

~ DRAFT ~

BCEAG

Bow Corridor Ecosystem Advisory Group

**Draft Recommendations:
Recreational Opportunities
Working Group**

June 26, 2002

Town of Canmore
Municipal District of Bighorn
Government of Alberta
Banff National Park
Town of Banff

Copies of this report and appendices may be obtained from:

Town of Canmore
600 – 9th Street
Canmore, AB
T1W 2T2
Telephone: (403) 678-1500

Alberta Community Development
303-2938 11 Street NE
Calgary, AB
T2E 7L7
Telephone: (403) 297-5969

Municipal District of Bighorn
Box 310
No. 2 Heart Mountain Drive
Exshaw, AB
T1W 2M4
Telephone: (403) 673-3611

Alberta Community Development
Second Floor, Canmore Provincial Building
800 Railway Avenue
Canmore, AB
T1W 1P1
Telephone: (403) 678-5508

Banff National Park Administrative Office
101 Mountain Avenue, Box 900
Banff, AB
T0L 0C0
Telephone: (403) 762-1500

Biosphere Institute of the Bow Valley
203, 749 Railway Avenue
Canmore, Alberta
T1W 1P2
Telephone: (403) 678-3445

Electronic versions of the draft report and appendices are available at www.biosphereinstitute.org.

1.0 BACKGROUND

Increased human use in the Bow Valley from Banff National Park to the Kananaskis River combined with recently designated protected areas and wildlife conservation objectives has raised concerns by locals and visitors about loss of access to recreational opportunities. BCEAG's *"Guidelines for Human Use within Wildlife Corridors and Habitat Patches in the Bow Valley"* (1999) made numerous recommendations for trails within wildlife corridors, but did not address the existence of many trails outside of wildlife corridors or future outdoor recreation needs in the Bow Valley. This document (subject to BCEAG and jurisdictional approval) is supplemental to the earlier *"Guidelines for Human Use within Wildlife Corridors and Habitat Patches in the Bow Valley"* (1999). The implementation and education efforts associated with the Guidelines for Human Use have not been adequate to date. A greater emphasis is required on education and development of community co-operation, in order to effectively implement the guidelines.

The Bow Corridor Ecosystem Advisory Group (BCEAG) is a senior level advisory group formed to address development issues in the Bow Corridor. BCEAG's partnering agencies include the Town of Canmore, Municipal District of Bighorn, Provincial Government, Banff National Park and Town of Banff. Working in a multi-jurisdictional partnership, BCEAG prepares integrated recommendations for consideration by the member agencies. ROWG is a working group of BCEAG, and as such, reports directly to BCEAG.

In this regard, ROWG has been established to provide a mechanism to coordinate and make recommendations on the management of recreational opportunities within the heights of land from Banff National Park gates to Seebe. For more details on the study area, please refer to Map #1.

Once this report is finalized, implementation of the recommendations generated within this process will be the responsibility of the partnering jurisdictions. The recommendations will not have statutory authority in any jurisdiction unless adopted under specific legislation. Partnering agencies may decide to work jointly where deemed beneficial.

For more details, please refer to Appendix 1: BCEAG Fact Sheet, Appendix 2: ROWG Terms of Reference, Appendix 4: Common Questions & Answers, and Appendix 5: Annotated Bibliography: Science Behind the Closures.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this project are fourfold:

- To raise awareness of the need to manage recreational use in the Canmore area in order to meet the following objectives: preserving wildlife corridors and habitat; dealing with erosion, safety and liability issues; minimizing user conflict; and managing trail development and impacts.
- To recommend recreational opportunities, particularly trails, that can exist in the study area while fulfilling the aforementioned objectives.
- To review these recreational opportunities with representatives from a wide variety of groups.
- To make recommendations on areas where potential conflicting interests could occur between recreational users and land uses (e.g., land development industry, rock industry, electrical power transmission, transportation, tourism development).

For more details, please refer to Appendix 2: ROWG Terms of Reference.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

ROWG was formed at the request of trail users to involve a wide range of user interests within recreational planning processes. Openness was a hallmark of this process and opportunities for public involvement were high. The Terms of Reference for this process were developed by ROWG and subsequently approved by BCEAG. In addition, ROWG members (many of whom are volunteers) made themselves available throughout the process to anyone wishing to express their views or ideas.

~ DRAFT ~

ROWG was formed to include representation from BCEAG member agencies, trail users and other interest groups (e.g., conservation groups). All ROWG members are listed below.

Mountain Biking Public - Ken Davies, Kathy Davies	Hiking/Walking Public – Doug Campbell, Brian Carter
Climbing Public – Dan Verrall	Equestrian Public - Carole Stark
Cross-Country Skiing Public – Theresa Gawron	Conservation Representative – Jeff Gailus
Ecological Scientist – Danah Duke	Town of Canmore –Steve de Keijzer, Andre Gareau
Alberta Community Development – Steve Donelon, Don Cockerton, Ron Henderson	Alberta Sustainable Resource Development – Jon Jorgenson, Greg McAndrews
MD of Bighorn - Greg Birch, Ed Latvala	Banff National Park – Anne-Marie Buchwald
Biosphere Institute – Melanie Watt	Canmore/Kananaskis Chamber of Commerce - Rob Elliott
Recreational Studies – Megan Squires	Calgary Area Outdoor Council – Jane Papenhuyzen, Alf Skrastins
Alberta Environment - Rob Wolfe	

ROWG utilized a wide array of public-participation techniques to engage the general public during the preparation of these recommendations. These techniques have been highlighted below:

NAME	INTEREST REPRESENTED	DATE	NUMBER OF ATTENDEES
Workshop #1	Cross Country Skiing and Running	February 4, 2002	10
Workshop #2	Equestrian	February 25, 2002	10
Workshop #3	Climbing and Hiking	February, 28,2002	16
Workshop #4	Conservationists	March 4, 2002	14
Workshop #5	Canmore Collegiate High School – Environmental Education Class	March 6, 2002	10
Workshop #6	Calgary Area Outdoor Council	March 6, 2002	15
Forum #1	Canmore General Public	March 11, 2002	87
Forum #2	Exshaw General Public	March 14, 2002	5
Forum #3	Harvie Heights General Public	March 16, 2002	26
Workshop #7	Mountain Bike Interest Group	March 25, 2002	47
Draft Report Open House	Canmore Open House	June 10, 2002	92
TOTAL			285

- Interest group workshops were advertised by ROWG participants using a variety of methods.
- Advertisements for the public forums were placed in the Banff Crag and Canyon, Canmore Leader, and Rocky Mountain Outlook for two weeks preceding the public forums. In addition, posters advertising the events were distributed within Canmore, Banff and Calgary. A press release was distributed and printed in the Rocky Mountain Outlook and Canmore Leader one week prior to the public forums.
- Advertisements for the open house were placed in the Canmore Leader and the Rocky Mountain Outlook for two weeks preceding the open house. In addition, posters advertng the events were distributed within Canmore, Banff and Calgary. Copies of the draft report were provided to the Rocky Mountain Outlook and Canmore Leader one week prior to the open house. As a result of this action, the Rocky Mountain Outlook printed one article prior to the open house and both the Rocky Mountain Outlook and Canmore Leader printed articles after the open house.

4.0 KEY FINDINGS

Although it is apparent that there are many issues and divergent views regarding trail use in the Bow Valley, the following highlight some of the recurring themes.

- Ongoing education will be critical to the successful implementation of these recommendations.
- People expressed concern about trail closures and maintaining the integrity of the wildlife corridors.
- User conflict and crowding on trails needs to be addressed.
- Many questioned how trail users could have substantial impacts on wildlife.
- It was evident that there are often strong values behind the views.
- The benchlands trails are of particular importance.
- People expressed concern about vehicle access through Harvie Heights.
- Development is seen as the root cause of many of these problems.
- Need for consistency and fairness (e.g., golf courses still being allowed in corridors).
- Adequate and appropriate trailhead parking is important.
- Erosion is a problem that needs to be addressed.
- A range of opportunities for various users needs to be provided.
- Monitoring and adaptive management were seen as important (e.g., dealing with future changes such as population growth).

For more specifics on what was heard, please refer to Appendix 3: Public Consultation Summary.

5.0 PRINCIPLES

ROWG has considered the mandates, management objectives, public comments, and views of the various jurisdictions and stakeholders. To assist in the evaluation of options for the on-going management of the study area, ROWG has adopted the following guiding principles:

- Ecological Integrity
ROWG supports maintaining the integrity of wildlife corridors, habitat patches, and other environmentally sensitive areas.
- Shared Recreational Use
Many designated trails in the Bow Valley shall be shared use for a variety of non-motorized recreational uses. In some cases, single use trails may be established so as to provide a variety of opportunities or ensure public safety and enjoyment. The availability of resources to provide an adequate standard of trail for shared use may also be a factor. Recreational opportunities should be provided for all users by working in consultation with user groups, developers and jurisdictions.
- Sustainability
Trails and wildlife corridors need to be sustainable. This requires a balance among various uses including providing a range of opportunities for outdoor recreation, minimizing conflicts between trail users, minimizing soil erosion, and protecting the integrity of environmentally sensitive areas in the Bow Valley.
- Compliance with Human Use Guidelines
ROWG accepts that changes to the seasonal and permanent closure recommendations contained within the Guidelines for Human Use within Wildlife Corridors and Habitat Patches in the Bow Valley (August 1999) will not be considered unless new reasonable alternatives/information becomes available to warrant such changes, and it can be demonstrated that the changes will be "as good or better" for wildlife.

- Provision of Trail Opportunities
ROWG supports the establishment of a trail system that provides linkages through the entire study area with minimal use of roads. In addition, ROWG supports the provision of an effective trail system that discourages proliferation of new unplanned trails while establishing and recognizing a “sustainable” network of trails. Public safety is important and will need to be addressed during the detailed planning stages.
- Community Partnerships
Land management agencies and municipal authorities should continue to work closely with stakeholders and the community at large in a partnership approach. The goal of this partnership should be to maintain viable wildlife corridors and protect important habitat and features while providing a broad range of sustainable trail opportunities. This partnership approach will ensure that land managers have a good understanding of the needs of the various users and the community as a whole as well as bringing a variety of non governmental resources (e.g., volunteers, donations, contributions in kind) to the development and operation of a trail network. This will also help to ensure that stakeholders and citizens understand and support the measures implemented to protect wildlife or other features in the valley.
- Trail Maintenance
If trails are prone to erosion or overuse, they will 1) stop being used and create the demand for new trails on a declining land inventory, or 2) cost too much money to be maintained. Therefore, when planning, designing and developing trails, extra consideration must be given to the long-term life of the trails. Official trails will be carefully planned, managed, maintained, signed and mapped. Unofficial trails may be left in place, or in cases where there are environmental concerns, physically closed and reclaimed. Recreation users should be able to depend on an established system of trails which will not be lost through development.
- Planning for the Future
Planning for the future use of trails will be the single greatest factor in ensuring the success of the ROWG recommendations. It is expected that Canmore will grow and change significantly over the next 20 years. Therefore, the trail system and planned usage should take into account these changes so that the trails are sustainable and still support these guiding principles. In addition, ROWG supports the establishment of an integrative coordinated approach to trail management, whereby different agencies work together to develop a functioning long-term network of trails in the Bow Valley.

6.0 GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Community Education and Participation

- Ongoing contact is to be maintained with key audiences to help people feel informed about and included in the trail management process, and to build a sense of community ownership of the issues and solutions. Key audiences include: Bow Valley residents (permanent, part-time, seasonal), visitors, trail users, recreation and environmental interest groups, land management agencies, BCEAG members, educators and educational institutions (formal and non-formal), tourism operators and promoters, land developers, and the media.
- A comprehensive approach to education should weave together: communications and information sharing; meaningful community dialogue involving interest groups and the general public; targeted educational events or initiatives; and use of the media.
- Citizen participation in volunteer trail management and stewardship initiatives is to be encouraged by involving people in data gathering and interpretation; wildlife and human use monitoring; trail restoration and maintenance, and evaluation of the effectiveness of trail management techniques.

- Relevant research reports and educational resources on wildlife corridors, human impacts on wildlife, and human use management should be shared with key audiences as materials become available.
- Trail signs and maps should reinforce the key educational messages and processes. Sign messages and layout must be consistent between agencies, simple, appropriate, contain the reasons for closure, and indicate a re-direction to alternative routes.

Key components of the educational message

- the rationale behind specific closures and recommendations;
- recognition that recreational activities, pace of growth, and level of development in the Bow Valley have significant adverse impacts on the integrity of the wildlife corridors;
- a recognition of the needs of both wildlife and people; emphasize co-existence between humans and wildlife;
- the need for and role of personal responsibility/stewardship;
- research on, trends and examples of efforts to manage human impacts on wildlife;
- information on alternative trails and impact management techniques; what trails and actions are appropriate;
- trail use ethics/etiquette (relating to user conflicts);
- clear and user friendly maps/visuals.

6.2 Research and Monitoring

- Continued research and monitoring will be key to evaluating the success of the ROWG recommendations and to applying principles of adaptive management to wildlife corridor and recreation needs. Adequate resources will be required.
- Ongoing monitoring of human use on recreation trails within the study area is recommended to evaluate changes in the level, timing, and type of use occurring, to document areas of new random trail development, determine compliance with recommendations, and to identify potential opportunities for trail development or reclamation. Each jurisdiction should undertake monitoring on lands under their responsibility. Common methodologies for collecting and reporting human use information need to be developed and implemented.
- Continued research into the effects of human use on wildlife in corridors and habitat patches specific to the Bow Valley is required. This research is the responsibility of Alberta Community Development and Alberta Sustainable Resource Development who will continue to support and follow through on existing wildlife research commitments in the Bow Valley.
- Periodic monitoring of wildlife movement and habitat use in the Bow Valley should continue to assess changes in the distribution, timing, and movement of wildlife as it relates to human use, development and recreational opportunities.
- Specific monitoring and research objectives identified in BCEAG's Wildlife and Human Use Monitoring for the Bow Valley (Banff National Park to Seebe) (September 2001) should be implemented.

6.3 Trail Construction and Maintenance

- All jurisdictions are encouraged to develop a range of types and standards of trails. Common design, construction and maintenance standards should be utilized wherever possible.
- Construction and maintenance will normally be done through a partnership arrangement where projects are partially funded and supervised by the jurisdiction responsible and, as well, there will be a volunteer labor component and often, outside funding as well.
- Names should be established for all new trails.

6.4 Physical Impacts

- Erosion is a concern on some trails, especially where severe vertical grade exists. Where multi-use demand is greatest, trails should be on grades that are less steep. Where steep terrain cannot be avoided, a series of switchbacks could be developed. Trail braiding is another concern on many popular multi-use trails and as with erosion, best management practices need to be employed.
- Trail marking should have no permanent effect on trees and vegetation. Bear proof garbage containers may be required on certain high use trails, especially where there are trailheads, viewpoints, or natural stopping areas. In addition, washroom facilities may be required at trailhead locations and at the base of very popular climbing areas. Washroom facilities should be addressed in the planning stages for trailheads in new subdivisions (potentially tying them into the town sewage system for summer use only or considering other options such as composting toilets).
- Trailhead access and parking should be established to reduce impact of on street parking especially in already existing residential neighborhoods or those in the planning stages as in the Three Sisters Development. This would be the responsibility of the developer or the various jurisdictions depending on where the parking is required.
- Small pods of ecologically sensitive or unique areas or those of public sentiment or concerns, such as the fern forest near Harvey Heights, could be protected or avoided by either re-routing trails or by building wood paths through these boggy areas, the latter solution requiring financing by public awareness fund-raising perhaps.
- Condensing multi-users onto one trail in certain key “hot spots” contributes to user conflict. To mitigate this effect it is important to maintain looped trails to avoid the out and back use of the same trails. Also the establishment of an off-leash area for users on the north side of the Trans-Canada highway would reduce impact between dog, horse and people, as well as reduce impact of dogs in wildlife corridors.
- Locations for mountain bike play parks and potentially other specialized and localized “trail” activities should be sought out. The use of non-designated areas is discouraged and prohibitions more strictly enforced when alternatives are available. The establishment of a controlled area for this purpose may be taken up with this particular user group in the future. ROWG recommends that this topic is one of the key areas to be discussed by the proposed future trail advisory committee.

6.5 Enforcement

- Compliance with the human use and trail guidelines should, where possible, be achieved through education and community and stakeholder participation. The concept of self-policing by trail users and the use of peer pressure to achieve compliance objectives will be important to the successful implementation of ROWG recommendations. However appropriate legislated enforcement authorities and tools also need to be in place to support management actions. Both Provincial and Municipal jurisdictions should take action to ensure that the necessary compliance tools are in place and that authorities are prepared to use these tools to ensure compliance with trail recommendations. Most important is the legislated ability to permanently or seasonally close trails and / or areas to human use and to be able to enforce this through the issue of warnings, charges and orders combined with meaningful penalties.
- Implementation and enforcement of ROWG recommendations will be the responsibility of each of the BCEAG partnering agencies. Following is a description of the legislated authorities for each.

Legislated Authorities

- There are five different government jurisdictions that have authority to manage and regulate activities on lands within the ROWG study area. Each of these jurisdictions uses a variety of legislation and planning tools to achieve management objectives.

Provincial Jurisdiction

- Alberta Protected Areas

Alberta Provincial Parks, Wildland Provincial Parks (e.g. Bow Valley Wildland Park) and Provincial Recreation Areas are managed under the authority of the Provincial Parks Act. Legislation in the act permits the minister to restrict certain activities or close trails and areas for public safety and other management purposes. The act also provides regulations for use in enforcing the closures. The Provincial Parks Act also contains a regulation which requires dogs to be on leash at all times in provincial parks, wildland parks and provincial recreation areas.

Warnings, charges and orders can be issued under the Provincial Parks Act which also includes provisions for penalties (fines) and seizures.

- Forest Reserve and Public Lands

A portion of the study area falls within lands under the jurisdiction of Alberta Sustainable Resource Development and are subject to legislation pursuant to the Forest Reserves Act, Forests Act and Public Lands Act. These Acts can provide for the closure of a trail or area to motorized use for public safety or environmental reasons however specific regulations would have to be developed and would require passage by the legislature and an order in council. The Minister of Sustainable Resource Development, under the Forest and Prairie Protection Act, may close to public entry any land where fire danger warrants a closure.

Municipal Jurisdictions

- Town of Canmore and Municipal District of Bighorn

In terms of trails and associated recreational activities, the Municipal Government Act provides the authority for municipal councils to pass bylaws and resolutions to control activities only on municipally owned or controlled lands. Municipal governments also have the authority to control development of private land through the development approval process. Specific conditions can be attached to such development approvals.

The Municipal District of Bighorn currently does not have a bylaw related to the closure of trails or areas on municipal lands. The Town of Canmore does have a bylaw that allows the municipal council to make resolutions closing municipal reserve lands during specific times. Both municipalities have bylaws that require dogs to be leashed.

6.6 Future Advisory Committee

- A recreational opportunities working group should continue in perpetuity. The suggested mandate would be to serve as an effective communication link between the Bow Valley land managers (Town of Canmore, MD of Bighorn, Alberta Sustainable Resource Development, and Alberta Community Development) and the major trail user groups. This ongoing group would report issues, track trail changes, and make recommendations to improve trails. This reporting should be directly to the relevant land managers noted above with meetings held on a quarterly basis.
- Recommended participants would be one representative each from the four land managers, a conservation representative, a running/hiking group representative, a mountain biking representative, an equestrian representative, a wildlife scientist, and one other member from the public at large. Volunteer terms will be for a maximum of three years and the chair of the group would be elected by the group, but be expected to change yearly. The frequency of meeting would be up to the group, but should be at least quarterly.

7.0 TRAIL SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

The following section highlights some of the major recommendations. Please refer to the attached maps for details of all recommendations.

7.1 North Side of Valley

East of Cougar Creek

- The potential establishment of a multi-use trail between Harvie Heights/Canmore/Exshaw is currently being studied. ROWG supports this concept.
- The seasonal closures (December 1 to May 15) for all trails within the former riding club pasture area should remain. Other trails in the immediate area will be subject to the same seasonal closure. This area is an important winter/spring area for elk and sheep.
- The permanent closure on the upper alpine club trail should remain. A new single-track trail is recommended for the area south of the upper alpine club trail. Furthermore, it is expected that many of the trails in this southern area could become part of an official trail system.
- Some trails in this area are showing signs of erosion; these problems should be addressed.
- The possibility of a trail north of the closed upper alpine club (C2, C4 & C5) trail was suggested. This trail is proposed for the area above the habitat patch, and should be investigated at a later date for feasibility. Wildlife concerns for this proposal were noted.
- Some type of crossing over Cougar Creek is recommended. Ground-truthing will be required. Due to spring flooding, a permanent bridge may not be practical.

West of Cougar Creek

- A new trail has been proposed from Cougar Creek through the central part of SilverTip. This trail will help to connect with other trails in the area to form loops.
- A new trail (including a potential provisions for a viewpoint) has been proposed just north of the golf course. This trail comes with the proviso that once this trail is built, all trails north of this location within the wildlife corridor will become permanent closures (in other words, the trail is intended to serve as a replacement for the upper benchland trail). This trail is intended to be open year round but as per the majority of trails in the Valley, it will not be maintained as a winter trail.
- A safe trail connection from South Canmore to Cougar Creek is recommended.
- A pedestrian only trail on upper portion of the Mt. Lady McDonald summit trail is recommended. Appropriate signage should be installed.
- The Southeast Palliser ASP area is proposed as a temporary dog off-leash area.
- The Tibbett's Quarry Trail needs to be redesigned to decrease speed via switchbacks. The high trail that connects the SilverTip loop to the Tibbett's Quarry Trail will be left open.
- A trailhead east of Harvie Heights should only be created if the demand becomes evident. The demand does not currently exist. Numerous potential locations were suggested (e.g., boundary creek, the MD water reservoir, etc.).
- A short connector trail from the west side of the Harvie Heights hotel zone northwards to existing local trails is recommended.
- A marked trail from Tibbett's Quarry Trail circumventing the Fern Forest Trail should be established to avoid this sensitive area.

7.2 South Side of the Valley

Canmore Nordic Centre

- The Canmore Nordic Centre (CNC) is managed to provide a broad range of recreational opportunities throughout the year. ROWG encourages individuals to use this area as a year-round recreational area.
- Within the footprint of the CNC, the development of a:
 - single-track loop;
 - hiking loop and;
 - paved roller-ski loopis recommended. As with other areas, planning will be integral to addressing wildlife concerns, erosion issues and visitor safety. Although trail locations have not been determined at this point, existing trails will be utilized wherever possible.
- The two single-track trails down to Georgetown Flats (Skull Mountain and Coal Shutes) should be reconstructed and prescribed as no winter maintenance.
- Better signage is recommended throughout the entire CNC.
- The CNC is the only area within the study area where there are winter maintenance recommendations on trails.

Highway 742 to Pigeon Creek

- The development of a highline trail (located far above the wildlife corridor east to Stewart Creek) is recommended.
- In addition, a lower trail south of the Peaks of Grassi subdivision is recommended. Fencing above the Peaks of Grassi is also recommended to encourage use on the proposed new trail.
- The majority of trails within the wildlife corridor should be closed other than a few well-spaced (at least one kilometer apart) perpendicular crossings to provide access to the proposed higher trail.
- Designation of routes for the Sentier National Trail and Trans Canada Trail should be accommodated.
- A bridge connection from South Canmore to Mineside (as per the Wildlife Human Interaction Prevention Plan) is recommended.
- A pedestrian only trail for the existing trail at Ha Ling / Miner's Peak is recommended. Appropriate signage should be installed.
- ROWG supports a wildlife crossing structure on the Rundle Forebay in conjunction with:
 1. a provision for a human use crossing structure;
 2. appropriate fencing;
 3. mechanisms for accommodating human use on the dyke.
 - ROWG believes items 1 – 3 above are necessary to ensure the functionality of the proposed wildlife crossing structure.
 - The trails in this planning area will be subject to further review (including a public involvement process) through the planning process for the Rundle Forebay.

7.3 East End of the Valley

- ROWG supports the establishment of a trail system that provides linkages through the entire study area with minimal use of roads.
- Jewell Pass Trail was identified as an area of emerging user conflicts. The proposed future trail advisory committee will deal with these and other issues.

8.0 MAPS

Attached.

9.0 IMPLEMENTATION

- Implementation of these recommendations is the responsibility of BCEAG member agencies.
- Successful implementation of ROWG's recommendations will require adequate resources from the key agencies. This involves funding, manpower, and expertise.
- An ongoing trails advisory committee is recommended to work with BCEAG member agencies on the planning and management of trails. Please refer to Section 7.6 for more details.
- The Town of Canmore and Alberta Community Development (ACD), as the BCEAG member agencies coordinating the current ROWG process, will ensure that the Town and ACD, as well as other relevant BCEAG members, are aware of recommendations which they have the authority (either solely or in cooperation with other agencies) to implement. ACD and the Town will propose a table of actions and responsibilities (i.e., who does what) for BCEAG's consideration which will identify responsible agencies and identify costs and timelines for each of the actions proposed by ROWG. The table is intended to be a living document which can be updated regularly as requirements change.
- Partnerships (e.g., citizen groups, individuals, volunteers and corporations, etc.) will be required to implement some of the trail recommendations. Both ACD and the Town will ensure that an appropriate structure is in place to recruit and support work by these partnerships. The appropriate structure for this may be the proposed ongoing trail advisory working group.

10.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- These recommendations were prepared with the help and assistance of many individuals.
- Special thanks to all of the key ROWG members who in addition to reviewing and writing sections of the report, put in endless hours at meetings, workshops, forums, open houses. Their significant time commitment and willingness to volunteer on this challenging project is greatly appreciated. These individuals included Ken Davies, Megan Squires, Doug Campbell, Carole Stark, Jeff Gailus, Dan Verrall, Theresa Gawron, Melanie Watt, Alf Skrastins, Kathy Davies, and Jane Papenhuyzen
- Thanks are also in order for other ROWG members who volunteered their time during the process. These individuals included Danah Duke, Rob Elliot, Melissa Mauro, James Bannon, Chris Miller, Brian Carter, and Ann Maynard.
- Thanks go out to the various government representatives. These individuals included Steve Donelon, Don Cockerton, Ron Henderson, Greg Birch, Ed Latvala, Steve de Keijzer, Andrea Gareau, Jon Jorgenson, Greg McAndrews, Jan Simonson, Eva Katic, Anne-Marie Buchwald, Gary Buxton, Darrel Zell, Cliff White, Sue Webb and Rob Wolfe.
- Special thanks to guest presenters John Third (SilverTip), Bill Douglas (Three Sisters Resorts), Norm Houchin (Stantec Consulting) and Frank Kernick (Eagle Terrace).
- Special thanks to Scott Jevons for his excellent work preparing maps throughout the process.