

Chadburn Lake Park Management Planning Process: What we heard

Over the course of the Chadburn Lake Park management planning process we heard a range of opinions and aspirations for Chadburn Lake Park. The public engagement activities were designed to capture, review, and refine ideas related to the Plan. This document gives a full record of input received regarding the Draft Plan, released in June 2016.

This is a snapshot of the ideas and feedback that were shared:

Encourage healthy living, trail stewardship by promoting and celebrating trails. A treasure for local residents. Develop an observatory and other viewing areas to take in night sky. A management plan is an opportunity to further protect and enhance trail network. Beautiful, peaceful, quiet recreation in nature. Excellent kayaking and canoeing for beginners and experts alike. Accessible walking trails for kids. I feel that all this is really just for bikes. I would like to see the whole Conservation area connected. That's way too little area set aside for conservation. Intensive recreation area seems bigger than it needs to be. It would be great to have more picnic areas set up with tables, fire pit, etc. The millennium trail is already paved, leave the rest of the Chadburn area trails alone. Great summer swimming hole, awesome cross-country trails, good flat water kayaking learning spot. Some of the best orienteering in North America. First Nation culture, stories and traditional use. Feeling of being alone. I love the loons. Love the accessibility (close to city). Love the trails. No remote camping within city limits. Keep camping to established campgrounds. We love Chadburn Park because it's our backyard. I think that should be stronger acknowledgement to First Nation Heritage throughout the plan. Any kind of infrastructure that enhances the user experience to the maximum number of people in the least environmentally impactful way. People drive too fast on roads. Lots of wildlife in the park – lynx, mule deer, caribou and bears so close to urban centre. I feel that there is too much emphasis on development.

Overall there was an understanding among the people who participated that the Draft Plan represented Chadburn Lake as it is generally perceived today and that the area contained potential future development opportunities. Most participants felt that the Draft Plan had elements that were appealing and it became clear that certain initiatives and ideas appealed to different segments of the participants – but not to everyone. It also appeared that the management directives presented in the plan were consistent with the participants' desire for conserving large tracts of land while still allowing for recreation to continue.

While certain ideas such as including remote wilderness camping, paving a path around Riverdale, and improving the access to Grey Mountain summit were attractive to many, the majority of the participants were skeptical that these initiatives were realistic at this time and they were removed from the Final Plan. Other notable changes include changing the designation of some areas around Grey Mountain and Chadburn Lake. For example, an area around Chadburn Lake designated as Natural Environment in the Draft Plan is now designated as Conservation in order to reflect some of the feedback and to protect the integrity and sensitivity of the ecological communities in the area. The full list of changes stemming from public feedback is shown in the following chart.

The feedback was, in essence, the beginning of a review process that revealed community values and aspirations and provided important context for finalizing the long-term vision for Chadburn Lake Park and developing the final plan for Council.

Summary of all comments received in verbatim.

| Theme | Stakeholder comment | Included in plan? | | |
|---|--|-------------------|----|-----|
| | | Yes | No | N/A |
| Section 1: Written input submitted to the City | | | | |
| Fish and wildlife | The text specific to wildlife habitat and protection throughout the document would benefit from clarification, as suggested by Fish and Wildlife Branch at Yukon Environment | | | |
| Yukon Government Regulations | Clarify various regulations regarding hunting and trapping, as suggested by Policy Branch, Yukon Environment | | | |
| Park purpose | Please keep Chadburn Lake Park in its totally natural state...someone mentioned that it is not Stanley Park and that is sooo right. After living in the Yukon for almost 2 decades and now being back in the 'great city', Whitehorse is soooo fortunate to have wilderness right there. We used to absolutely love walking the Chadburn Lake Trails...what a gift. Once you change that, it is gone...no going back. | | | |
| Trails | Add Hepburn Tramway walking trail on p.35 | | | |
| Plan allows for too much development | I feel that there is too much emphasis on development: Long Lake, Hidden Lakes, Chadburn Lake. Beaches, parking lots, cleared shoreline, getting picnic shelter closer to water; wilderness camping, storage huts. Slow down! These are pretty neat places. It would seem that maybe Long Lake should be sacrificed first and leave the others for some time in the future when our kids or grandkids say they need this. We can't easily go backward. | | | |
| Focus funding on maintaining existing trails | Spend money on fixing trails. Where bikes want to go fast, put in switchbacks and make a really good trail. | | | |
| Signage | pend the money on good signage. Use medallion-style confidence markers. Be creative and design a good local artistic system. | | | |
| Design considerations for Grey Mtn. Road | Don't make a major road to communications towers, rather build a good parking space near the top and a good switchback up to the top. | | | |
| Be careful not to neglect walking | There is no user group behind specific ideas, unlike the mountain bikers and desire for flow trails and snow bike trails. But more people walk so you might give more credence to walking ideas. I'd say with no group you should be digging for creative ideas. | | | |
| Build stewardship | Stewardship. You must make a group that has ownership, ability to determine directions. The city can't afford to do everything and catering to the most vocal was something the Parks and Rec Master Plan implied it | | | |
| Criteria for building trail in conservation zone too restrictive | Our organization) believes the current criteria for building nonmotorized multiuse trails in the conservation zone is too restrictive. For example, the criteria that a new trail in the Conservation area have "Citywide"significance may not be achievable, but this area is so far away from easy access, that not all City residents would be able to access it. | | | |
| User Conflict' section inaccurate | (Our organization) is concerned by the "User Conflict" section. The current section reads quite negatively towards mountain bikers and we think it doesn't reflect the reality of the trails. For example, | | | |

| Theme | Stakeholder comment | Included in plan? | | |
|--|---|-------------------|----|-----|
| | | Yes | No | N/A |
| | the user conflict outlined at Magnusson Ski Trails is something that the City pursued, only to find that 70 out of 72 people who completed the trail survey were in support of the packing project. We do not believe that 2 out of 72 people is significant enough to qualify this as a "User Conflict" situation. Or if it is going to be specifically mentioned, we request that is clarified that that less than 3% of people have concerns. Given that the public opinion on motorized vs non-motorized is closer to 50%, this seems like a poor example of user conflict to list first. Additionally, one user conflict issue that we see missing, and have spoken to the City about in the past is trail vigilantism where blockades or other trail obstructions are purposefully placed on the trails to injure or slow down other users. | | | |
| Trails part of 'Wilderness City' brand | (Our organization) considers an easily accessible, wellmaintained network of trails essential to Whitehorse's Identity as 'The Wilderness City', and local participation in our organization leads to increased awareness about stewardship and conservation. This, in turn, builds Whitehorse as a tourism destination for mountain biking that receives global attention. | | | |
| Tourism and Culture | Make clarifications as per Department of Tourism and Culture regulations | | | |
| Monitoring tourism and culture activities | Monitoring of tourism and commercial activities through periodic surveys and research to help manage and meet the needs of users- this is flagged for the 0-2 years schedule but is not identified in the 5-10 years schedule | | | |
| Improve Long Lake trails | I believe that the trail around Long Lake needs to be upgraded in order to preserve the ecological integrity of the area (it is classified as an ESA 1). As it stands the trail has high use intensity and if this amount of use continues on the trail erosion problems will occur and the large old growth trees circling the perimeter of the lake will continue to be damaged | | | |
| Alsek Road clay cliffs trails | The clay cliff area on Alsek Road has excellent potential to be a mountain bike and bmx skills park. For many years it has been an ad hoc park and continues to be an important area for youth to build their bike handling skills. I strongly think the plan should look at developing this area in conjunction with CMBC and the Riverdale Community Association. | | | |
| Greater emphasis of traditional territory | I think that should be stronger acknowledgement to First Nation Heritage throughout the plan (educational programs for traditional uses, renaming, info signs,etc). The park is after all on traditional territory | | | |
| Clarify Yukon Government's role in infrastructure | I think somewhere in the plan should be the point that permission needs to be gained from the landowner, aka YG for any new infrastructure to be | | | |
| Clarify trail sub-categories | Also section 3.5 is confusing. I think listing the different types of subcategories of trails in some sort of gradient order would be helpful, it jumps around from not allowed, to allowed to no trails. It would be easier to understand the differences between the subgroups if they were ordered from most permissible to most restrictive or vice versa. Also, a definition of what are the area-specific management directives are. What's a single-use non-motorised trail ? is that like mountain bike trail? What's a trail impact on other features that seems more like value rather than a directive that is similar to the other once listed. | | | |
| Highway reserve request | The management areas look fine only thing is YG has a highways reserve request for a quarry in the | | | |

| Theme | Stakeholder comment | Included in plan? | | |
|---|--|-------------------|----|-----|
| | | Yes | No | N/A |
| | far north east portion of the park in the Conservation area. It is a reserve so who knows if it would be approved in the future | | | |
| Explicitly mention wetlands | (Our organization) is supportive of the Park-Wide Management Directives. In particular, we encourage the City to keep directives 1 and 3 in the final plan as written. As stated in the plan, and in our previous comments and discussions with the City, wetlands are sensitive to disturbance from development and are appropriately assigned in the high and moderate Environmental Sensitivity Areas Classes as well as addressed directly in Directive #1. We fully support the compensation ratio proposed if development in a wetland were unavoidable to achieve no net loss of habitat. We also support having a buffer in place around wetlands and other sensitive features to minimize development impacts. We would like to see wetlands explicitly mentioned in the list of environmentally sensitive features in item 3 of the Park-Wide Management Directives. | | | |
| Consider long-term forest health | One of the challenges present for the Chadburn lake area is the fact that the forests are at climax and heading towards decadent. The forests need renewal. It will not maintain in its current form. Fire, insects or blow down events will be a driver shortly. There is need to look at the forested area and make a plan on how to encourage forest renewal to ensure a viable green forested area close to town in the future | | | |
| Livingstone Trail | The Long Lake road leads to the Livingstone Trail which is important for access to the north and should be noted in the plan | | | |
| Too much emphasis on bikes | I feel that all this is is really just for bikes. I see that bikes want a groomed winter trail which means motorized vehicle but is non motorized trail what a bunch of Hippocrates. This city should look at more shared trails for all to use but because the loudest groups don't want to share block any other recreation but their own. Funny no restrictions on where a bike can go that is because it is all they want is their special space walkers look out. I do not walk trails in summer much as bikes seem to think they own all trails. Seen this place go downhill over the last 30 plus years to specials groups taking over trails that were built before most people lived here and many were for snowmobiles and dirt bikes (motorized) so they could ride to old wood roads that are now non- motorize | | | |
| Outdoor education centre: considerations | If, and I accentuate, if, there is to be an increased presence of infrastructure, eg, an Education Center included on Chadburn Lake then it has to be very well thought out, planned for and located. the present list of partners to this idea in the draft park plan is somewhat misrepresentative of Department of Ed user possibilities. Elementary schools use Chadburn Lake and the Rotary Club cabin area much more than WoodStreet programming. And there are other outdoor Education programs from Whitehorse schools that use the area. BECAUSE OF THE ISSUE OF HANTAVIRUS POSSIBILITY THE ROTARY CLUB CABIN SHOULD COME DOWN. In my opinion this same site could be used to accommodate a newer, updated and secure learning center. This in my opinion would have the best possibility to enhance learning opportunities, control misuse, keep infrastructure impact and cost to a minimum and best yet... allow local wildlife their freedom to live reasonable | | | |
| Clarify where orienteering events may happen | section 3.5 #6 p.19 suggests "specials events" are "generally discouraged" with exceptions orienteering activity currently occurs throughout the park including proposed natural environment | | | |

| Theme | Stakeholder comment | Included in plan? | | |
|---|---|-------------------|----|-----|
| | | Yes | No | N/A |
| | (area between Long Lake and Riverdale) and conservation (Long Lake, Chadburn Lake) zones. Our organization would like some clarity around whether orienteering activity could continue in these areas. As previously submitted (January 2016) orienteering activity has occurred in Chadburn Park for 30 years at various levels: training, local events, regional and national level meets. As currently drafted orienteering activity in Chadburn Park would be limited to the "conservation" and "intensive recreation" zones. Given the minimal impact of orienteering activity (no facilities are developed by the activity) YOA would want assurances the "natural environment" zone is also accessible. After all, orienteering activity is a good example fulfilling Goal 2.1: "Enhance user experience through improved wayfinding". | | | |
| Adopt First Nation name for park | First thing I would do is change the name back to its traditional name...who the hell is Chadburn? Was he living in the area 200 years ago, or even in 1898? He sure wasn't around 1,000 years ago. BTW,time for the First Nations to demand the traditional names of all mountains in the area including Grey Mountain. | | | |
| Do not fragment trails | I am strongly opposed to the fragmentation of trail systems in this area. Winter or summer all trails should continue to be non-motorized multi-use or motorized multi-use as appropriate. By creating hierarchies you are just encouraging conflict driven by people who think they now have some exclusive right or domain to these trails.We're no better than spoiled children if we can't learn to share and get along with each other. | | | |
| Do not exaggerate trail-use conflict | Draft plan alludes to concerns about trail conflict. Those concerns are tenuous at best and are the result of an entitled few people who make a lot of noise. This perception does not reflect the reality of most of us who use those trails. In my many years of hiking, biking, snowshoeing, skiing, winter biking along with building and maintaining trails in this proposed park I have always had positive interactions with other trail users. Your own surveys on winter use in the Magnusson area bear this out. I urge you to remove these inflammatory statements from the plan as they will be seized upon to support the illusion of conflict and will certainly be thrown back in the city's face by the small and entitled faction of people who seem to think of this area as their own private recreation area. | | | |
| Section 2: Online survey –Comments on major themes | | | | |
| Conservation protection | I would like to see the whole Conservation area connected. A portion of Natural Environment on the bottom of the map should be Conservation area so that the area is not split but continuous. Motorized vehicles should be avoided as most of the drivers do not respect the wildlife and destroy whatever is on their path. Also, Conservation means leave the area as is and let Nature restore the area or restore the area yourself but by allowing infrastructure the City is no keeping this area for Conservation. I think the Conservation area should be left intact and not recreational activities should not be allowed. | | | |
| | The areas are very large for the amount of restrictions imposed. Many areas of low environmental sensitivity are included | | | |
| | Some of these areas are significant recreational areas and that should continue to be the focus. For | | | |

| Theme | Stakeholder comment | Included in plan? | | |
|-------|--|-------------------|----|-----|
| | | Yes | No | N/A |
| | example the upper parts of Grey Mountain or the Chadden/Hidden Lakes area. | | | |
| | The Long Lake Trail has reached its use capacity. To conserve this area trail improvements are needed to limit adverse impacts such as tree damage and erosion. As it stands this area is used intensively, management strategies should reflect this. | | | |
| | I appears that the area you have designation for conservation is very large. I have used this area for recreational purposes my entire life and my activities may be restricted based on your plans. The map scale doesn't allow for detail review of the area. There are not designed multi-use trails to the Chadbrun lake that I would insist should be included in the plan. | | | |
| | The areas around Chadden and the Hidden Lakes that have been designated as intensive recreation areas are located in ecologically sensitive areas. If this is not known to the planners, then much more research needs to be done before this plan can be considered 'complete'. These areas contain habitat for nesting birds, overwintering birds, marten and other small mammals, flying squirrels, and several species at risk that have legal protection (e.g. olive-sided flycatchers, horned grebes). To build more trails or encourage more human activities could be devastating to the wildlife communities in and around Chadden and Hidden Lakes. Also, I spend a great deal of time around Chadden Lake, and if more mountain bike trails are built, and if human activities are to increase, then I will no longer visit these areas. In short, the people who already use these areas' interests will be compromised by those people with little or no previous interest in these areas. This is fundamentally wrong!!! | | | |
| | No details of walking trails from and to the shelters, no mention about relocating some very steep trails south of the shelters. No mention about the condemned 2nd refuge bordered because of bats. | | | |
| | Bear habitat tends to be optional to local vegetation and berry response which could be anywhere. | | | |
| | Motorized trails as people with handicaps are not allowed | | | |
| | Conservation and recreation can occur together, if ESA's are avoided. | | | |
| | You need areas that include a new municipal campsite or rental cabin recreation area. You should be opening this park up to commercial and revenue generating opportunities for local business and the City | | | |
| | enlarge the conservation boundary | | | |
| | I think that much of the natural environment areas could be included in the conservation areas. There is little difference in characteristics and conservation designation could provide greater environmental protection. | | | |
| | this is a wilderness city and the more development there is the greater the loss is to our wildlife and the natural areas we love. | | | |
| | What about first nation settlements still open for development. | | | |
| | The area around the Hidden Lakes need protection | | | |
| | That's way too little area set aside for conservation | | | |

| Theme | Stakeholder comment | Included in plan? | | |
|---|---|-------------------|----|-----|
| | | Yes | No | N/A |
| Cultural Heritage protection | Very difficult to see map on mobile. Can't tell where the sites are as I can't zoom in | | | |
| | The areas set aside for cultural heritage protection seem to be very limited, are there no other areas in this large park of cultural significance? | | | |
| | The entire Yukon River Trail should be considered as culturally significant. | | | |
| | What about camps ex. fish camps | | | |
| | No details of existing walking trails to and from the 2 shelters. | | | |
| | Not worth answering as no one will listen as minds are already made up | | | |
| | The entire YUKON river bank should be recognized as culturally important and the routes from Canyon City should be recognized as historically important. | | | |
| | Enlarge conservation area | | | |
| | Areas set aside are fine, as far as I know, but I think there should be even more emphasis on interpreting and sharing such spaces with the public. Developing traditional FN trails would be of great interest to some of us who walk/paddle regularly and would be a potential tourist attraction. This could be an economic development opportunity for FNs | | | |
| Intensive Recreation designation | You have missed the wildlife. Every summer there are bears and an increase in human activity will result in relocating bears or killing them. I believe the area should be smaller and there should be a campaign to educate people of the importance of leaving wildlife alone and respect them. There should also be signs to make people aware/educate them of the importance of no disturbing the wildlife (plants and animals) and to leave no trail and to respect single track trails. It makes me sad and angry to see that people do not walk/bike on the trails to avoid the roots or rocks and that causes the trails to become wider, and wider, and wider... :(sad, so sad. | | | |
| | Increasing the use of these areas (near roads) may lead to more user group conflict. I'd like to see more trail development further from roads to separate faster trail users from slower users. Maybe this could be accomplished by enlarging the intensive rec areas | | | |
| | My concern is this is a small space and recreation will be limited. I bike and ATV off the grey mountain road and what this looks like is further restrictions to the activities that I enjoy and partake in responsibly. | | | |
| | The existing recreational footprint in this area is larger than shown and should be preserved. eg. Upper Grey Mountain or the lakes area | | | |
| | Long lake is and will continue to be used intensively. | | | |
| | what about around the lake - picnic areas, family-oriented items | | | |
| | This area is significantly smaller than the conservation areas. There needs to be better multiuse access through some of the conservation areas to allow for recreation use of the area beyond the city limits. | | | |

| Theme | Stakeholder comment | Included in plan? | | |
|--|---|-------------------|----|-----|
| | | Yes | No | N/A |
| | Again, human activities should not be increased in and around Chadden and Hidden Lakes. Building more mountain biking trails will compromise the ecological integrity of the area and will encourage more mountain bikers (that don't already use the area) to use the area which will raise a number of concerns including human safety. Motorized vehicles need to be prohibited from these areas for the same reasons. WE NEED TO REVISIT THE MOTORIZED VEHICLE USE ISSUE!!! | | | |
| | Again handicap that can not walk or bike are out | | | |
| | What is "intensive recreation" if it does NOT involve motorized vehicles (ATVs and Trail Bikes in particular) then I am fine with the area set aside. If it involves use by motorized vehicles then it is much to large. | | | |
| | this seems to be too large of an area | | | |
| | Intensive recreation area seems bigger than it needs to be. I believe that we need pockets of intensive recreation within that proposed area, eg. at boat launches on Schwatka and Chadburn Lakes, at biathlon trails, rifle range, etc. | | | |
| | per my earlier comments, this is the wilderness and your proposal takes up far too much space!! | | | |
| | doesn't capture lots of the existing trail system | | | |
| | It would be beneficial to allow single-track mountain bike trails of varying levels -utilize existing trails but also allow process for future development. | | | |
| | Area is much too small. Doesn't take into account all the trails in the area. | | | |
| | I think these areas could potentially be expanded, however I don't have the expertise to be sure of that or say exactly where | | | |
| | Please protect the Hidden Lake areas from development. | | | |
| | too much has been set aside for protection, not enough has been set aside for recreation. | | | |
| | I think the term "intensive" could be misleading. For example- some of the trails in the area are/should not be motorized, in particular the trails close to residences. "intensive" suggests otherwise. | | | |
| Areas set aside for Natural Environment | No new motorized trails should be allowed in this area or make a campaign to educate drivers of the importance of using the trails and only the trails and not to leave their beer cans, McDonalds garbage or Timi's behind agh!!! | | | |
| | Again, this area is significantly smaller than the conservation area. Perhaps some of the conservation area should be managed as Natural Environment. | | | |
| | These areas should be conservation areas. Building bike trails would increase human activities which would compromise the ecological integrity of the area, and would prevent me and many other hikers, who have enjoyed these areas for years, from using the area. | | | |
| | I'm sure there are vegetation response areas and wildlife use areas that are unique and/or high potential use areas that need a research data base to quantify. | | | |

| Theme | Stakeholder comment | Included in plan? | | |
|--|---|-------------------|----|-----|
| | | Yes | No | N/A |
| | Again any mobility problems people are out no balance in thought | | | |
| | See notes about conservation areas. More of natural environment areas could be conservation areas. | | | |
| | it's all natural environment, leave it alone! | | | |
| | This area need to be a great deal larger. We are cueing up the landscape with no plan for how animals mive in the area. Define animal corridors before you chop the rest of the areas up | | | |
| | Role of fire | | | |
| | Would like to see more of this zoning designation where the current red zonign is... | | | |
| | Way too little again. | | | |
| Areas set aside for park and visitor services | no explanation of how it will be enforced other than bylaw. Bylaw works set hours and it would be hard to enforce infractions, ie: overnight camping and illegal partying | | | |
| | Again, can't see on map | | | |
| | Surveillance! Is amazing all the garbage that people leave behind. The City needs to implement fines to people who dump their garbage, destroy the facilities, leave a mess behind. You could either have a "park police" or video cameras. If installing cameras is expensive you could have a program "adopt a video camera" where residents can donate to purchase and install cameras. | | | |
| | Are you going to officially designate Chadburn Lake as non-motorized use only? | | | |
| | Grey Mountain summit | | | |
| | The scale of this map doesn't allow for close scrutiny of this area. | | | |
| | I'm not supportive of such a huge increase in park and visitor service facilities. I'm concerned about the wilderness aspect of the region. | | | |
| | The fact that many of these areas are within conservation areas raises a lot of concerns. Promoting and accommodating more human activities is unnecessary and would compromise the ecological integrity, and many people's enjoyment of the area. | | | |
| | Mobility persons are out | | | |
| | It would have been helpful to have a description of parks and visitors services. | | | |
| | Too much development! | | | |
| | Proposed ideas are good. Devil is in the details. Definitely need biffies by Chadburn Lake, where people park and launch boats. A lot of peeing in the woods happens there because it is too far to go to the biffies. A dock at Chadburn Lake would also be fine. Having a family education centre there would be okay, but need to protect from vandalism. Cabin at Chadburn that has been used for camps, etc, in past is vulnerable to vandals. It is presently open - don't know whether it has been broken into or if it is a deliberate choice to leave it open. A centre would need to be in a location less vulnerable, if that is possible. I would discourage camping at Chadburn Lake. Although it would be a lovely place to camp, | | | |

| Theme | Stakeholder comment | Included in plan? | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------|----|-----|
| | | Yes | No | N/A |
| | it would be hard to restrict camping to one campsite area once it was started. | | | |
| | It would be great to have more picnic areas set up with tables, firepit, etc. At least one main one at Long lake or Chadburn lake | | | |
| | if people want all of these amenities they should not be coming here. | | | |
| | This is a high recreation area. Having been at the boat launch when summer camps are running there is a real concern for safety. Lots of kids in kayaks and sailboats verses motor boats, motors win. Better planning for safety is advised | | | |
| | The map is difficult to read. A new managed facility on the east shore of Schwatka Lake would be beneficial, but not on the side of the Hidden Lakes, as the Hidden Lakes area are already under heavy use and surrounded by steep slopes. Developing new graded trails there would unfortunately result in providing new snowmobile access to an area they've already damaged enough. | | | |
| | I suspect this may evolve. Would like to see better "services" at the V. i.e. garbage receptacle, and dog-shit bag dispensers. | | | |
| Paved trail around Riverdale | I think that the Millenium Trail serves the purpose as a multi-use trail. I prefer the trail around Riverdale to remain as greenbelt. | | | |
| | Paved trail should be for commuting or access to areas that are special. The river dale trail behind people's yard is neither - improvements around Schwatka lake or Long lake much getter than people 's back yards! | | | |
| | The millenium trail is already paved, leave the rest of the Chadburn area trails alone. | | | |
| | The paved trail will served mostly Riverside residents and could be a precedent for other subdivisions to want a paved trail. We have already destroy a lot of wildlife habitat by not allowing Whitehorse to grow vertical but horizontal (Whistle Bend included). The more green areas we save now the better for the future. | | | |
| | Backs directly onto titled property (not just encroachments) with greatly increased traffic and risk of break & enter. Will significantly impact some areas of natural sensitivity. Accessible paved trail already exists in neighbourhood; develop elsewhere. | | | |
| | I like the idea but asphalt is expensive and I am concerned about money being diverted from more important infrastructure projects to support the constructuon of a paved trail. how will the city pay for this? | | | |
| | We don't need it paved, perhaps just cleaned up to make it more accessible... | | | |
| | I think paved trails are more appropriate where one is trying to create a route that is separated from traffic. In Riverdale, there are many paved surfaces and more are not needed. Instead, there should be more beautification of existing streets, especially given the massive road allowance on Alsek. | | | |
| | Why not just leave it as is | | | |
| | The bike lanes on Alsek are effective for paved traffic circumnavigating Riverdale, and the greenbelt trails directly behind Riverdale are a great place for young people to learn to cycle off-road | | | |

| Theme | Stakeholder comment | Included in plan? | | |
|-------|---|-------------------|----|-----|
| | | Yes | No | N/A |
| | Pavement isn't always an improvement. | | | |
| | There are already readily accessible sidewalks and the cost of paving a trail and then ongoing maintenance are too high. | | | |
| | I this Riverdale has an unproportionate amount of new trail development while removing access to old multiuse trails. | | | |
| | This would be a gross misuse of taxpayers money, and it would increase traffic which is bad for wildlife and THOSE WHO ALREADY ENJOY THE AREA. | | | |
| | I think the trail is needed, but perhaps a wide gravel path would be preferable. The millenia trail is paved and so close, it would be nice to have an "in between" between the MT and the other skinner trails in the area. | | | |
| | Cost to high | | | |
| | When did paving become "green"? | | | |
| | Feel badly about saying no, but REALLY value not having pavement. Agree that there is value in disabled access, but believe there are surfaces other than pavement that could provide that. Nobody except people in wheelchairs need any changes - bikes, strollers, etc. can easily access full circuit now. | | | |
| | there is a road with a sidewalk already, as well as Millenium trail, easily accessed from Riverdale. | | | |
| | No. There are many other paved trails around town, and this should stay as is. It is a great running trail that is easy and safe access. By paving it, you remove a place with soft surface for runners, etc. | | | |
| | seriously?? there are numerous animals who live in this area, not to mention the residents who enjoy walking in the forest, many with their dogs, on unpaved trails. | | | |
| | would conflict with existing winter/summer trails, and give unreasonable access/disruption to backyards. | | | |
| | The existing trail is good enough, it will remove the natural aspect | | | |
| | Paved trails limit what you can use for trail running | | | |
| | Why just Riverdale? What about all the other subdivisions in Whitehorse. | | | |
| | I don't think it should be a priority | | | |
| | The millennium trail is already in river dale, paving is expensive to build and maintain. | | | |
| | The trails around Riverdale are already functional and the feel is natural. | | | |
| | should keep in natural state. | | | |
| | Way too invasive to homeowners and residents living adjacent to the trails. There is a universally accessible trail very nearby- (Millenium). Put another one in another neighbourhood to share the opportunity. | | | |

| Theme | Stakeholder comment | Included in plan? | | |
|----------------------------------|--|-------------------|----|-----|
| | | Yes | No | N/A |
| | What the hell for? This is not at all needed and paving the edge of wilderness is a true redneck idea. Where the hell did that come from? | | | |
| Remote wilderness camping | Id like to see more tent camping areas! Smaller footprint activities, lots of access to lakes and trails! Thank you!!! | | | |
| | No remote camping within city limits. Keep camping to established camp grounds. | | | |
| | There are other places in Yukon, worry about bush parties. | | | |
| | you would have to hire staff for that purpose. would create additional pressure on the area by increase use | | | |
| | Lots of campgrounds outside of town. I see it as being a party spot as it isn't going to attract people who want the nature experience (they will head out of town). | | | |
| | would prefer it syat for day use only. | | | |
| | Wilderness camping results in people hiking everywhere and eroding the area (eventually), example Tombstone where people hike to "popular" areas but without a designated trail most of the era is eroded and ends up being worst than building a narrow trail. But again, if people do not respect the trail, a narrow trail can end up being wider than a car (example the trails in Copper Ridge and many other across the city). | | | |
| | I worry about fire issues with the parks that are within City limits. If fires are not permitted with the camping, then I am okay with it. | | | |
| | Many options available already, too much impact. | | | |
| | This will immediately become "summer residential" area - how will fires and solid/human waste disposal be effectively dealt with and maintained...worst idea ever. | | | |
| | There are many opportunities to camp in and around Whitehorse. We don't need a campsite so close to town and plus, I don't want any fires in my backyard. | | | |
| | Too close to town for "wilderness camping" I'd be worried about people partying or making a mess | | | |
| | There are plenty of areas outside the City that are more appropriate for wilderness camping. I think this would serve to expand the trail network throughout the park. | | | |
| | I think the sites will just be abused by people partying. You would have to invest in monitoring the sites on a regular basis to ensure they are not abused / become garbage dump areas. | | | |
| | Too close to the city. Overuse and (too) high-impact on the environment are my concerns. | | | |
| | Increased fire risk even if there is a complete ban within city limits. Close proximity to Riverdale could be dangerous. | | | |
| | Too much activity in a park that is close to the city and provides me with a 'wilderness' experience. There are plenty of opportunities to go camping in the wild in the Yukon. | | | |
| | Allowing camping in ecologically sensitive areas, where camping doesn't already occur (at least not often) would be bad. Don't encourage camping or campfire is these areas. Keep these areas as no | | | |

| Theme | Stakeholder comment | Included in plan? | | |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-----|
| | | Yes | No | N/A |
| | camping areas. | | | |
| | Chadburn away from the access roads and trails is critical to wildlife in the area which to me, have priority. | | | |
| | With no motorized trails fire hazard is too great and fire rescue can not get in | | | |
| | Camping can lead to too many problems, such as litter, pollution and spoiled bears. | | | |
| | Too much danger of damage and fires | | | |
| | See previous notes. Too difficult to manage, contain; am concerned about damage to environment, spread from designated camp area(s) to beyond. Compromise might be to have picnic areas, but no overnight camping. | | | |
| | Garbage, attracting bears | | | |
| | this is not a campground. | | | |
| | lots of wilderness camping elsewhere in the territory | | | |
| | Unless you plan to provide supervised camping I only see disaster. Between forest fires, garbage, and environmental degradation, without supervision this will lead to destruction | | | |
| | May cause issues with campfires and the fire department getting involved | | | |
| | Too close to Whitehorse. | | | |
| | There are plenty of actually remote places to camp, providing this camping in town seems like it would be prone to abuse. | | | |
| | Fires, rowdy, staffing, upkeep | | | |
| | camping does not belong in whitehorse | | | |
| | If at Chadburn only, might be hard to manage in site indicated, and conflict with an educational facility in same area. | | | |
| | The risk of forest fires is too high -the consequences are not acceptable. The only way I would support is if there is full-time campground staff and no fires allowed, except perhaps propane campfires. | | | |
| | If you build "remote wilderness camping sites", then it's no longer wilderness, is it? Duh... | | | |
| Building a trail along Grey Mountain summit and connecting the trail network to Magnusson | Is nice not to have too much traffic in the area. People like biking/walking to the top using that road and more vehicles could result in more noise, pollution and disturbance of wildlife. | | | |
| | There are other ares where infrastructure needs improvement in the city that are more important. People that want to go up the road can as it is. | | | |
| | It will increase access and increase maintenance expectations. Use of the summit has intensified greatly in the past few years even without a maintained road. | | | |
| | It's fine as is .makes it more challenging and encourages non motorized access. | | | |

| Theme | Stakeholder comment | Included in plan? | | |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-----|
| | | Yes | No | N/A |
| | The road is accessible enough in its current condition for hikers & mountain bikers, and other outdoor rec people. | | | |
| | Again, I believe there is too much new trail development in the Riverdale area. I would like to see designation of some of the current trails as multi-use trails. There is no new spending on the maintenance of current multi-use trails within other areas of the City. There is only one designated multi-use trail on the Riverdale side of the City. This is an unbalanced plan. | | | |
| | Don't need more traffic on the road, improve road means drivers going faster | | | |
| | This would increase human activities in areas where many alpine birds nest. Also, increased human activity would cause the trampling of vegetation, particularly lichen, which takes a long time to recover. This would be very bad. | | | |
| | It is all done for non-motorized trails you are just trying to limit to young fit people not any older people with mobility problems | | | |
| | This will become a raceway for cars | | | |
| | road condition keeps traffic minimal, would be difficult and very expensive to upgrade this road due to terrain | | | |
| | It will add more traffic and bring more unwanted persons (uneducated teens with drug, littering garbage). | | | |
| | more cars, more traffic, Grey Mountain is a statement of a fit and healthy lifestyle. Don't make it easier to drive up there.....please.... | | | |
| | Continuation of more challenging access will better preserve the trails accessed from the road - traffic volume is not really an issue on lower trails, but the sensitive nature of the alpine environment accessed from the summit should be protected by keeping traffic volume low | | | |
| | That would be very costly. Resources can be better used in better visitor infrastructure at Chadburn Lake and Schwatka Lake, and more bylaw monitoring of those areas, which sadly are currently used as party, firepit, and dump sites. | | | |
| | I'm not sure that you want to encourage increased traffic. | | | |
| | I don't think there is enough parking to support increased usage to the summit. | | | |
| | Yes and no. Grey Mountain road is used by people who like to drink and smoke pot at the lookouts. If the lookouts are improved in a way that discourages that behaviour, then sure. Also- some monitoring by RCMP should occur- both for speeding and illegal activity. | | | |
| | Improving that road will mean heavy traffic and intensified deterioration of the already no longer true wilderness mountain top | | | |
| Improvement of Grey Mtn Road to summit area | it's good the way it is, don't take away the natural look by increasing parking lots. | | | |
| | I think it's decent the way it is | | | |

| Theme | Stakeholder comment | Included in plan? | | |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-----|
| | | Yes | No | N/A |
| | Not, unless there's a "park police" and a campaign to educate people. If you improve recreational facilities more people will use the area and there will be more garbage, wildlife disturbance, erosion.... | | | |
| | I do not support the cost required to upgrade the road to a standard that would accommodate tourists in RVs, and don't want to see RVs getting stuck | | | |
| | Road to look-out in present state [today] is sufficient. Not necessary to improve road to summit. Keeps traffic down for hikers. Grey Mtn. new trail from Magnusson Parking would allow a round trip. | | | |
| | I don't believe that the road needs improving. I walk, drive and bike on it easily. | | | |
| Section 3: Online survey - general comments | | | | |
| Infrastructure | The park does not need a lot of costly infrastructure. Part of planning is to protect. Protect and manage the park. Don't over build. | | | |
| | Change huts (like the ones adjacent to the Millennium Trail) would also be great. | | | |
| | More outhouses need to be provided to users of the park. | | | |
| | A commemorative bench / picnic table program could be of benefit to the park. | | | |
| | would be nice to have an educational building @ chadburn. nice not to stand in rain @ sessions there. | | | |
| | Improve Pee Wee Hill access by installing stairs. | | | |
| | A multi use outdoor facility with options for public booking and usage, First Nation space and use, and other access options is a key feature to be included in this new envisioning. | | | |
| | To expand your day use area, how about a sandy beach at Chadburn Lake for toddlers to play in with their shovels and toys. | | | |
| Wildlife values should trump infrastructure | There is already a outdoor education facility at Chadburn Lake, the rotary club cabin which, to me, now needs to be demolished and perhaps upgraded. The natural environment and the wildlife therein far outweighs in value any high impact infrastructure. | | | |
| Do not over-regulate | The great part about the Chadburn area is the lack of rules and regulations and how well it has worked without them. I support construction of more trails but not more rules and regulations. There is a lot of wilderness in the Yukon and around Whitehorse you don't need to regulate the use and development in this manner. | | | |
| Do not over-develop | Please do not destroy our heritage and identity. This is not the big city and for those wanting to see big city ideas here in the Yukon, they should move and leave this beautiful place alone. | | | |
| | Why do people move away from urban centres to places like Whitehorse where there is still a certain degree of wilderness, precisely because there still is, and yet keep wanting to transform where they've moved to into a duplicate of the southern cities they came from? Are they nuts? If they miss the urban atmosphere that much, then why don't they go back to it? We don't need them around here, that's for sure. | | | |
| Budget | there must be a budget attached to all this planning and no mention of that. if you increase infrastructures you have to plan staff and maintenance, what is that cost? and where will the money | | | |

| Theme | Stakeholder comment | Included in plan? | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------|----|-----|
| | | Yes | No | N/A |
| | come from? taxes? day use fees? | | | |
| Paved trail around Riverdale | I support a paved trail around Riverdale for accessibility, but would like to preserve a parallel natural surface trail option for trail running. If a paved trail is installed around Riverdale, snowmobiles should not be allowed on it. | | | |
| Self-propelled recreation | Initiative 6 should say self-propelled | | | |
| | The use of this area should take into consideration carbon balance - encourage walking, sailing, biking etc. Discourage the use of things that use so called fossil fuels. Every drop of gas has to be trucked to YUKON so the less we use the better it is for the world. | | | |
| Drinking | Drinking is an issue, driving and fishing | | | |
| Speeding on roads | Speed limits along Chadburn Lake Road, Grey Mountain Road and Schwatka Lake Road should be decreased with all the additional activities. And they should be monitored and tickets issued | | | |
| | There is no mention in this survey to safety. Fast moving bikes verses cars. Personally I was surprised the other day coming down twin fields road and a biker raced right across the road right in front of me. I couldn't see them and had no idea there was a trail there. The biker would have been able to hear me but didn't slow down. I could have killed him. | | | |
| | How will speed limits in the park be addressed/regulated? | | | |
| | As well there always seems to be a lot of racing along the roadways and loud boisterous gatherings. | | | |
| Valuation of natural capital | City should value natural capital, the park and dark skies | | | |
| Fire risk | Smokers outdoors need more education regarding forest fire risk | | | |
| | My next concern is the partying that happens down that road. The partiers have destroyed property and light fires that could have real consequences on Whitehorse. I realize that this is a big topic with no easy solutions but must still be thought of. I personally have no solutions, but want it known that we need to continually look for solutions. | | | |
| Promotion | Need to promote park, look at what NCC commission is doing for Gatineau | | | |
| Community clean-up | Do a community clean up of monofilament fishing line in Hidden Lakes | | | |
| | Organize a community litter clean up | | | |
| Wayfinding | Add km markers on roads for wayfinding and safety | | | |
| Process compliment | It looks like you are doing a great job. | | | |
| | Thank you for all the work in putting this together. the plan looks great | | | |
| | Thanks for doing this! Whitehorse needs it! | | | |
| | This is an incredibly efficient and genuine consultation exercise. Congratulations! | | | |

| Theme | Stakeholder comment | Included in plan? | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------|----|-----|
| | | Yes | No | N/A |
| | A broad multi-level plan .I think this will make the park more accessible to all and hopefully instil a better appreciation and respect of the great outdoors that we in Whitehorse are fortunate to have at our doorstep. | | | |
| Waste Management | Please add video cameras to ensure people do not dump their garbage and do not leave trace | | | |
| | Recycling receptacles in park | | | |
| | I hope the infrastructures will help to reduce the salvage dumping, because on the grey mountain road, there is a lot of it.... | | | |
| Trail restoration | A restoration program (using volunteers?) is needed as some of the trails are getting wider and there's lots and lots of small trails here and there that people have made just because. | | | |
| Trail development | I'd like to see Conservation Areas allow trail building-maybe through a more rigorous process than the current Trails and Greenways. | | | |
| | Recreational infrastructure needs to include portapotties or other toilet facilities to ensure that women and girls can easily participate in outdoor recreational pursuits. | | | |
| | Project should indicate existing trails and how the public feels about them. Improvement ?, Relocation ?, Safety ? ... | | | |
| | Right now the fad is for more bike trails, as a biker I love better trails, as an environmentalist I am concerned. People seem to be able to go out and add trails where ever they like as long as they don't support ATV's. People are building trails therefore within feet of each other. This one is easier that one is more challenging. No thought to environmental degradation or the fact that they are so close an ATV can easily pass with some effort. trails without planning leads to clear cutting. | | | |
| | My personal priority is the single track mountain bike trails. I think that more development in general for hiking and fishing is also great, and multi-use trails are a wonderful idea, but the mountain bike exclusive single track trails are a real gem that I would like to see maintained and expanded as well. This recreation area is a huge asset to the city, and I think that in this case it is better to lean toward getting the most use possible out of it, in a sustainable way. | | | |
| | There should only be two priorities. 1) Conservation with a preference to non-motorized acitivities and 2) Promoting any project that encourages excersize and a healthy lifestyle (trails, trails, trails....) | | | |
| | I am very concerned about the restrictions the plan seems to impose on future mountain bike trail development. The trail network developed over the pat 10 years has resulted in creating a destination for mountain-biking - attracting visitors and allowing for the growth of small business. The trails have been developed in a responsible manner, and the work even resulted in the closure or rehabilitation of certain trails. I realize there are sensitive areas on Grey Mountain, but if we're too restrictive, people will get in their cars (or fly out) and go ride elsewhere. This is not exactly great for the environment either. Is there really such a conflict between summer biking and winter caribou habitat? Do caribou actually use the area? My sense is that some of the older hikers and walkers have never gotten used to mountain biking and have seized the planning agenda here, using arguments about habitat as an excuse to shut down further trail development. Dogs probably aren't great for wildlife either - should | | | |

| Theme | Stakeholder comment | Included in plan? | | |
|---|--|-------------------|----|-----|
| | | Yes | No | N/A |
| | they be banned from the park to protect the wild animals? Let's use common sense - this is a large park near an urban area that is primarily used for low-impact recreational activities - it is not, and should not become, a wilderness preserve. I, for one, don't want to have to drive to Carcross or Pilot Mountain or wherever else trails will end up being developed to go ride my mountain bike. | | | |
| | I said no to the flow trail as I believe it's not the right location -- it would be better built at Mt. Mac. | | | |
| Grey Mountain Summit Trail | The "Grey Mountain Dream" summit trail to Mother T is a terrible idea that will never come to fruit. Anyone who has scouted that area knows this. Time would be better spent improving the trail along the summit to a) make it more accessible to people and b) reduce the impact on the summit ridge due to all the braided trails and routes created by not having one defined route along the ridge. | | | |
| | Summit to Mother T trail would be FANTASTIC | | | |
| Wayfinding | Also more trail maps would be excellent and make the area more easily accessible for more people | | | |
| Motorized recreation | Improvements to this area are a great idea provided they do not result in more restrictions for responsible users, especially motorized users. As a responsible user of ORVs I feel targeted by the city. | | | |
| | Motorized access was NOT included in this survey. I would like to see this identified and the rights of motorized traffic outlined in the park plan upheld. | | | |
| | Again limiting to non motorized travel is a joke as it takes away recreation of some and mobility people can not access so becomes select person play ground | | | |
| | I don't see where you've addressed motorized use, including boating. | | | |
| | My main concern is about increased motorized use in the Chadburn Lake area. I believe that snowmobiles should be considered motorized use. Also believe that absolutely no more motorized trails should be developed in the area. Wherever they travel, legally or otherwise, there is degradation to the trail system, disruption to the peaceful enjoyment by non-motorized users and probably disturbance to the wildlife. We don't owe people on motorbikes the right to damage/disrupt/destroy the space for everyone else. | | | |
| Upgrades good investment if budget available | I see improvements being good for the community provided they are completed in a fiscally responsible manner and can be justified against other important infrastructure improvements needed in the city. I use the trails and really enjoy the improvements made by the city but I am not willing to pay more taxed if the city cannot afford the improvements. | | | |
| Public feedback should not be anonymous | Surveys should not be confidential. If people are really concerned about proposals they should be willing to share their name and address. This provides better survey results. Surveys like this are not reliable as individuals can complete multiple surveys with anonymity. Therefore, the survey, at best, is a general guide to opinion that cannot be relied upon. | | | |
| | I'm a mountain biker and trail builder (among the many ways I use this area) so want to ensure that recreational use and trails are supported in a larger footprint than just intensive recreation. | | | |
| Partnerships | Contact the Yukon Invasive Species Council, we're interested in developing interactive signs about | | | |

| Theme | Stakeholder comment | Included in plan? | | |
|---|---|-------------------|----|-----|
| | | Yes | No | N/A |
| | invasive species. Whitehorse is a major source of invasive species so making sure that we're taking steps to avoid introducing species through this development is essential! | | | |
| Timelines over-ambitious | The plan is ambitious and many of the goals and initiatives are slated for the first two years. I suggest that the time lines be re-examined for each goal to provide some activity in years 0 to 2 but the initiatives be sustained on the 2 to 5 and 5 to 10 year range. | | | |
| Typo on pg. 14 | Just so you know I read the whole document there is a typo on page 14 section 5 line two "roots" should be "roosts". | | | |
| Park needs better name | I think we should find a better name for the park, Chadburn lake is already well known but it doesn't identify or characterize the many features of this park. For example Grey mountain is a far more inclusive feature but I think something more creative or descriptive would enhance the marketability of the whole area. | | | |
| Non-motorized lakes | Once again all these lakes including Chadburn should be non motorized use. | | | |
| User Safety | First Aid Kits at select junctions is a really good idea | | | |
| | Will the public locations have AEDs provided? | | | |
| Grey Mountain Road | Improved maintenance of upper Grey Mountain Road would be much appreciated | | | |
| Park designation | I believe the City is being influenced to excessively on the park/development of this area. It should remain undeveloped for multiuse. | | | |
| Bear safety | I would like to see more signage for bears: what to do, how to be bear-aware, etc. There should be bear-resistant garbage cans that work properly and are emptied regularly. It would also be wise to have signage that encourages people to report illegal dumping, littering, and other undesired behavior. | | | |
| Over-catering to mountain biking | The people and wildlife that already use the area (and have so long before the popularity of mountain biking in the area) have interests that will be compromised. These interests should trump those of people who do not yet use the area, or who have only recently used the area. Many of the people who claim they have interests in the area, have no history in the area. By giving their input they are, then, considered an interested party, but they are not. Increased biking and skiing in the area has had a significant impact on ecosystems and the enjoyment of hikers. These activities need to be better managed, not increased. | | | |
| | The Magnuson Ski Trails have been wrecked by the snow bikes. Consider separate trail networks for each user group, as there are plenty of trails to accommodate separate networks. Mountain bikers barrelling down Pee Wee Hill and other trails are a hazard to other users. This needs to be addressed before more bike trails are installed. Walkers would also like walking-only trails. It looks like this plan is overly designed to suit mountain bikers to the detriment of other user groups, although surveys after surveys indicate most users are walkers. | | | |
| Dog management | I would like to see some education or thoughts around dog and dog waste in the park. Too often when biking have I hit or come close to hitting waste. Running I have often been chased, jumped on, or | | | |

| Theme | Stakeholder comment | Included in plan? | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------|----|-----|
| | | Yes | No | N/A |
| | nipped by off leash dogs where the owners seem not to care. Recognizing this is a problem throughout the city, not this just this area, it would make me feel safer and help me enjoy my time using these areas more if not constantly looking at the ground or concerned about every dog I see. | | | |
| Park enhancement | Make this a space that isnt just a token park. Let it bring in revenue be a destination for tourism and be a key recreational space for Yukoners. Put in a new municipal campground, make access easier for everyone not just those with 4X4 | | | |
| Boat traffic on Schwatka | There is also no mention of safety with regards to too many motor boats verses recreational. You have two kids clubs in the Swatcha lake in the summer against motor boats, eventually there is going to be a disaster without some forthough. | | | |
| | We use Schwatka Lake in a canoe. There needs to be better monitoring of fast motor boats. If the waterways are Federal who is going to monitor their use if more access is made available. | | | |
| Dark Sky Park Certification | Will this park meet International Dark Sky Park certification, in regards to its spaces protected for natural conservation that implement good outdoor lighting and provide dark sky programs for visitors? | | | |
| Park limits future development | I believe it is foolish to limit development opportunities within the city limits on what amounts to be almost the entire east side of the river | | | |