary had 148 participants (86 stakeholders and 62 public attendees) and Okotoks had 113 participants (55 stakeholders and 58 public). The stakeholder session held in Calgary had the highest number of attendees throughout all SSRP Phases while the Public Open House in Lethbridge had the highest number of participants. Many of the participants identified a stakeholder group(s) affiliation when they signed in including municipalities, industry, environmental organizations, non-government organizations, irrigation districts, agricultural organizations, economic development authorities and landowners.



Participant numbers and corresponding dates for each of the 42 Community Sessions are included below:

Date	Location	Stakeholder Participants	Public Participants	Total Participants
Tuesday, November 5	Crowsnest Pass	49	62	111
	Taber	27	29	56
Wednesday, November 6	Claresholm	19	29	48
	Milk River	22	10	32
Thursday, November 7	Canmore	23	54	77
	Strathmore	13	11	24
Tuesday, November 12	Edmonton	25	35	60
Wednesday, November 13	Calgary	86	62	148
Thursday, November 14	Lethbridge	71	285	356
Tuesday, November 19	Cardston	27	29	56
	Foremost	16	2	18
Wednesday, November 20	Airdrie	19	17	36
	Fort Macleod	18	26	44
Thursday, November 21	Drumheller	5	2	7
	Vulcan	8	8	16
Tuesday, November 26	Medicine Hat	32	29	61
	Pincher Creek	51	42	93
Wednesday, November 27	Brooks	20	6	26
	Okotoks	55	58	113
November 28, 2013	Cochrane	63	44	107
	Red Deer	70	12	82
Totals		719	852	1571



In addition, 16 additional stakeholder meetings were held with Land Use Secretariat and other Government of Alberta staff in attendance from October 17, 2013 through to February 26, 2014. These sessions were requested by the various stakeholder groups and included municipal councils, organizations and agencies. Meeting summaries were produced for attendees and government staff reviewed all summaries as part of the Phase 3 SSRP feedback. These summaries are included in a separate report entitled Phase 3 Stakeholder Consultation Summary – Draft South Saskatchewan Regional Plan which is available from the LUS in hard copy and on the website.

Three hundred and sixty-five public submissions were also submitted and are included with the details following.

This summary report provides an overview of the key themes advanced during the Phase 3 public sessions and additional public written submissions. The report is organized by the draft SSRP six topic areas as follows:

1. Regional Vision and Outcomes;
2. Economic Growth;
3. Biodiversity and Conservation;
4. Integrated Management of Public Land and Stewardship of Private Land;
5. Advancing Air and Water Quality and Enhancing Watershed Management; and
6. Strengthening Communities, Enhancing Recreation and Cultural Opportunities and Inclusion of aboriginal Peoples.

Additional comments beyond the scope of the public sessions were also recorded and are included in this summary following the summary of comments captured from the six discussion topics.

Regional Vision and Outcomes

The Draft SSRP proposed the following vision statement, strategic directions and regional outcomes for the South Saskatchewan Region:

Vision for the Region:

Southern Alberta is a diverse, healthy, vibrant and prosperous region where the natural beauty of the mountains, foothills and prairies are managed so that citizens feel connected to the land and its history. The region is a thriving place that offers a wide range of opportunities to residents and visitors alike. Social, economic and environmental values are effectively achieved with



shared stewardship and an integrated approach. The quality and integrity of the landscape is sustained through the use of science, innovative thinking, traditional aboriginal and community knowledge, recognizing the interests of all Albertans.

Strategic Directions:

- Conserving and maintaining the benefits of biodiversity;
- Advancing conservation and integrated management of Crown Land;
- Supporting and enabling conservation and stewardship on private lands;
- Advancing watershed management;
- Managing air quality through continued collaboration;
- Strengthening communities;
- Providing recreation and tourism opportunities, active living and the preservation and promotion of the region's unique cultural and natural heritage; and
- Inclusion of aboriginal peoples in land-use planning.

Regional Outcomes:

1. The region's economy is growing and diversified;
2. Biodiversity and ecosystem function are sustained with shared stewardship;
3. Air quality is managed to support healthy ecosystems and human needs through shared stewardship;
4. Watersheds are managed to support healthy ecosystems and human needs through shared stewardship;
5. Community development needs are anticipated and accommodated;
6. The quality of life for residents is enhanced through increased opportunities for recreation, active living and the preservation and promotion of the region's unique cultural and natural heritage; and
7. aboriginal peoples are included in land-use planning.



Regional Vision

Support for the draft SSRP regional vision and why:

- I like the plan, hope the implementation goes well.
- Like the concepts in the vision.

Concerns about the draft SSRP regional vision and why:

- Who monitors the policies and the enforcement?
- Want everything – need priority and trade-offs.
- Will there be an overseeing body to ensure the plan is implemented correctly?
- Water Management – if this does not exist, then the rest of the plan will not work.
- Need to restore the ecosystems in logging areas.
- Very disappointed that environmental lobby has not made the draft plan yet fracking, off-highway vehicle (OHV), etc. did make it in.
- Overall growth in southern Alberta with current over-allocation of water is a major concern.
- Anticipation of additional expansion of industrial uses that use water (agriculture) creates huge concern and potential draws on water consumption.
- What happens to our input and the plan if we have a change in government ideology?
- The government has drawn their lines and decisions made – what good will these comments do?
- The vision communicates more about the economic growth and diversification – does not resonate with all people.
- A black and white plan leaves shades of grey that cause concern when they are ignored.
- Shared stewardship – are all the industries held to the same standards across the board? All parties should adhere to a common policy.
- Integrated regional planning may not work to maintain the integrity of the landscape.
- The general public will not identify with the locality – more information up front.
- Robust growth sets the tone for too much industrial use of the land.



- Get the feeling that so many regulations and layers to the plan are leading to the eventual shut down of the areas across the board.
- Publicly acceptable method of enacting is necessary.
- Community-based communications (listen to the locals).
- Taxpayers have the right to use the public lands and do not want the lands to be restricted unreasonably.
- Climate change does not appear as a priority – it should.
- All are qualitative – needs to be quantitative.
- Plan is not directive enough to provide clarity and foundation for full understanding – be specific:
 - Environmental science/impacts
 - Recreational intent
 - OHV access – intent, policy – on the ground
- Green area allotments – ESRD transfers allotment rights – disposition holder effectively “sells” AUM rights. Inappropriate.
- Regional vision – “Social, economic and environmental values are effectively achieved...” – these three values should be equally important. Economy should not trump everything else. Money is not the only consideration.
- People should be aware that once this plan is passed, it is in effect for 50 years.
- Title is odd; appears to be a plan for neighboring province. I know it is based on watershed but ‘South Alberta Regional Plan’ describes the plan area better.
- Status quo is maintained.
- Like to see more change in the plan.
- How do you do everything everywhere?
- How much worth will our comments be given in this plan? Waste of time?
- Listened to industry and not to people.
- Need balance between resources and land use – resources are too favoured.
- Biggest challenge will be implementation.
- Danger of accommodating all sectors – end up with same old same old (which ones win or lose).
- There are too many areas for the plan to cover – maybe smaller areas, groupings, etc. should be considered (and separate issues).
- Trying to fix too many things at one time.



What is missing in the draft SSRP regional vision?

- Need more enforcement to police the implemented policies.
- Right now the SSRP is only protecting rock and ice (higher elevations). New areas are already covered by policy and we need to protect lower areas where the biodiversity is.
- Need larger scale, more detailed maps otherwise it appears that you are hiding things from us. (needs more detailed/larger scale maps).
- Not enough detail – more detail could be in Table of Contents.
- Need to include population (provincial) forecast – current situation: forecast (10 years), how are we going to get there?
- There needs to be information on where industry will be permitted. There is a lack of data in the plan that could provide clarity on industry regulatory.
- Fire mapping (wildfire).



Regional Outcomes

Supportive feedback about the draft SSRP regional outcomes and why.

- As a general direction it sets the goals very well – looks and sounds promising

Concerns about the draft SSRP regional outcomes and why:

- Strategic direction is environmental and no mention of economics, but outcomes have economics listed first.
- Full protection of the Castle – think long-term to save the landscape and biodiversity.
 - plan seems to be going backwards in level of protection
 - need headwaters protection, especially with changing climate
 - forestry is not appropriate in the area and is needed to help absorb higher rain falls being recorded than in the past
- Biodiversity and conservation need to be increased and expanded not just maintained.
- In Pincher Creek, forestry consists of 2 per cent of the land mass looking west to east; it's needed for agriculture tourism and wildlife.
- Put wheel tax on recreation vehicles in area.
- Keep cattle grazing status quo.
- There is no local forestry industry in this area. All the logging does not provide any local employment at all. The Alberta government feels they can log anywhere they feel like it, just because they can.
- Need recognition and addition of wildlife connectivity in protected areas and throughout the region in SSRP.

Missing in the draft SSRP regional outcomes:

- Regional outcomes – quality of life should also include recognition of agriculture and sustainability and protecting valuable soil and lands for food production.



Outcome 1: Economic Growth

The region's economy is growing and diversified. The Draft SSRP breaks up this outcome into seven categories, including the objective and corresponding strategies for each industry. These seven industries and the objectives for each in the Draft SSRP are as follows:

- Energy (Petroleum and Natural Gas, Coal and Minerals) Objective: Opportunities for the responsible exploration, development and extraction of energy resources are maintained.
- Renewable Energy Objective: Opportunities for the responsible development of the region's renewable energy industry are maintained in support of Alberta's commitment to greener energy production and economic development; and Value-added opportunities that enhance the sustainability of Alberta's industries and communities are created.
- Corridors for the Co-location of Linear Infrastructure Objective: The region's infrastructure is planned to facilitate economic and population growth and efficient use of land.
- Agriculture Objective: The region's agricultural industry is maintained and diversified.
- Forestry Objective: The region's forest industry is maintained and diversified.
- Surface Materials Objective: Opportunities for the responsible development of surface materials resources are maintained on public lands.
- Tourism Objective: The region is positioned as a world-class, year-round, tourism destination.

Support for Outcome 1 in the draft SSRP and why:

- Support continued coal mining industry in the region – economic development; impact on the land in a reduced/restricted area of a large group of users will be greater (for example Ghost access management plan versus McLean Creek).



Concerns about Outcome in the draft SSRP and why:

- Concerns about hydraulic fracturing.
- Off-road vehicles versus more natural self-propelled non-motorized recreation.
- Tourism – too much weighted to motorized recreation. More of a focus on ecotourism is required.
- OHV use restricted to designated trails in designated areas with a promise for enforcement.
- Concerned to know what the draft plan might say regarding an electrical transmission line route around the town of Claresholm.
- Requires stronger language with regard to creating a more balanced approach to economic and conservation.
- Page 20 – need to include economic benefit from non-motorized.
- Ensure that leased lands have to be reviewed in the same or more rigorous way that private lands are.
- With Cabinet review every 10 years, will more and more industry be prohibited or shut down?
- Concern for the livelihood of oil and gas industry – economic concerns with creating more parks.
- Need to recognize economic impact of recreation – recreation can provide more money than others.
- Plan needs to focus more on the economy, especially associated with recreational use.
- Needs to be a balance – don't dismiss economic value of OHVs.
- Fairness policy for economic development for sustainable economic growth and preservation of environment (all nature based) – final plan should institute a line for investment development, where the investors take stewardship responsibility and the government institutes a levy (tax) to establish a consortium in communities where its land use becomes developed or extracted or modified or any intention to disturb(ed) that the investors/stakeholders are taking responsibility for this environmental change.
- Before any development occurs that extracts/causes an environmental impact, a financial benefit needs to be established that includes discussions with all stakeholders.
- The models for resource extraction of oil and gas is (are) successful and needs to apply to agriculture and tourism. This should include a land use bond; bond can include long-term investment.



- Industry takes precedence over environmental concerns.
- Economic strategies would restrict rather than help economy in the region.

What is missing in Outcome 1 in the draft SSRP?

- Look more at selective logging – logging is good but needs environmental review.



Outcome 2: Biodiversity and Conservation

Biodiversity and ecosystem function are sustained with shared stewardship. The objectives are as follows:

- Terrestrial and aquatic biodiversity are maintained;
- Species at risk are recovered, and key grasslands habitat is sustained;
- Areas are added to the regional network of conservation areas;
- Biodiversity and healthy functioning ecosystems continue to provide a range of benefits to communities in the region and all Albertans; and
- Long-term forest ecosystem health and resiliency are maintained.

The objectives for stewardship and conservation on private lands are listed below:

- The contributions of landowners for their stewardship and conservation efforts on private lands are recognized;
- The contribution and value of private land in supplying ecosystem services is recognized, and opportunities to support ecosystem services on private land are identified; and
- The value of ecosystem services supplied by economic sectors reliant on private lands is recognized.

This section was broken down into two separate discussion topics:

- Discussion Topic #3: Biodiversity Management Framework and Conservation Areas; and
- Discussion Topic #4: Integrated Management of Public Land (Eastern Slopes – Green Area Public Land and Grassland – White Area Public Land) and Stewardship of Private Lands.

Biodiversity Management Framework and Conservation Areas

Support for a biodiversity management framework and the conservation areas in the draft SSRP and why.

Biodiversity Management Framework

- Biodiversity protection.
- Natural areas must be protected.



Conservation Areas

- Pekisko is fabulous – good thing.
- Anything added to the order and protection of the lands is a positive.
- Supportive of Pekisko Heritage Rangelands portion of the plan.
- Support Access Management Plan for north of Hwy 3 – Livingstone and connect to High Rock.
- #11 Crowsnest Lake – Archeological National Significance – support protection but would encourage increased management, maintenance and adequate facilities. There is a dance hall that is a significant resource structure to history and architecture – suggest adaptive reuse.
- Support managing motorized recreation in Castle or outfitters.
- Support Eastern Slopes conservation areas.
- Happy that existing grazing rights will be honoured in Wildland Park but are concerned that we might lose this in the future.

Concerns about a biodiversity management framework and conservation areas in the draft SSRP and why.

Biodiversity Management Framework

- Foothills – West Mountain – need to emphasize more road closure and no access, specifically Old Man River road – protect cutthroat trout – is currently pure, don't want to lose.
- Livingstone range – must include valleys – needs more protection, preserve ecology.
- Reforestation regulations that are not met must be highly regulated.
- Riparian areas – reserve or management plan especially in areas where forestry is taking place.
- Areas of old growth forest set aside and not forested. Areas significant for wildlife not only for existing wildlife also for species that would move between areas.
- Enforce existing law.
- Enforcement capacity is lacking.
- Grizzly bears are causing increasing livestock losses, more than ever before, and we cannot get adequate compensation.
- Increase in grizzly population due to increased cougars and black bears - activity in their natural habitat.
- How do we balance out resource extinction?



- Concern that so many game wardens have been eliminated. Alberta has two biologists while Montana has 100 – why is it not important to Alberta?
- Overview – counting grizzly bears? More bears than ever before - grizzly bears recovery plan. Where is the information?
- Number of bears is much greater than the government says.
- Indicator species – aquatic species are good indicators (cutthroat, bull trout) not just grizzlies.
- How will SSRP affect my licensed, stockable pond? I have worked to improve the creek and pond.
- How will proposed dams affect grazing leases and PLUZ grazing areas?
- How will we manage grizzly bears around ranches/cattle under current threats of sanction for protecting ourselves?
- Also concerned that the Government of Alberta find solutions to maintain feral horse numbers at reasonable levels (sustainable).
- Make the plan more transparent with regards to management intent – chart insufficient to relate how it affects them (show permitted/not permitted uses on a poster board/poster).
- Concerned about the protection of the remaining species such as the sage grouse, burrowing owl, the curlew, hawk and the longspur. We need to pause and reflect on our headlong voracious appetite for resource development without regard for nature's millions of years of development.
- Please support the federal government's emergency order to protect the Greater Sage-Grouse under the *Species at Risk Act*, slated to come into force on February 2014. I understand that the City of Medicine Hat and LGX Oil & Gas Inc. have filed an application to the Federal Court seeking a judicial review of the order, which would suspend the order for six months. In spite of this resistance, please act to protect this endangered prairie animal.

Conservation Areas

- Proposed provincial parks – concerned that these areas will limit recreational areas (jeopardize livelihood of OHV for future generations – if OHV users are restricted in these areas, where will they go to recreate?)
- Maintain gravel roadways in south west area of region (west of Highway 6, south of Highway 3) to maintain reduced use of the area.
- Implementation of nodal camping areas/nodes do not have to correlate with OHV trail access:
 - Limited space for multiple users
 - Increase funding for enforcement – how is enforcement happening?



- Clarification of the strategy for land-use purposing (monetary comparison) should be explained – OHV revenue in Alberta is equal to revenue in logging industry in Alberta.
- Clear cutting destroys trails and then new trails need to be created – forestry should create new trails when they destroy trails.
- Should be allowed to drive ATV's on roads when trails are blocked – side roads have little or no traffic, might be able to close some trails if can use roads.
- Enforcement for OHV's is not nearly enough. Need more officers and much heavier penalties.
- What is a trail plan? Does the province have accurate mapping of where the trails are? What is an access management plan? (too much red tape) – ATV's need to cross creeks/ivers; if not allowed to cross, then who builds the needed bridges?
- Should have different types of ATV trails – mud bogs and sustainable trails; easy, medium, hard rides.
- Castle area shouldn't be in conservation; it should be for off-highway vehicles – if (13) conservation, should still maintain off-highway vehicle access and camping access.
- Need to have balance of conservation and recreation – need to maintain recreation.
- By not permitting people to random camp in an area, they move to another area – higher concentration of people in a smaller area equals more garbage and footprint in a single area.
- Just because a small amount of people are not responsible users doesn't mean land access should be restricted (most are responsible users).
- Livingstone Range area is good for hunting, snowmobiling and camping.
- Too much conservation area, not balance with recreation.
- Castle area – prime access for Alberta to British Columbia trail system; Castle conservation area cuts access.
- Crowsnest Pass area (removing 13 world class snowmobile area with conservation area).
- By designating random camping area, it gets away from the idea of random camping – they just become campgrounds.
- Where is the enforcement in the areas? Not enough enforcement officers to enforce the rules and regulations that we currently have.
- By restricting access to areas, it forces people to a more concentrated area – now it makes it easier to enforce but is not good for the land user.



- The studies that form the conservation areas – are the assumptions and results accurate? (i.e. grizzly bear habitat).
- Need to protect off-highway vehicle trails as people with disabilities cannot hike and ATV's are how they recreate.
- Eastern 9 District Owner:
 - They have about 600,000 acres of land (private)
 - Public has access on their land so they have experience with recreation issues
 - They have two sites with 400 stalls and during summer almost 100 per cent full at all times
 - Kinbrook Provincial Park usually full due to reservation process but actually most drop (1/3 no show)
 - E10 willing to work with Government of Alberta to increase the size of Kinbrook (for at least the last 10 years)
 - They didn't want random camping so set up 12 sites that were fenced – this did not work, so they move to the two sites with 400 stalls
 - In the past 15 years, they have had a policing policy which works well except for motorcycles
 - Looking at the draft, they feel that the Government of Alberta will have enforcement/policing policy issue
 - Plan talks about a 30 per cent target for water by 2015 – they think this is just direction and not a must; if it becomes a must then they have concerns
 - Happy that private land is not being affected
- Castle area – proposed wildland park should include the valleys – if not, it is a mockery of conservation.
- Random camps – what does managed mean?
 - Don't dictate
 - Don't want like campground (Don't want it to be like campground)
 - Annual fee to random camp
 - \$50 annually – like Banff Park pass
 - Need enforcement – is costly
 - Stiff fines if (no) pay
 - Registration on quads – where does that go, should go to parks – not getting anything out of it
 - Don't charge us more



- Critical of plan for Castle area - must protect valley bottoms.
- High level of protection needed for entire Castle area – iconic area for southern Alberta
- Castle wilderness should be a Provincial Park.
- Conservation areas – Wildland Provincial Parks – should not allow OHV in conservation areas away from population centers.
- No motorized vehicles and OHV in the backcountry – have only low impact types of recreation in these areas.
- Conservation areas – what is undisturbed defined as? What about areas that have plans for industrial development but have not yet developed?
- Should not remove trails and roads without a management plan in conservation areas – what would be done to replace the trails if removed?
- Double negative use in activities not allowed in conservation area.
- Concern Castle conservation areas are only protecting higher elevations.
- Flooding is a concern – business as usual. Want clear cutting eliminated. Roads are reclaimed after harvesting.
- Linear footprint management by 2017 implemented as soon as possible. Do not wait until 2017.
- Hydraulic fracturing needs to be stopped until we understand the effect on groundwater.
- Little faith in process to meet conservation outcomes.
- Prevent people parking trailers on public land for months at a time.
- Need clear signage of different zones so people know where they are.
- Concern that aboriginal traditional uses are disappearing – why is it a criteria for conservation areas?
- OHV – Ghost, Waiparous, McLean areas are a mess – more restrictions and control – misuse on hiking trails causing severe erosion.
- Without enforcement of parks, conservation and recreational areas, all of this planning is for not/useless.
- Expand Kananaskis Country down to Old Man along highway 40, down trunk road and to the folly – Old Man Road can be the boundary.
- Upper Oldman River Area and Beehive – no motorized access. Moving onto private lands – elk are leaving/less prominent in areas, grizzly bears have left because too much activity, elk aren't migrating.
- Laws, adequate fines and enforcement.
- Private land is not acting like habitat reserve.



- Enforce protected areas - fines, pull out trailers, and 14 day maximums not enough.
- Alice and Chinook expansion and Provincial Park designation supported: ski trail grooming currently a local society, after Provincial Park designation, who will maintain it? Cross country area in PLUZ portion will need trail designation.
- Colman (Star Creek) Staging Area – clarify intent – crosses gas line, doesn't make sense, is there demand? #18 is where staging is needed (McGillvery) – needs maintenance.
- Who will be responsible for maintaining public lands and their use?
- Shift in the way the government has approached maintaining the infrastructure, a lot of red tape for individual groups (NGO's) being able to go out to sustain areas. Will increase with release of the plan due to the many levels or layers of government.
- Grant system is currently being used versus having a group that can maintain areas for sustainability – forestry used to be responsible for this.
- Knowledge of how the plan will be instituted.
- Objection of the taxpayer being restricted on using public lands paid for by their taxes and by this plan.
- Great ideas that may not come to fruition if there is not a system in place to enforce and maintain/sustain these areas laid out in the plan.
- Restricted access to Quad Squad unless they took responsibility/liability for what was being done.
- Page 145: Do not support #7 Chinook expansion that allows grazing – should be no grazing allowed.
- Do not support Livingstone Wildland Park.
- Enforcement of Recreation and Parks Areas.
- Percentage of trail development dedicated to enforcement.
- Balance to the use of the beautiful spaces.
- Protect headwaters – include entire Castle wilderness area.
- Want continued vehicle access to ice climbing areas along north Ghost and Waiparous (flood damage to trails/access – check Ghost access plan for detail).
- Increased access to recreation areas can cause more flooding – recreation access is not worth losing your homes in a flood.
- 45 per cent of current Alberta population, not enough land for recreation purposes.
- Lack of connectivity between conservation areas – difficult to manage.



- One ecosystem with three different designations.
- Do not like restrictions put on public land use within parks – prefer wilderness recreation area (i.e. Castle area).
- The Castle provides 65 per cent of our water. Would like to see the area south of Beaver Mines as conservation lands and protect more than it is. Only two logging roads but forestry is north of the highway.
- Safety issues of recreating on the trails at night. Would like to enforce by user pays to pay for enforcement. To a point user groups try to enforce, but we need the “authority” uniform.
- Cut out the trails – a lot of revenue is lost in the province (i.e. fuel, equipment, etc.).
- This is family outdoor recreation.
- There is not a bear shortage in this area.
- Full support of timber harvesting in the Castle.
- The enforcement in these areas is the main issue.
- When you take the OHV’s off the road, then everyone goes in the ditch and destroys more environment; doesn’t make sense.
- The connections aren’t really there among the trails in the OHV area.
- When they close down areas such as Waiparous and Beaver Mines then it just moves people to other areas and puts pressure on new areas.
- There isn’t an issue during hunting season – shows that people can work together in this area without regulations.
- Support the controlling of random camping in Castle area. Environment and Sustainable Resource Development needs to control these people.
- Yearly pass for camping and OHV would be good.
- Should look at charging more than \$100, which would filter out people that just want to trash the place.
- The user fee has to go to trail and site maintenance and enforcement, not to general taxes.
- Should encourage memberships and need to enforce registration so that government knows how many people are actually using the area.
- Other places such as Utah charge a small amount (\$40) for out of province.
- British Columbia relies on user groups to police passes.
- Should be able to pay user fees at any place.
- Another idea is forced membership - then you know that your money is going to trail maintenance.



- Really want to ensure that there is public consultation when it comes to closing specific trails. Worries that by agreeing to this plan that you're agreeing to whatever the government wants to close in the trail system.
- Should let the OHV's on municipal roads, will alleviate the pressure on the backcountry.
- The pressure on camping will only grow in the next period of time; need to increase the space but not increase the cost. How do private individuals break-even but the government sites can't?
- Synergy among OHV's and horse riding can be found – the OHV's clear a path for the horses.
- The map should show the forestry trunk road – this is a main access for OHV use.
- So much pressure on south slopes because government closed areas west of Calgary.
- How was logging approved in Hidden Creek after imposing a moratorium on logging? Logging not appropriate in Castle.
- Quad user:
 - Enforcement is poor
 - Suggests size restrictions and weight restrictions (i.e. regular quads equals 500-800 lbs., newer quads heavier, wider)
 - No signs on trails that indicate types of vehicles and dimensions that are permitted
 - Staging areas – should have maps (not always available) – also need bathrooms, waste receptacles
 - Not enough conservation officers – suggests US format: often have weight restrictions and posts limiting entrance to certain vehicle widths. US often will close down trails between April-November, while Alberta does not
- Access for recreation use:
 - Map inadequate – need topographic info
 - Infringement on license of occupation for Castle
 - Lack of enforcement in Castle area. Due to close of trails in other areas the pressure on trails has moved to the Castle area
 - Penalties not significant to make an impact
 - 80 per cent of trails have been closed in last 15 years
- If you want to impact tourism, they need a place to go.
- There needs to be a way to regulate without privacy being eroded.



- This plan erodes what has already been created.
- If you keep closing things off, you also close off opportunities for families and future generations to experience some of the outdoor wonders – in a responsible manner.
- Support the allowing of OHV's in High Rock; needs enforcement from the government in order to be effective.
- Regulation doesn't have place in certain areas; worries about government being involved.
- More expansion for Castle region – not big enough.
- More enforcement for random camping area.
- Logging should be done more sustainably – clear cutting shouldn't happen.
- Enforcement – been (on) fireworks in this area creating a dangerous environment for enforcement.
- Motorcycles should be banned all over – they destroy a lot. Get the government to provide a motocross area.
- Need to enforce the rules – shouldn't be giving such small fines. Need more boots on the ground rather than office people. (should be \$1000, second offense is to confiscate).
- Random camping is atrocious, needs enforcement. Perhaps should restrict or create infrastructure to control.
- Upper Old Man/Old Man Campground - all land north of there should be restricted, i.e. Beehive restricted (from the falls north).
- Support controlled logging – reduces wildfires and increases feed areas for bears and ungulates.
- Enforcement – need to ask people for registration. Self-regulation should work. Look at the States where you pay more and you can drive on roads.
- User fees should be for everyone (hikers to Jeepers).
- Need better mapping to show trails that are responsible, good for quadding and don't cause degradation. Need to be looped so people don't make their own trails.
- Restricted access – walk if you want to fish in the Castle area (or horses).
- New conservation areas says that oil and gas, logging, etc. are incompatible to conservation, then they go and allow these activities in the areas – very confusing.
- The area is too diverse to plan. Would be easier to separate the areas.
- More enforcement and steeper fines for OHV's – confiscation if they have too many violations.



- User fees could be self-sustaining, and if the penalties are severe enough to make people think twice about doing it again.
- Castle area:
 - Concern green area limits hunting uses
 - Better policing/fines for vandalism
 - Increase enforcement powers of forestry rangers
 - Castle Falls - agree in management intent, hope to see more enforcement
 - Leaseholders – limit access to public based on use of land (i.e. grazing) - how to get access to Crown land through leased lands?
 - Like to see multiuse trails and better management and access of them
 - Random camping missing on land-use tables – support fees to access random camping areas
 - 14-day rule needs enforcement – buy 14-day permits and post them on campground
 - Enforcement officers – not enough
 - Change perception of off-highway vehicle use – that’s small percentage of users – can be used for hunting, berry picking, wildlife watching, etc.
 - Unrestricted grazing through and near water courses should not be allowed to continue, especially in green areas and leased land – all south of Castle to north of Raise Horse and Dutch Creek
 - How will this be enforced?
 - Who’s accountable?
 - Empower forestry officers
 - First 14-day pass free then pay system
- Bring back forest rangers and wardens with authority to take people to court – heavy fines – this should solve most of the existing disturbance and damage. Follow existing policy – enforce it.
- Recreational fees and other recreation specific fees must go back into supporting recreation infrastructure and use.
- Trails are a means to get where off-roaders want to play – not what users want to play on.
- OHV is supported – don’t pick on us for destroying habitat – grazing practices are having serious impacts (Dutch Creek – Old Man Race Horse; zone 402 – hunting zone).
- No more parks that limit bikes and OHV use.



- Pro random camping and don't agree with the abuse going on, but there's no enforcement happening – preserve random camping for generations.
- Open areas west of Calgary (i.e. Cypress) – reduce impact on land base by dispersing users – Calgary users are now in south recreation areas.
- Charge a fee for random camping/use of public land – go to enforcement and building trail system (leads to tourism):
 - Fees eliminate bad apples
 - Fines need to be large enough to be a deterrent (i.e. driving in rivers)
- Castle/Crown environmental values should be protected at lower elevations.
- Connectivity between valleys in Castle should be protected.
- Any logging should be sustainable/low impact (i.e. not south facing slopes, leaving stands).
- To reduce cumulative impact, do not improve open camping sites.
- As a taxpayer – how are we going to pay for this when there is a higher demand for health care, education, and flood mitigations (with a decreasing middle class sector)?
- Around Canmore there isn't enough environmental protection.
- Most areas need to be protected in entirety, not just the top (i.e. Highwood Valley).
- SSRP must deal with the extreme OHV impacts caused by people who do not use respect; supportive of the responsible recreation users.
- OHV use should not be permitted in conservation areas.
- No mud bogging (trucks).
- OHV's have no place in Wildland Provincial Parks or in the Castle conservation area.
- Potential conflict and rub between the opening of more lands to recreation vehicles with protection of land – manage very carefully.
- Make OHV issue a level playing field. If recreational quadders can't use the trails, the ranchers fixing fences shouldn't use the trails either.
- GOA should consider (reasonably priced) random camping permits and designated trail fees to help pay for enforcement.
- Conservation personnel know that many stay beyond 14 days, yet they don't enforce it.



What is missing in the draft SSRP?

Biodiversity Management Framework

- Areas of headwaters should have minimized access but not removed.
- Bank erosion from free range cattle, not just off highway vehicles.
- Have areas that are designated for winter ATV use that are sensitive in the summer but not the winter.
- Protect the big sage brush – is missing – lower elevation ecosystem.
- Hydraulic fracturing and oil use regulations.
- Species at risk need to be saved.
- Financial analysis to show whose resources are financially viable.
- Ecological good and services – must be an educational component.
- Saving just one species will put others in the broader ecosystem at risk – should consider all.

Conservation Areas

- Should make an inventory of OHV trails and protect them.
- Tourism should include OHV recreation as world class tourism – Castle area is great area for OHV trails (these two objectives do not meet up).
- More emphasis on monitoring and enforcement – details needed, who/how/when – present is inadequate, not enough staff on ground to do what need to do.
- Critical to consider protection for Eastern Slopes Forest.
- More grassland protection throughout areas mentioned in RAC – not included in this draft.
- Very little new areas in the draft, instead it's just areas already protected.
- Phase 2 to Phase 3 need more protected areas. Castle area 100 square kilometres as a wildland park. Valleys as well as tops of mountains need to be protected.
- Proposed conservation areas in Ghost Livingstone, Porcupine and Kananaskis country need to be protected.
- Area around Wildhorse – intact native grassland protected as much as possible.
- Connectivity maps need to be reintroduced – what happened to these?
- We need to save the mountain parks.
- How and where are the various management intents shown on the map?



- Beehive area should be expanded eastward to Pekisko Mountain range area.
- Create map showing nature conservatory land holdings.
- Need sub-regional plans – provide enough detail.
- Wording of what types of vehicles can access areas.
- Some rules for everyone for Wildland Parks.
- Where is the designated trail map?
- There should be a trail map that will be updated, and support the fact that they're working with local groups to plan future trails by consultation and by GPS.
- What is happening on west Castle?
- Equestrian camping should be encouraged.
- Black Creek should be on the list. Part of Bob Creek, Black Creek is a restricted area.
- Little mention in the plan about non-motorized recreational use – OHV's shouldn't get priority.
- Castle/Crown environmental values should be protected at lower elevations.
- Connectivity between valleys in Castle should be protected.
- Any logging should be sustainable/low impact (i.e. not south facing slopes, leaving stands).
- Will new proposed parks affect the ability to have grazing leases?
- The Castle is not well protected – no use protecting rock and ice and leaving the valleys unprotected. Too much logging and OHV's in the Castle. Government needs to get serious about conserving watersheds. Logging in Castle has no benefits, only impacts.
- How about a wheel tax on OHV's in the PLUZ/green area? We need some way of fostering a sense of ownership and responsibility. This money could be used for maintenance and enforcement.
- When the environment suffers, everyone will – even those that are only in the wilderness for OHV recreation.
- Above 7000 feet not much to protect – valleys are fair game.
- Not heard – Castle area – officers need mandate to enforce: random camping and ATV are out of control; need more officers, need authority to do job and clear direction.
- Conservation areas – can't just be the top of Castle, must be bottom as well.



- Mud bidders are in charge.
- Enforcement is lacking.
- Not enough protection – should be more.
- Protecting the mountaintop does worse than nothing – of course those areas are to be protected from logging. There are no trees up there. The draft plan is disappointing.
- Grazing leases have evolved over 130 years and should be left alone. Pleased with draft plan in general.
 - Less conservation area around Castle – good
 - Status quo – range management plan is effective
 - Landowners are best possible stewards (lessees)
- It is inconsistent that linear additions (in valleys?) are proposed for the Don Getty expansion areas, but valleys are not included in the Castle conservation area and Castle Wildland Park – include the valleys in the park/conservation area.

Integrated Management of Public Land and Stewardship of Private Lands

Support for integrated management of public land and stewardship of private lands and why.

Integrated Management of Public Land

- Proposed conservation areas protect headwaters (good), but not endangered fish habitats – bull trout.
- Linear footprint management – first step is control of access to lands- access management is very important, especially with leaseholder's liability.
- Address growing recreation needs and manage high impact recreation – how do you effectively marry these two?
- Support wildland for outfitting improvements.
- Native grassland (fescue and short mixed grass) conservation areas? Last remaining intact Plains Rough Fescue is to the west/north of Cypress Hills.
- Expanded wildlife and grasslands – support.
- Conservation of native grasslands; they do not come back, no developments should be considered.



Stewardship of Private Lands

- Support of conservation on private lands; was in support of previous conservation strategies.

Concerns about integrated management of public land and stewardship of private lands and why.

Integrated Management of Public Land

- Green area – leaseholders managing access – how does this happen and do other interests (i.e. hunting) need permission from leaseholder to access land?
- Green area/public – conflict between timber production and biodiversity due to clear cutting – need to better manage the timber production.
- Random camping is encouraged in designated areas is not strong enough, how will those not encouraged be reprimanded?
- Garbage removal in winter – keeps bears away.
- Regarding headwater protection – protection in the valley areas. Top to bottom protection in Castle Area – would like to see it as a Wildland Provincial Park.
- Recreation/OHV's need more enforcement and education.
- Grizzly bears have more than recovered and using them to restrict access should not be happening.
- We need fewer restrictions on snowmobile access, not more.
- Gate going up to Lost Lake (north) has boulders blocking the gate – the boulders are very dangerous to snowmobiles in the winter when the gate is open for access, as they are barely hidden and get hit by snowmobiles. The gate is also a hazard, it has flags.
- Where do snowmobilers go if more area gets designated as parks? There is a creeping lack of access. They can have the current parks; all we want is some access.
- Do grizzly bears have priority over people? People should have priority.
- Very concerned about enforcement, lack of it.
- Incorporating existing integrated resource plans are in contradiction to:
 - Headwaters, wetlands, groundwater and riparian areas need better protection
 - Biodiversity and critical habitat need to be maintained; opportunities to maintain or enhance ecological goods and services



- Integrated resource plans are also 30 years old, outdated and do not meet today's demands on the landscape and increased populations
- Parts are workable, but spirit and focus no longer relevant – need to match today's land use intent of preservation, conservation and longevity
- Need to create more opportunity for learning, awareness so people are more informed to make comments on the plan.
- Designated trails and trails in general need enforcement and monitoring (i.e. snowmobiles use cross-country ski trails).
- Concerned about lack of connectivity of conservation areas for wildlife.
- Theme in plan of robust growth goes against conservation – what about the value of natural capital?
- One third of the area is not enough to prevent flooding.
- Hydraulic fracturing should not be permitted in any area near to the areas included in these Eastern Slopes maps.
- Any offsets should take place in the same area to keep the objectives of the land in the surrounding community/area. Set proximity limits to offsets.
- Overlap of walking versus motorized hunters in the green zone.
- Promote non-motorized trail use.
- Allow/coordinate aggressive OHV use on future logging roads/utility areas. Then logging occurs, and the area is rested (in the proposed cut areas).
- Can't shut everything down for public use.
- Communications not reaching youth and young adults.
- Should consider Tent Mountain near Highway 3 as a recreation area.
- Need to ensure fair access to grazing leases for public recreation – very concerned these public lands are not accessible to public and current process allows leaseholders to play games and not permit reasonable access.
- Need enforcement for recreation.
- Need trails system and shouldn't require reclaiming of roads that could be part of the trail system (i.e. Atlas Road).
- Need specified penalties in Public Land Administration Regulation.
- Off road vehicles need to be controlled/mitigated to not harm the environment.
- Will Eastern Slopes affect grazing leases?
- Let us resolve to finalize a plan that makes us proud to be Albertans for hundreds of years



- Foresight
- Fierce protection of vulnerable environment
- Conserve and enhance biodiversity
- A good action plan needs to be decided by both parties.
- More enforcement needed in recreation areas – Castle area is only protected above 7000 feet; biodiversity needs more protection, headwaters need more study and protection. What happened to Castle Special Place (1998)?
- As a local OHV dealer and avid land user, it is very important to me, our business and several others that we do not lose the land-use privileges we currently have should this act take place.
- What will the designated trails be? Will it include existing OHV trails/ areas? For example, can we designate trails we currently use like old roads, cut lines, etc.?
- Why can't licensed/registered quads ride on numbered gravel roads? They are forced to ride in the ditch which causes more damage.
- Why can't they open up more lease land along the Old Man (for example)? Opening up these lease areas would relieve pressures on the Eastern Slopes.
- Need enforcement of OHV recreation at peak periods and for all existing relevant regulations.
- People who quad avoid paid campsites because they can't ride their quads.
- Why does GOA fight OHV's?
 - Work with them – works in Quebec, North Carolina – users with a recreation background need to be involved
- Random camping should be 14 days max. People spending the whole summer out there (hog prime sites); they park trailers to save the spot but they only come out on weekends.
 - Enforce this.
 - Trail/random camping fee would provide dollars to enforce
- Should charge for random camping and trails access – use dollars for enforcement of those damaging creeks/land.
- Current recreation area sites too small for new RV units.
- Need more dumpsters on public land (collect garbage – better to have a haul it out philosophy).
- Concern about continually pushing people out – more impact on other areas (too much concentration now in the south).



- Management decisions should be based on people who use the area (people who have knowledge of area).
- Dollars should go to groups like Quad Squad – don't mind paying fee for trails, enforcement.
- Make penalties for bad actions more costly.
- Shutting an area down results in more pressure in other areas (i.e. Atlas Road – removal of crossing has concentrated activity to south).
- Fees need to funnel back to users and trails program (not government general revenue).
- ATV trail bike access – selective closures for rest, but open areas up to compensate – rotate – including Kananaskis Country.
- Remote gravel recreation access roads (forest gravel roads only) – allow OHV's to use edge of road (otherwise get trail development and ditch erosion).
- Ontario – does trail fees, sticker on quad – helps pay for management (garbage, enforcement):
 - Make affordable
 - Allow different options (daily/weekly/monthly) – allows for once a year hunters, etc.
- Getting lots of pressure in the south from Calgary – finish trail system near Calgary to take pressure off.
- Concerns with logging industry and environmental impacts.
- Trail closures on Eastern Slopes is concerning.
- If you designate lands for recreation you have to enforce (i.e. camping, quadding) – instead of closing trails and areas, enforce them. Where is the staff to monitor? Compare the cost of the whole SSRP process- apply it instead to where enforcement could be implemented.
- Native grassland in white area: should minimize, is not correct – too weak, no sales.
- Not enough east – no new grassland protection, this is needed (needs another look at).
- Conservation of grasslands – should not break out into cultivation or other uses – maintain what we have.
- White area/public – doesn't sell intact grasslands and find way to protect them.
- Support addressing the conversion and sales of intact grassland.
- Access to Poll Haven grazing – lease access needs to be policed/ reviewed. OHV's are a serious problem for environmental damage (it's critical).



- We need changes to access on Poll Haven grazing lease.
- Creeks in Poll Haven grazing lease are being destroyed. The illegal OHV use is relentless. An access plan is great but useless without enforcement or monitoring.
- People have a mentality that they own the land which translates into disrespect. They need to start applying heavy fines for rule breakers – there must be consequences to environmental damage.
- Motorized recreation is a plague that is out of control. Riparian damage, erosion, gates left open, etc. – evidence shows that SSRP can't protect waterways if they are being destroyed by OHV's.
- It's not access to Poll Haven that is the issue, it's the need to control who accesses the area and what they are permitted to do there. It's just the bad behavior that is the issue.
- At Poll Haven, we pay the costs and the taxes yet incur costs from recreation damage and the extraction of lumber. Happy to pay for fencing, etc. but not taxes, it's not fair.
- Poll Haven – we need the stocking rates reviewed. Currently we need more stock on the area to control aspens – can't apply Eastern Alberta Grazing Management to Poll Haven.
- Access of Poll Haven is an issue – improve roads.
- Public land not for sale.
- Grasslands conservation – need to do that instead of agriculture.
- Crested wheat grass takes over native species, need incentives to control this (more money for grazing or agriculture).
- All grassland should be maintained, public and private – need land caveat or conservation easements.
- Is the assignment process for heritage rangelands going to be the same?
- What about watershed protection in the white area? There is still significant amounts of runoff in these areas, so there should be some attention given to this.
- Grasslands should be used for food production – grazing is inefficient.
- How were the irrigation areas set?
- Do not support the sale or development of native grasslands.
- Grasslands are being lost and have a dramatic effect on agriculture/ grazing.
- Concerned that native grassland changed because of fear for property rights.



- Stewardship conservation – mention incentives because there is a fear of lost property rights on native grasslands for conservation. There are good ways to support working on the land and caring of the land.
- Manage public land – native grassland policy should be no loss of native grassland.
- Irrigation must not be allowed on public lands that are native grasslands.
- Irrigation districts should not be allowed to increase their water licenses – if irrigation is to expand, water must be from existing licenses.
- The government needs to have the courage to end the allowance of leaseholders of public/Crown land (in both the green and white areas) of receiving money from subsurface energy/mineral royalties.
- Need to use land effectively as well (individual sites and areas of adjacent lands) – are there not more recreation site opportunities in the white area? With population growth, will not new and expanded sites be needed?
- The province should use the SSRP to do more to protect good (and excellent) agricultural land from ad hoc/random commercial/industrial development along highway corridors and outside urban municipalities. Strong policies could work. Another path is through innovative tools already existing in the Land Stewardship Act. Promote those tools. Develop good regulations under *Alberta Land Stewardship Act (ALSA)*.
- Land Trust Grant Program – what makes lands “better off” under conservation group’s management? (Versus grazing community)
- Land Exchange Program – intent- keep intact grasslands, don’t trade at the expense of one industry/individual need and for marginal lands (ABP).
- Private agricultural land – encourage more use of innovative tools allowed under *Alberta Land Stewardship Act* (offsets/easements) to promote conservation of Ag land that could be impacted by light industrial development (equipment storage/warehousing) – we need to think beyond 10 years in this regard; Ag land is of fixed supply.
- Poll Haven – OHV’s and trucks are tearing up grasslands and riparian areas (bogs), and grazing disposition holders are under scrutiny to maintain stocking rates while recreationalists can do whatever they want – more enforcement is needed.
- Would conservation offsets allow industry to purchase lands?
 - Ensure conservation offset doesn’t allow individuals to enter program and then exchange lands
- Ensure public access (hunting) not limited by biodiversity management framework or new SSRP policies.



- Shouldn't be irrigating native grasslands to farm it (wasting water).
- Opposed to using fresh water in an attempt to make native grasslands – make it something different than meant to be.
- Do not support expanded irrigation onto native.
- Further east, I want to see a Heritage Rangeland designation for remnant native grasslands in the Milk River Ridge and Wild Horse Plain areas as well as along key stretches of wild rivers. As we await the final regional plan, there must be a moratorium on further leases and surface disturbance of native grassland to ensure that no further losses of this important and grossly under protected habitat occur.

Stewardship of Private Lands

- What is the representation of viewpoints – who are the people that are contributing to the conversation? (per cent of population engaged in the plan and from what viewpoints).
- Concerns with stewardship on private land.
- More control for leaseholders over recreation users in leaseholds.
- Private property rights must be respected – this is not happening now, so must be returned.
- Concern around stewardship and conservation on private lands - do not want to leave wording vague enough to allow paid access for hunting/ fishing/trapping (strategy A, bullet #4).
- Perhaps the stewardship needs to be less integrated and more protective of forests and wetlands on a very large scale.
- Is there any changes to leases holding that could potentially change mortgages/loans, etc. for leased lands?
- There needs to be better or easier ways for landowners to get assistance in committing well owners to reclaim their abandoned or retired oil and gas wells. Who do we contact to ensure surface reclamation?
- Ensure the independence of the Air and Soil Monitoring Authority (not being influenced by government and industry).
- Would like recognition that farmers take care of the land and wildlife including the negative impacts wildlife has on agriculture.
- Erosion of landowner rights.
- Farm vacations – could government encourage this? Through incentives?

What is missing in the draft SSRP?



Integrated Management of Public Land

- Industry clarity – put rules into the plan now to create clarity.
- Why not more heritage lands proposed in East? Many Berries area?
- Parks officials and management staff must be increased.
- Enforcement – Solicitor General; Mixed-use – non-motorized and motorized; multi-use – dirt bike and quads, jeeps, etc.
- Would there ever be funding for quad gates so that users could cross gates/fences without leaving gates open (too many gates get left open).
- Need to connect recreation trails with other jurisdictions like British Columbia and Montana. It would be good to have trails connecting Alberta and British Columbia – formal designation and lines across the provinces.
- More detail (trails) – enough clear intent to know sense of what on the ground policy might look like – process, governance, dispute resolution.
- Look at other jurisdictions for what works (i.e. MOAB- Colorado) – Europe, US are high density areas that have figured out how to have trails that co-exist.
- Need an appeal process if trail or all access plans strays from original intent – need to assure congruence from intent to deliver on the ground.
- Need riparian corridor protection for all major river corridors (Bow, Milk, S. Sask., and Old Man).
- Pictures in plan – would help with context and understanding, language in workbook more helpful.
- Need more innovation with economic aspects (i.e. renewables) – life after oil and gas? (more efficient water use).
- Not clear – how much protection of wetlands in the Eastern Slopes.
- How much protection from deforestation on the Eastern Slopes.
- Criteria for multiuse corridors (MUCs) – include public consultation process, more detail on public interest.
- Need to see boundaries for public land area for recreation/tourism.
- When are you going to fill in right hand side of map?
- Stark contrast with no new protected areas/conservation areas in prairies east of Highway 2. Why is everything focused on Eastern Slopes?
- How about a license levy on OHV registration (a trail pass) for funding trail maintenance and enforcement.
- In trail planning, consider what appropriate use based on vehicle type and landscape (weight restriction?) – i.e. some places for dirt bikes might not be appropriate for sport utility vehicles.



- Atlas/Window Mountain area – trail planning.
- Are there maps available that show old gravel pits, coal mines, etc. – possible recreation/trail value.
- Distance between linear disturbances should be included with intact native grasslands map – other land use intensity should be included on map as well.
- Grasslands, wetlands protection management.
- Why doesn't white area map show intact grassland – looks bare on main map.
- Need to create incentives for farmers to keep native grasslands native.
- Did the Cypress Hills fragmentation study get applied to this study? What about wildfires? Heavy on flooding, what about other environmental concerns?
- Where did heritage rangelands go?
- Does Bill 28 have the final say on SSRP? A copy of Bill 28 should be provided so people will know what the intent of Government of Alberta is.
- Map doesn't show northern portion of the region (i.e. large area north of Brooks).

Stewardship of Private Lands

- Privately owned land must be regulated for waste and natural resources development.
- Greater hunting and fishing regulation.
- Military reserve regulation of land use concerning waste disposal.
- Define private property rights.
- Education on private property land rights needed.



Outcome 3:

Air quality is managed to support healthy ecosystems and human needs through shared stewardship

The objective for advancing air quality is as follows:

- Releases from various point and non-point sources are managed so they do not collectively result in unacceptable air quality.

Support for the air quality management framework in the draft SSRP:

Concerns about the air quality management framework in the draft SSRP:

- Air quality – impact on air quality comparison between highly populated areas (use of lawnmowers, leaf blowers, gas-powered household tools, etc.) versus OHV emissions is very different (OHV emissions have lower impact on air quality than household tools).
- Industry that pollutes should not be promoted.
- Concerned about air quality and the monitoring plan.

What is missing in the draft SSRP?



Outcome 4:

Watersheds are managed to support healthy ecosystems and human needs through shared stewardship

The objective for surface water quality is as follows:

- Surface water quality in Bow, Oldman, South Saskatchewan and Milk rivers is managed so current and future water uses are protected.

The objective for enhancing integrated watershed management is as follows:

- Regional approaches and tools support integrated management of water and aquatic ecosystems.

Support for the water quality management framework and strategies for advancing watershed management in the draft SSRP:

- Surface water quality management framework.
- Headwaters, groundwaters and wetlands need monitoring and protection.
- Supports funding for watershed management (RDRWA) – preparations now for droughts (not if but when it comes).

Concerns about the water quality management framework and strategies for advancing watershed management in the draft SSRP:

- No feed lots west of Highway 2 as it is part of the watershed area – see if we can remove existing feed lots or improve wastewater treatment.
- Prohibit confined feed operations in the watershed area to protect water quality downstream – west of Highway 2.
- Balance recreation with watershed protection.
- If no motorized access to watercourses, how does that conflict with trails for OHV's that cross watercourses?
- Multi-use corridors should be kept out of the Foothills and watershed; keep along existing corridors (i.e. highway corridors).
- Lands benefitting from irrigation should provide funding for watershed protection.
- Blanket statements over areas like non-motorized access in wetlands and watercourses are dangerous and often reflect the small minority that is disrespectful.



- Flood – watershed management – flood prevention?
 - Big picture planning so where is the flood control?
 - Flood tunnels from east end of reservoir to river to prevent flooding
 - Suggestion: Bow River needs another approach – diversion channel (tunnel) i.e. Winnipeg
 - > Bow River upstream of Bearspaw Dam in Bearspaw – south on west side of transportation corridor – go east, on south end of city back into river (hydraulic profile is higher)
 - > Aqueduct on Elbow River
 - > Go into aboriginal reserve
- Bow River flooding – need forests to mitigate.
- Too late to ask recreationists about their view.
- Why do snowmobiles have to stay on designated trails? They aren't hurting anything on snow.
- Government isn't going to take recreation stakeholders' views seriously. Environmental NGOs are working to end motorized access.
- Not enough attention to headwater function and cumulative effects.
- Sustainability is more important than growth. What is happening in southern Alberta is unsustainable, especially given reduced water.
- Concerned about water exports from the province – Alberta does not have spare water; no exports.
- Industrial (especially oil) uses too much water and pollutes large amounts of water, leaving it unusable for farming or wildlife purposes.
- Industry is not adequately regulated, is allowed to pollute without taking financial and ethical responsibility.
- Keep water in the river.
- Concern regarding spacing of horizontal wells and concentration of cattle operations (and effect on water).
- Residential water wells – location in relation to oil and gas wells; how well are wells cased and sealed?
- Industry needs much more regulation to prevent water, soil, air pollution.
- Why is grazing allowed in creeks/riparian but not motorized – fairness needed.
- Require off stream watering.
- Grazing areas and cattle in riparian areas are creating damage and need to be managed like OHV's.



- Headwaters – needs to be a large buffer than what the offset is now.
- Oil well drilling within city limits (west side, less than 1 km from Sunridge and Copperwood) – hydraulic fracturing - water degradation, coal mines, wildlife. Close to new schools, which is very dangerous.
- Water quality – Old Man headwaters – allow logging? Contradictory – not conservation.
- Old Man River- Castle region – plan says that development is the only cause of silt in waterways – need to look at logging and OHV use (motorized recreation).
- Water quality indicators – there are set indicators but then the plan says that there isn't enough info to set limits? There are well defined pesticides that should be used instead, or use these indicators for monitoring purposes.
- Ireland river/waterway management and energy generation methods should be considered – Willow Park Creek release into Pine Creek coulee – no mention of these areas and infrastructure in SSRP. Example to consider – China Yangtze River.
- Manage water from rain or snow for entire land mass – watershed is more than headwaters and mountain areas. Watershed – from the Great Divide to Mexico.
- The understanding of impacts on water need to be the primary concern and considerations for the plan.
- OHV users support watershed protection but many mapped water courses are in reality dry, have no defined channel or are ephemeral. They are less likely to be damaged by OHV's. Don't want to be penalized for dry water courses.
- All discharged (used) water should be treated and made potable.
- What is the impact from urban expansion on the quantity and quality of water resources? (public and industry).
- Does snowmobiling off a designated trail affect conservation imperatives? How does it hurt the landscape?
- Concern regarding negative impact on water caused by recreation.
- Will the SSRP shut down OHV use? The plan doesn't seem to make clear opportunities to ride/quad.
- Impact of hydraulic fracturing on water quality and impact on aquifers.
- Seismic impact on groundwater quality.
- Number one priority should be water and its protection.
- Headwaters protection needed to protect the entire watersheds.



- Prioritize headwaters, wetlands, groundwater riparian areas – protection now and pride ourselves as provincial leaders in this area.
- Do not knee jerk to flood mitigation, i.e. dry dam proposal; no guarantee flood will come again in that area.
- We try to conserve the quality of water, yet the municipalities, industry and private residents don't support it by their actions.
- No accountability with agriculture pursuits that don't monitor water used or if needed.
- Have incentives in place to put meters on pivots or reduce consumption.
- Why waste our water when it could remain in the ecosystem?

What is missing in the draft SSRP?

- How can you do a land-use plan without discussing water allocation?
- Show land that is currently being irrigated (to show/give the whole picture).
- Overall, water conservation measures are mentioned but not any process as to how to make it better than it is. Shouldn't keep going as is.
- Shortage of water runoff and catchments, storage solutions.
- Need more local monitoring of groundwater.
- Layer missing: availability of water.



Outcome 5: Community development needs are anticipated and accommodated

The following is a list of objectives for planning cooperation and integration:

- Cooperation and coordination are fostered among all land-use planners and decision-makers involved in preparing and implementing land plans and strategies;
- Knowledge sharing among communities is encouraged to promote the use of planning tools and the principles of efficient use of land to address community development in the region.

Calgary Regional Partnership

- Municipalities in the metropolitan areas are encouraged to work together to:
- Plan for future growth; and
- Decide on the criteria and decision-making processes for local and regional development approvals to the collective satisfaction of all members within their mandate.

Below is the objective for building sustainable communities:

- Ensure provincial government is provided to municipalities and other stakeholders to:
- Promote healthy and sustainable communities;
- Foster the establishment of land-use patterns for an orderly, economical and beneficial development, as well as to maintain and improve the quality of the built environment;
- Support timely planning and provision of social infrastructure;
- Contribute to the maintenance and enhancement of a healthy natural environment;
- Foster preservation of historic resources through responsible land-use management;
- Contribute to a safe, efficient and cost-effective transportation network; and
- Minimize risks to health, safety and loss to property damage as a result of land-use decisions.



Strengthening Communities

Support for the draft SSRP and why:

Concerns about the draft SSRP and why:

- Page 94 – Good to restrict development.
- Municipal items are vague – is the plan advocating higher density?
 - Duplication of policy in other provincial policies
 - Very little guiding information
- Who pays to restore flood damaged areas?
- How is development being controlled and where are the priority areas? Sprawl in Calgary and along Highway 22 is consuming prime agricultural land.
- Multiple uses – can be too open to any type of development – what does multiple uses mean; how to protect agricultural lands from development.
- Rules allow for enforcement, which helps protect the environment and people.
- Bill 28 – legislation needs to be in place in order for Government of Alberta to take responsibility.
- Urban/rural interface issues – educate on respect for private land like urban wants respect for their property. Urban town open spaces documents show arrow to private lands so its residents think private lands are parks.
- How do you measure quality of life? Page 106 – more specific about what aspects of population will be measured (i.e. growth).
- Conflict around municipalities and environmental conservation.
- Will the SSRP add an additional level of bureaucracy to approval processes?
- Keep decision making local.
- Page 91 of the Draft SSRP, Outcome 5, under the topic of Calgary Regional Partnership: “Municipalities in the metropolitan plan areas are encouraged to work together to:
 - Plan for future growth
 - Decide on the criteria and decision-making processes for local and regional development approvals to the collective satisfaction of all members within their mandate.” (page 91 excerpt) I would like to suggest removing the word “local” and replacing it with an alternative wording of: “issues of mutual interest” or “common planning issues” or just remove the words “local and.”



What is missing in the draft SSRP?

- Why not put Bill 28 into the draft – the concerns related to land-use planning rather than unelected body make the decisions.
- Setback for windmills and houses – needs to be addressed in the plan.
- We need to do a carrying capacity study for our region, province and nation to determine what a sustainable population would be.
- Need to engage municipalities in implementation of the plan.
- Ensuring financial supports for municipalities to do the collaboration and work.



Outcome 6:

The quality of life of residents is enhanced through increased opportunities for recreation, active living and the preservation and promotion of the region's unique cultural and natural heritage.

The objectives for enhancing recreation and cultural opportunities are as follows:

- A wide range of recreation experiences and tourism opportunities that meet the preferences of regional residents and visitors will be provided; and
- The artifacts, fossils, historic places and aboriginal heritage sites that define the region's distinctive character are identified and effectively managed.

Enhancing Recreation and Cultural Opportunities

Support for the draft SSRP and why:

- Good idea to attract people to managed areas for random camping.
- Very supportive of regional trails system and planning trails in new PLUZs
- Support better management of natural areas, but not removing existing recreation uses.
- Happy with plans for designated trails.
- Like the idea of the Blue Rock camping area expansion. Please consider keeping unserviced campsites to keep costs down for users.
- Support fee (seasonal) for random camping to help provide enforcement of existing rules.
- Supports trail system plan.

Concerns about the draft SSRP and why:

- Blending user groups (recreation – non-motorized and motorized) to minimize conflict:
 - Minimal width trails
 - Sustainable resources to minimize impact
 - Choking trails to reduce widening/overuse (reduce widths to prevent quad use/ATV use – leaves path open to motorcycles, hikers, horse trails)



- Concern that restricting recreational uses in certain areas is just relocating the problems and impacts to another area of the region.
- Reducing random camping will increase conflict of user groups on the area.
- ATV use subservient to environmental use and protection – west of Sundre and Caroline.
- Designated versus non-designated trail systems – how do the proposed new parks/expanding parks impact existing trails, particularly existing sustainable trails? Include grandfathering existing trail systems that will be incorporated into expanding wildlife conservation areas – enforcement and signage increase.
- The primary area of concern is the issues relating to the Ghost wilderness area.
- Support environmental management to maintain the resources for future generations.
- Our members have been very active in supporting Ghost access issues working with the various government agencies in the past.
- The area is extensively used and enjoyed by many in the climbing community, both in the summer for rock climbing and the winter for ice climbing.
- The winter ice is world class and provides a large amount of relatively safe climbing for many skills levels, much of it with low exposure to avalanche risk – this point allows climbers to frequent the Ghost when other areas are at a high risk level (guiding/tourist income).
- There is a limited amount of rock climbing in the north Ghost; it is accessible on foot in the summer months.
- Due to the distances, the river crossings and the remote environment climbing the many north Ghost ice climbs in the winter would be a serious undertaking, especially considering the amount of relatively inexperienced climbers that use the area as a training ground.
- Biggest concern is the potential loss of access to the north Ghost by vehicle.
- The access we are looking to maintain is a point A – B scenario; we are simply looking to get to the climbing as opposed to off-roading all over the place, we have in the past worked with keeping to marked trails.



- The Ghost has previously and recently with the 2013 flood damage gone through major intervention by man with respect to diverting portions of the north Ghost flow to Lake Minnewanka. This work is carried out in the river beds.
- The Ghost area has a lot of underground flow in the river beds and large stretches dry up during summer and winter with flow only being present during spring.
- Discouraged that motorized recreation wasn't acknowledged more – concern that won't be considered.
- Need to change access management to recreation management plans.
- Need a vehicle for raising funds to support trail development (need user fees and DAO; needs to go to trails).
- Make sure motorized recreations include 4 x 4 communities.
- Need to ensure diversity in trails and in recreation areas – need to recognize and plan for the expectations, needs and desired experiences of recreation groups.
- Ensure local input on recreation management plans.
- How are comments captured? How are key themes summarized?
- Impossible not to cross water in Waiparous – Know Before You Go exceptions to the rules against crossing the water.
- Reporting license numbers in the Don Getty area and no action was taken, so abuse should be followed up on.
- RAC was not sensitive to hunting and outdoor recreation enthusiasts.
- Trail system plan should be made up (with) user group representatives.
- Eastern Slopes stakeholder meetings did not include motorized (late 1980s, early 1990s- it mobilized the group back then).
- Would pay a user fee or put in designated amount of time.
- Most important step after SSRP is approved is to implement Appendix J on page 130.
- McLean Creek camping - non-ATV users camping on reservation, but some ATV users can't book in some areas. OHV zone campground should be OHV users only. Overflow will not open unless campground was full, even for staging wild horses etc.
- Regional: Trails plan will develop where trails should go; workbook is a good guide to provide feed.
- Forestry, cattle, oil and gas user need to have fairness in terms of usage.



- Appendix G, page 123 and on page 126 – on plan approval PLUZ are in place, where should the trail be? Will involve all stakeholders; primitive camping space will be PLRA (public land recreation areas) – be clear on the trails, designated, signage and fencing.
- It has to be based on common sense, not by the letter of the law.
- OHV management has improved over the last 10-15 years.
- Don't over-restrict random camping – can't be restrictive based on some "bad apples."
- Conflict between mountain bike trails in Bragg Creek area and lumber industry – trails will be removed and replaced with not the same type of trail.
- Recreation areas should have lands for all people and activities – separate recreation activities that are not compatible (i.e. golf courses and OHVs).
- Enforcement – who do you phone to report issues? Need to enforce the penalties, not just give warnings.
- Closely control OHV's due to the damage they do.
- With the current population growing, the potential for enjoyable recreation is decreasing.
- Potential motorized trails lead to other recreational opportunities such as climbing and hiking in places not otherwise accessible.
- What happens in terms of recreation on lands that are not part of parks/ other public lands?
- Rules and regulations for trails need to be in place.
- Chinook and Alice Springs Area: logging in proposed park area, support park expansion to conserve area, park boundary extends to PLUZ is supported.
- Hope parks can take responsibility for areas and maintain garbage, toilets, etc.
- Great Divide Trail has lots of dirt bike activity recently, concern this will increase in traditionally non-motorized areas.
- Designated multi-use doesn't work well from rec and industry perspective – separate areas or trails (i.e. Separate motorized and non-motorized). Identify what recreation and industry uses complement each other.
- Public Land Recreation Area – concern about facilities like toilets and garbage, otherwise areas will be same – 14 day rule enforced please. More non-motorized specific trails will increase attraction for tourism – consider economic benefit (1500 participants for (Sinister 7). Consider trade-offs (i.e. Ecotourism versus coal) long term.



- What happens to snowmobile or OHV registration money? Where does it get channeled to and why doesn't it go to fund trail maintenance?
- Don't reduce current quad trail capacity.
- Supervision and enforcement is important; make policies and regulations and users will respect them.
- Concern increasing Sibbald area recreational use will deteriorate the ability for grazing currently occurring in this area.
- OHV expansion – location is pertinent for the least amount of damage to the land and disruption to current land uses.
- Supervision and enforcement is a current problem in recreation areas – enforcement officers should monitor in pairs due to safety concerns.
- The expansion zones along the Elbow and west Bragg Creek to the Provincial Parks do not add any benefit ecologically to the park system.
- Recreational opportunities/expansions should take place closer to larger populations.
- Larger expansion of parks needed in the west Bragg Creek and Elbow River sites.
- Concerned with Note 7 on page 154 – No “new”, but need to be able to repair, possibly reroute or may need a new/another stakeholder at the table.
- Concerned with Ghost Access Management Plan and the process, it is not working. Trails not designated that have been proposed, historical inventory was ignored; important to start with what is there.
- One of the biggest impediments to bridges is liability; bridges are the biggest issue for water crossings. Hardening of trails is an alternative (bring in rocks, etc.).
- A fund/user fee is OK if money is directed to trails, etc. (not general revenue).
- Access Management Planning: It is not clear who decision-makers are for the access management plans; therefore who/how can there be recourse to all the different decisions from policy to planning to legislation alignment?
- Lynx Creek – SE Hillcrest Mines: people use throughout summer and leave garbage. What goes on with holding tanks when they don't leave – enforce 14-day rule. Enforce stewardship of land – in summer, no space to picnic for locals. Flood damage to area – need restoration as erosion will continue with use – sink holes are a concern for safety.
- Quad Squad is great but other motorized users are destroying the area.



- Concern of a push towards commercial/resort/destination type uses verses addressing and speaking towards how people are actually using the land now (random camping, hiking, biking, fishing, quadding).
- Who is to be contacted for specific regulations? Enforcement.
- Propose to introduce annual license/permits for OHV/random camping to fund enforcement programs as a possibility – leads towards sustaining and preserving areas. Success = visible results – presence of enforcement agencies (fines and punishments).
- Need more recreational staging areas and improve the ones they have – also need more trail maintenance.
- Knowles Flats (McGillivray Creek) is in the municipality: this causes issues with enforcement and regulations. Recreational vehicles use the creek without concern for the surrounding neighbours or the environment. Dumping of brown water down the creek. Issues with summer camp fires being left burning after campers leave.
- Random camping at McGillivray Creek is not enforced; people stay all summer and are not safe.
- Cattle guards are not being maintained as promised in previous agreement.
- Roads are not maintained.
- Increase number of quadding specific parks (wildland areas) – concerned that existing trails will become off limits and not be replaced.
- Hikers can't use OHV trails – incompatible, need enforcement. Appendix J – need hikers' involvement.
- Ghost and west Castle:
 - Ice climbing – will access be maintained? (i.e. roads would be well used if provided; current access is difficult and destructive)
 - Trails have been wiped out by floods
 - New trail and road access should be established (4 x 4 vehicles)
 - Ice climbing community maintained roads when they were present, and would do so again
 - Do not close areas to ice climbers
 - Check Ghost access management plan
- Maintain current number of opportunities (maintenance of trails).
- There needs to be more facilities to assist the people that are going to these recreation areas.
- Should be putting money towards creating more campgrounds. Haven't done anything for over 30 years.



- Regulate OHV use that impacts resources (i.e. water quality, zones for foot versus OHV access).
- Need effective enforcement of random use and reclamation of linear footprint.
- Want continued access for random camping and OHV use, but recognize the need to manage the use. Okay to have a permit/fee – need to have that money go directly back into the area maintenance and enforcement.
- Allow open OHV use in areas designated for timber harvesting; establish designated trails afterwards.
- Expand and make more campgrounds for people, especially on Highway 940 that accommodates motorized.
- Deal with the May long weekend parties – this is causing biggest problem.
- Consider extending length of stay restriction in underutilized campgrounds to longer than 14 days.
- Need to ensure funding is available for trails planning and development – consider alternative sentencing as a funding source for trail development – fees for recreation offences should go to recreation management.
- Support designated trail systems.
- Willing to pay a fee for trails – want to see registration fees for OHV's re-allocated to trail development and management.
- Support trails – need to ensure the connectivity of trails.
- Tracking system for people of non-compliance.
- Tourism industry is huge and needs to be focused on; Emphasis needs to be increased on tourism.
- Beaver Creek, Porcupine Hills has become busier because of closures elsewhere – need to manage impacts.
- Will pay a fee for good trails, enforcement, bridges.
- Fear of recreational development negatively impacting environment and water quality.
- Municipalities should have final decision making rights in their own areas.
- Self-enforcement can be included as there is responsible usage of park areas.
- Clarification needed- National park versus Provincial – fear there will be no recreation. Misconception and the activity rules.
- Beaver Creek – all year – transport roads are busy (recreation).
- Preserve existing trail inventory when developing designated trail systems.



- Protected areas should be protected (i.e. no logging).
- Castle valleys should be protected, not just rock and ice.
- Quad Squad – GPS trails north/south of highway:
 - This is available – completed in the last few years
- Not worth the dollars to create new campsites/gravel pads to divert random camping.
- Clear some areas to focus random camping – primitive sites, fire rings:
 - Maintain these sites
 - Increase number of sites
 - Bob Creek – campsites are now not used, existing access is still used
- Designated random camping areas will create more problems when people are in a close confined area.

What is missing in the draft SSRP?

- The plan doesn't give structure of development for recreation development.
- Access corridors are not mentioned (getting to new places without crossing illegal area).
- Finer detail as to what sub master plans that customize each site for its specific circumstances.
- Process to look at what is the problem and determine how we can fix it, and what is the best process – each site might be different.
- Providing opportunities for sustainable recreational development.
- The plan needs to express more about recreation master plans – current system only allows open/closed status:
 - Recreational opportunities will be lost if this is not included beyond tourism
 - Needs to be incorporated from an environmental perspective
 - Protection does not make sense if people are not allowed to enjoy those spaces
- Regular maintenance is required to be part of the process.
- Why does the SSRP not incorporate the knowledge from all trail users of all types in the development of a recreation master plan?
- Need to include planning for completion of the national trail in the plan. Currently several non-connected sections have been built in Alberta.



- Current law around trail access is not practical. It was implemented in the absence of other things that are needed, e.g. infrastructure, education. For example it is similar to speed limits – we don't really follow it.
- Spotlight will be on the rules after plan comes into effect, but not ready for it because of things missing above. How do we get from current state with impractical law to where we want to be, just happens while we get to where we want to be. How do we get from where we are today to where we want to be. We need to reduce backfire risk if we move too quickly on the rules part.
- Leverage work on trail mapping but need to be clear on process or there is reluctance to share.
- Need clear process, who is doing what and how, who is making the decisions. Complete consensus is not working.
- Need all four major components: (1) sustainable, effective planning completed (engineering) (2) education (3) enforcement (4) evaluation. Do not overemphasize enforcement (3) before doing the first two.
- Provide more information on rationale for closing some trails.
- There needs to be a clearer commitment to sustainable recreation.
- Trails for horseback riding need to be identified within the plan – different trail system is needed for this type of activity.
- Opportunity for looking at town and city land for recreational development (OHV's, horses, mountain bikes).



Outcome 7:

Aboriginal peoples are included in land-use planning

The inclusion of aboriginal peoples is according to the following objective:

- To encourage aboriginal peoples' participation in land-use planning and input to decision-making in recognition of the cultural and economic importance of land use to those aboriginal communities with constitutionally protected rights. This will provide both aboriginal communities and the Government of Alberta with a basis for better addressing current and potential land-use conflicts, in a manner supportive of aboriginal traditional uses, such as the exercise of treaty rights.

Inclusion of Aboriginal Peoples:

Support for the draft SSRP and why:

Concerns about the draft SSRP and why:

- First Nations inclusion needs to have a public workshop session on the reserves so that it is not just a few leaders who make decisions on behalf of a larger community.
- How does the federal/provincial relationship play out in terms of water management on First Nations reserves?
- First Nations need deeper community involvement when determining where traditional and sacred sites are.
- Aboriginal consultation is limited – more integration into the rest of the stakeholders, more equality with Albertans on a participation level in the consultation.
- What types of consultations are occurring with the First Nations and Métis? Are their opinions being considered? What impact are their perspectives having on the plan?

What is missing in the draft SSRP?

- Need better outcome and indicator (i.e. how were their values incorporated into plans).
- No information about aboriginal legal rights and ownership.



Additional Comments

The following additional comments and questions were raised during the public open houses that were deemed outside of the six discussion sessions but were captured as part of the public feedback.

- Support the idea of a plan but worry about implementation processes.
- Concern regarding reference to other plans that are in the works or non-existent.
- Lack of clarity on stakeholder sessions – who is a stakeholder?
- Name of plan is misleading.
- Conservation means protection – not happening or use other terminology – allowing existing disturbance to occur is not conservation.
- I am very disappointed that there is not more integration of land and water. I thought this land-use plan was intended to do that. Good that you have acknowledged the existence of water, but not much more than that has been done in this plan.
- Industry needs to have clarity.
- What does “prohibiting surface access” for new petroleum and natural gas mean, and how does it differ from what is prohibited in conservation areas?
- Feel the SSRP is abusing the few folks who live in these desirable areas so that others can temporarily benefit.
- Feel Albertans (urban residents) have a sense of entitlement.
- Government has brought its own agenda which does not respect rural folks.
- Use of acronyms can be confusing.
- Feel urbanites shouldn’t get any say over rural issues.
- Page 41 of SSRP, top of page – concern about wording that laws may be amended or changed; concern how this would impact historic users.
- Concern Wildland Park requires firearm discharge permit and do not allow dogs off leash – existing trappers and outfitters and hunters in these areas will be impacted (i.e. cougar outfitters need dogs off leash).
- Even just showing the process for a potential plan would ease concerns.
- Not enough emphasis on environment.
- Industry regulatory clarity – just give decision rather than a maybe so industry knows what to expect.



- Ecological measures to how much land can expand – limitations to water production – appropriate thresholds establishing how many people a landscape can withstand without losing its ecological value (balance between people and landscape).
- Need a summary table in columns.
- Need to look at plan flow – jumps around, not easy to follow.
- Don't like table, needs more detail (i.e. air quality).
- Page 65 – all indicators need to be included on page 105 – some missing in both (i.e. linear development).
- Need explanation of why certain indicators are used – better explanation of targets/limits.
- There needs to be more graphics that depict the information in the plan (i.e. charts, graphs, etc.).
- What we heard: Where is recreation/tourism? This was a big part of phase 2 consultation.
- More education of how to respect the land, then less enforcement will be needed.
- Recreational use has higher sustainability and lower impact on the land. Industry has irreversible impacts on the land. Why does the plan compare these two uses since the scale of impact is so varying?
- Don't touch Beaver Dam Creek. (three miles east of Westbrook School):
 - Beaver Dam Creek flows all winter
 - Water for livestock all year round
 - Large numbers of elk and deer in that area, see an odd moose in the area
- Castle is the most magnificent area in Alberta.
- Species at Risk – cutthroat trout – protected under National Species at Risk, but not in this draft plan.
- Lack of connectivity in this version – there was a lot of mention of connectivity in RAC – why the disconnect?
- Creating plan for Linear Access Densities (2017) – critical to happen sooner to protect species at risk and recovery of species at risk.
- Plan should be more bold and brave – the plan feels like business as usual.
- The process of including the public in the process is fantastic.
- Publicity for this event was horrible. Where was the advertising?
- Across the region what we heard boards, blog provides summary.



- Willing to pay user fees if it is directed into enforcement.
- Good to see co-location of linear features to help reduce footprint.
- Enforcement is needed on trails and in camping areas.
- More camping facilities required at Lake McGregor, Travers Reservoir, Twin Valley Reservoir (put in nine-10 years ago):
 - Random camping occurring on private lands in proximity to reservoir (Lake McGregor, west side of Travers)
 - Twin Valley campground – room for another campground – county put in campground, province had put in day use previously
- Plateau Mountain – needs improved signs for park.
- The plan is trying to be all encompassing for too many users.
- Sustainable is a cliché – sustainable development is an oxymoron.
- The word sustain should be a bare minimum.
- It is good to know that we have an input into the process as opposed to allowing a closed door approach.
- The *Municipal Government Act* (MGA) heavily stacks the deck in favor of developers – people and corporations that are merely suppliers.
- Headwaters need disturbance (managed) over time, one fire under severe indices with heavy fuels will burn all of capacity out of the soil.
- The inclusion of the Great Divide Trail needs to be part of the trail master plan.
- Banff National Park should be in the SSRP. Need to take cumulative effects more seriously. License off roaders, use revenue derived to police trails.
- Do not need larger parks – protecting everything is not land management. Healthy ecosystems should be measured by the biodiversity created by disturbance over time. Special interest groups need to recognize the value of all age classes within a forest, not just old growth and need to be flexible in their use of the land. Trails are not permanent structures and can be planned or moved so they do not create conflicts. Some trails in west Bragg could have been designed to avoid conflict rather than located to create conflict.
- Tourism in the headwaters needs to be balanced with water conservation, quality, quantity, etc. – alternative is to restrict tourism on the headwaters.



- The headwaters shouldn't be logged commercially to protect the water quality and provide maximum storm water absorption:
- It is not just Calgary's drinking water; it flows to the Atlantic Ocean.
- Safeguarding watersheds means managing the vegetation which includes the need for forest renewal and different age classes. Disturbance is necessary for healthy ecosystems and healthy watersheds.
- Needs to ensure that all forms of development are responsible and sustainable.
- Need to map an inventory of subsurface water (i.e. aquifers, etc.).
- Need for strong protection of wetlands, fens, marshes (nature's flood control).
- Public Land Recreation Areas (PLRA's) – look at adding these west of Calgary (i.e. McLean Creek, Waiparous, Crowsnest).
- Economic value creating an experience for visitors for all users.
- The trail systems in the west Bragg Creek and Elbow Valley area should be protected and managed in a large Provincial Park.
- The main concern about everything in the plan is about enforcement and ensuring that the plan focuses on what is best for the place and not just the government.
- The name of the Saskatchewan Plan should be changed – throws people off to pay attention; gives the perception that government is pushing it through.
- More advertising.
- The paper advertisement said there was a plan, but no info about the meeting.
- Local politicians should be involved.
- The term stakeholders for the workshop is misleading – makes you think you have to be a part of an organization to participate; should be 'general public' workshop.
- Really like what seeing so far.
- Workbook is hard to read and needs better advertising – columns needs to be more specific to areas affected.
- Not enough specifics – much of plan is good but not detailed, hard to disagree with.
- Not enough trust in government in doing this plan.
- Agree with the restrictions in the plan, but how to enforce?
- Support for plan in general.



- The name Saskatchewan is misleading.
- Concern over Cabinet decision-making power and the value of SSRP.
- Address issues regarding personal harvest.
- Improve public boat launches (i.e. Milk River Ridge) – one launch and have to pay the county to use it; other boat launches.
- Public awareness on SSRP because the name doesn't tell people what it's about.
- Review what was done in the past.
- People are constantly in the limited areas available.
- Indian graves and other similar areas are now party spots and not enjoyable for families or those seeking a more serene camping experience.
- Post phone numbers to call when vandalism or damages are seen (i.e. people leaving fires burning, etc.).
- I am deeply concerned that all of the comments that I and numerous other environmentalists have made over the last 30 years have been totally ignored.
- Hidden Creek – should never have allowed timber harvest here - causes mistrust with headwaters management intent with forestry.
- Plan should speak to ethical hunting (shouldn't be allowed in groups, i.e. 25) – leads to grizzly deaths for protection.
- How does the federal government get involved in this project?
- Map colour coding is unclear.
- First review of the SSRP should be two years.
- What happened to the Special Places Plan? That fell by the wayside and this may too.
- Make our natural landscapes the tourist destinations – must be less.
- Looks pretty so I don't trust it (the plan).
- The financial implications of the draft plan are unknown and undetermined – considering current government cutbacks, how will this be afforded? Who will be on the hook for the costs?
- Hope for conservation is not a conservation tool.
- Define consultation without adverbs – what will it look like and consist of?
- How do we protect natural areas from the human footprint (i.e. OHVs, boats, etc?)



- These consultations should include the federal government, other provinces/states and municipalities – this information should be available to the public.
- Political priorities are like shifting sands.
- Shorten review of the plan from five years to two years.
- What type of access/use is proposed for the proposed conservation areas by the descendants of the original inhabitants? Looks like it will be more limited.
- Policies do little to effectively conserve better agricultural lands.
- The plan does little to motivate “broader” acceptability of multi-municipal fringe (i.e. metropolitan plans).
- Bow River headwaters should be considered in the SSRP as they play an integral part in the region.
- Why don't we have a five year trial before implementing into law? No one wants to be told what to do.
- Maybe reviews being held within one year should be reviewed after two years.
- From time of release of the draft plan to the consultation, there was insufficient time to review and digest.
- The fishing and boating industry is absent from the plan.
- I have attempted several times to complete the workbook - but found the document very confusing and too long. It is dissuading the public from providing their opinion on matters relating to the SSRP.
- Concern about private property rights.
- p. 46 - on-stream storage - support this as the Milk River basin has study completed.
- p. 51 - more recreation on conservation area in public lands - concern about what are the costs to land disposition holders.
- p. 56 - write-on-stone- there was considerable discussion with Parks not having a buffer zone, but there is a 'buffer zone' (buffer zone will limit what can be done in the zone).
- p. 58 - Strategic Direction #2 - Advancing conservation and integrated management of Crown Land – what about the disposition holder - will they be forced out?
- p. 58 - Regional Outcome on Economy -what about economic for the region, these are very urban-focused, not rural (what are the benefits to rural communities).



- p. 64 - tourism strategies - what happen to those operators on existing lands?
- p. 66 - Conservation Integrated Management Approach - what are the implications to land disposition holders, possible decrease of the number of animals that can be allowed on land.
- p. 67 - create new conservation areas on Crown land - what are the implication on existing land disposition holders.
- p. 96 - recreation opportunities strategies - urban communities will be the winner, no mention of rural communities, no benefits from supply those services by rural communities.
- What are the implications to land disposition holders with the liability cost for idling land (i.e. taking out of production) by the plan?
- What are the implications to land disposition holders on conservation areas and public lands - e.g. will they be restricted in the number of animal allowed on the land?



