

OHV Users Survey Guide for the Recreation Management Draft Plan for Livingstone and Porcupine Hills Areas

Survey at the following link:

[HTTP://talkaep.alberta.ca/livingstone-porcupine-hills-footprint-and-recreation-planning](http://talkaep.alberta.ca/livingstone-porcupine-hills-footprint-and-recreation-planning)



We highly recommend you to review the plans and provide your feedback to the Government of Alberta on this survey. Your input is important !!

If you need assistance, please use this guide on how we answered, and the green boxes will provide information as to the reasons why.

Section 1: Strategic Direction

The Government of Alberta is changing its approach to recreation management on public land. Recreation management plans enable the government to work with partners and recreation users to improve sustainability of the recreation infrastructure system and provide the experience Albertans and visitors are seeking. The plan recognizes that access to natural spaces improves residents' and visitors' sense of place and connection to nature, which enhances quality of life and promotes stewardship of Alberta's public land. The physical, spiritual and mental benefits of outdoor recreation are widely recognized as essential for health. Public lands provide an opportunity for Albertans and visitors to benefit from all that outdoor recreation offers. With a management plan in place, managing recreation on public lands will be undertaken in a way which assures Albertans that public lands can be enjoyed for recreation and that opportunities will be provided for future nature-based tourism and economic diversification in southwest Alberta.

With that in mind, the vision for the draft Livingstone-Porcupine Hills Recreation Management Plan is:

With that in mind, the vision for the draft Livingstone-Porcupine Hills Recreation Management Plan is:

"The scenic and well-managed landscapes of the Livingstone and Porcupine Hills regions, and their abundant wildlife, thriving populations of native fish, inspiring vistas, and unique Indigenous and rural ways of life, will provide Albertans and our visitors with a diversity of recreational opportunities which connect us to the natural environment. Recreational users will find adventure, challenge, solitude, escape, and wonder that reflects the living diversity of Alberta's southern foothills and mountains and the stewardship ethic that sustains the landscape" (see Section 1.3 on page 3).

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the Vision for recreation management within the Livingstone and Porcupine Hills areas? Choose any one option.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Proper consultation or collaboration with affected stakeholders and current users was not performed. Over 70% of the existing OHV trails (mitigated and maintained by volunteers) have been arbitrarily removed without consultation with those affected. This area was to provide for meaningful OHV recreation, as stated at the release of Castle Parks. If the government is not working with users now, how can they be trusted to do in the future? This plan is dramatically reducing existing recreation and public access, while misleading Albertans about the current use. (p51, last paragraph). The management intent is almost identical as Castle Parks, being applied to Public Lands.

2. The draft management plan identifies outcomes that support a wide range of recreation uses (motorized, mixed use, and non-motorized trails, staging, day use and camping areas) in different landscape settings consistent with the natural, Indigenous and local character and history of the area. These outcomes also support respecting the rights and needs of other users of the landscape including other recreation users, surrounding landowners and disposition holders.

See Section 2.2 on page 12 of the draft plan.

The Strategic Outcomes are as follows:

- **Watershed integrity, biodiversity values and reduction of wildfire risk will be enhanced through improved management of the recreation system, in collaboration with users.**
- **Outdoor recreation and tourism opportunities will provide a diverse array of activities for Albertans and visitors.**
- **Albertans have increased awareness, knowledge and respect for the current, historical and cultural use of the areas.**
- **Recreationists are responsible stewards of the land and resources.**
- **Recreationists demonstrate increased compliance with the rules and regulations when recreating.**
- **Provincial, municipal governments and emergency service agencies work together to improve public safety.**
- **Local and regional communities with an interest in increasing and diversifying their tourism industries are supported by opportunities that enhance appreciation and enjoyment of the area.**

To what extent do you agree or disagree that the outcomes will support reaching a desirable future for recreation management in the area? Choose any one option.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

This plan does not diversify recreation, it is discriminating against one type. Why is all non-motorized being supported everywhere, but OHV is continually removed from existing areas with no places to go? We do not need commercial tourism on public lands, these lands are for Albertan public to enjoy - responsibly. This plan extends Castle Parks on this land, and again removes and discriminates against those Albertans who have responsibly enjoyed it - for the exclusive enjoyment of others who already have many other places to go.

3. Do you have any additional comments on the outcomes of the draft Livingstone-Porcupine Hills Recreation Management Plan?

Section 2: Recreational Management Direction

Recreation, Biodiversity and Ecosystem Function – please review Section 4.1 starting on page 19 of the draft plan.

The public use of landscapes, especially unmanaged use, can have significant impacts on watershed integrity and biodiversity. While the management of all recreation is to be carried out in a manner that supports sustainable use of public lands, several key shifts are required to ensure maintenance and improvement of environmental values over time within the Livingstone and Porcupine Hills areas. These include:

- Reducing human footprint to sustainable limits. While all recreational activities have a footprint, motorized vehicles have the greatest impact on wildlife, water, livestock, adjacent landowners, and other use.
- Designating motorized use. Impacts from unpredictable use by recreation users are significant for wildlife, particularly ungulate species and wide-roaming carnivores, as well as livestock.
- Construction of trail water course crossings. Bridges and culverts will eventually be constructed over all water bodies on designated trails. These measures will reduce sedimentation to waterbodies and limit impacts to fisheries populations.
- Development and implementation of standards and best practices. Requirements for location, design and use of recreation infrastructure will mitigate the impacts of recreation on sensitive areas, species of concern, wildlife corridors and other natural resource values.

4. Do you agree with the management direction set forth in this section of the draft plan? Choose any one option.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

The 0.4/0.6km footprint is based on funded ENGO reports of DENSITY/SPEED/WIDTH of Highways and Major Roads, and is not applicable or proven relevant to OHV use in backcountry trails. Not only does this plan classify ALL motorized use the same impacts as On-Highway vehicles (which is false), You have reduced the OHV motorized trails by 70%, but they only represented 33% of the Linear Disturbance. This plan is simply reducing and discriminating against Albertans responsible enjoyment over false and misleading science.

5. Do you have any additional comments on the management direction for Section 4.1 Recreation, Biodiversity and Ecosystem Function for the draft Livingstone-Porcupine Hills Recreation Management Plan?

The 0.4/0.6km footprint is based on funded ENGO reports of DENSITY/SPEED/WIDTH of Highways and Major Roads, and is not applicable or proven relevant to OHV use in backcountry trails. Not only does this plan classify ALL motorized use the same impacts as On-Highway vehicles (which is false), You have reduced the OHV motorized trails by 70%, but they only represented 33% of the Linear Disturbance. This plan is simply reducing and discriminating against Albertans responsible enjoyment over false and misleading science.

6. Within Section 4.2 of the draft plan, direction is provided for managing motorized trails.

It includes direction on trail classification for motorized use, noise, off-road capable highway vehicles (trucks, 4x4s, Jeeps, SUVs, etc.), single track trails for motorbike use, and winter trails in consideration of the growing population pressures, other land uses and users and the social and economic benefits of well managed motorized recreation. The intention for motorized trails and access is that trail infrastructure will move from an ad-hoc state to a system of purpose built, engineered and appropriately designed trails, including properly designed staging areas. Existing trails that have been established and maintained have been assessed for potential incorporation into the new designated trail system and long-term monitoring will occur to ensure the designated trails systems mitigates environmental effects and impacts to other land users, including reducing noise effects to neighboring landowners.

Over time, the motorized system will reflect a variety of trail designs that accommodate a range of experiences. **Planning and designation of the motorized trail network will be determined through integrated and coordinated planning among government agencies and stakeholders** and will conform to the motorized access limits set by the draft Land Footprint Management Plan.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the management intent for motorized trails in the draft plan? Choose any one option.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

This plan did not collaborate with the Motorized users on developing this plan, why are we to believe they will when implementing it. This plan also completely marginalizes the amount of trail work and mitigation that has been done by the volunteer groups, while simply removing trails from areas that did not have any environmental concerns. This plan simply cuts out 70% of existing trails, and does not provide for the users experiences.

7. Do you have any additional comments on the management direction for Section 4.2 on motorized trails for the draft Livingstone-Porcupine Hills Recreation Management Plan?

The proposed trail network does not provide connectivity, user experience, scenic points of interest, connection into BC trail network, and congests the users. Many trails have simply been completely removed from an area (Tent Mountain/West Castle). No involvement or recognition of the considerable amount of volunteer work and money already gone into mitigating and maintain these trails. Simply removing users and their recreation, is punishing them and preventing those with physical limitations to experience the beauty of Alberta that might otherwise be denied.

8. Trails – Non-motorized

Section 4.2 of the draft plan, starting on page 26, provides detailed direction for the management of non-motorized trails. A summary is provided below.

In Section 4.2, starting on page 26, the overall management intent described is to continue to enable non-motorized activity throughout Porcupine Hills and Livingstone except where land use commitments, public safety risks or sensitive environmental issues would prohibit such access.

The draft plan recognizes the current absence of formalized non-motorized opportunities within the Livingstone and Porcupine Hills areas. The plan directs that significant trails, including managed networks (e.g. hiking, skiing, biking), those that provide connectivity to staging areas, viewpoints, cultural or natural landscape features or are destination trails (e.g., Great Divide Trail), will receive appropriate designation and are upgraded as needed to prevent degradation from over use. Equestrian and mountain biking trails will be formally established as resources permit, including developing staging areas and other infrastructure that support these activities. These trails will be developed in partnership with trail groups and users. Commercial trail riding operators will continue to operate as per existing regulation.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the management direction for non-motorized trails? Choose any one option.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Public Land Use areas are not to be developed into commercial Parks. This plan uses references to Linear disturbance to remove 70% of the OHV trails, but then states will develop and provide for more Linear Disturbance for Non-Motorized? There are numerous areas in Alberta, including the Castle parks where non-motorized are being given the trails developed, maintained and mitigated by OHV clubs. Now this is happening again directly across the Highway. This plan discriminates against one user, then provides for another at the current users expense.

9. The draft plan also identifies that current informal non-motorized opportunities throughout the Livingstone and Porcupine Hills are permissible unless restricted for public safety, other land use commitments or sensitive environmental issues. It directs that such use be monitored and the management approach adjusted if impacts become apparent.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this direction? Choose any one option.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

10. Do you have any additional comments on the establishment of non-motorized trails for the draft Livingstone-Porcupine Hills Recreation Management Plan?

We fully agree that all Albertans should have the ability to enjoy responsible recreation on Public Lands, but it should not be done as such to justify removing and excluding others current enjoyment. The desire to provide for inclusiveness - is being done with at the expense and exclusion of others.

The footprint of an equestrian rider, a mountain biker or a hiker can be equal to or greater than that of a motorized user. It is important not to discriminate based upon perception. There are numerous areas for Non-motorized activities that are being publicly funded (tax dollars), supported and provided for, including the new Castle Parks. Motorized use has very limited areas to go, and almost no support other than from its associations/clubs, users and volunteers.

This area was stated to provide and support motorized use upon the announcement of Castle Parks, and now it again is being pushed off the landscape for non-motorized use. Many other activities use motorized as the means and access for their other recreation (Hunters, Fishing, Wood harvest, etc).

Balance should be paramount to provide and support all Albertans Backcountry recreation, not simply divide groups into motorized and non-motorized - creating division in those Albertans who enjoy the same public lands. Many of the trails being used by multiple recreationalists, are jointly maintained by OHV groups and other stewardship groups, and these plans are working to divide Albertans instead of working to create multi-use areas for all to enjoy.

11. Camping

Section 4.3 starting on page 30 of the draft plan provides detailed direction for the management of camping. A summary is provided below.

The management direction in this section is general – it relates to all the camping in the plan area. It indicates the continued use throughout the Public Land Use Zones (PLUZs) for backcountry or tent camping unless restricted due to safety or other land uses. As described on page 30, motorized camping will be managed throughout the PLUZs within rustic motorized camping zones, Public Land Recreation Areas and Provincial Recreation Areas managed by Alberta Parks.

This section provides guidance on where and how motorized (RV, tent trailer, trailer, etc.) camping will be managed in the future. Rustic motorized camping, defined as camping with a recreational vehicle (RV) or camping unit that is designed to be carried on or towed behind a motorized vehicle within a designated area having limited or no services or amenities will occur in designated zones. The majority of these zones are existing camping areas and will offer a similar camping experience to what has historically been available, while also ensuring that these sites are located away from riparian areas and water bodies. Camping zones will be monitored for use and may be moved, expanded or closed as needed. The location of the designated rustic motorized camping zones will be published on the Public Land Use Zone maps for the two areas and updated annually. When released, the PLUZ maps can be found on the Alberta Environment and Parks website.

Do you agree or disagree with the management direction for rustic motorized camping? Choose any one option.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Random Camping is the primary choice for those that recreate in the backcountry and on Public Lands. The reason many random camp, is for accessibility for their intended recreation and proximity to trails heads. Camping in Zones is a good management tool, but if the recreation and trails are not being supported or provided for many people will camp elsewhere. The goal is to provide for the recreational experience and managing use. I recommend this government to review the many surveys and work with the actual stakeholders/users of why people random camp and ensure they are working to support the experience vs only trying to regulate and manage it.

13. Public Land Recreation Areas

Section 4.3 starting on page 31 proposes that six Public Land Recreation Areas be established and how they would be managed. A Public Land Recreation Area (PLRA) is “a delineated area on public land established under the Public Land Administration Regulation (PLAR) that is intended for recreational purposes including camping, staging or day use. Activities within a PLRA are regulated through the Public Land Administration Regulation.”

These areas will be managed in accordance with PLAR and may provide basic amenities including garbage disposal and outhouses. Other amenities including warming shelters, kitchen shelters and picnic sites may be installed in the future.

Figure 7 on page 32 shows the possible location of the six Public Land Recreation Areas: four in the Livingstone Public Land Use Zone (Atlas, McGillivray Creek, Caesar’s Flats and Stimson Creek) and two in the Porcupine Hills Public Land Use Zone (Trout Creek, Beaver Creek).

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the establishment of PLRAs in the Livingstone and Porcupine Hills?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

14. Do you have any additional comments on the establishment of the Public Land Recreation Areas as outlined in the draft Livingstone-Porcupine Hills Recreation Management Plan?

The majority of recreationalists of Public Lands do not use the PLRA's, as these areas traditionally and historically do not provide the experiences users are looking for. Many similar areas across Alberta are seldom used in comparison to the amount of users, and they camp/stay outside of these areas. I highly recommend that you consult with the recreational groups using the land to ensure your plans for these areas do not result in more un-used PLRA's.

15. Day Use

Section 4.3 starting on page 33 of the draft plan provides detailed direction for the management of day use. A summary is provided below.

Specific sites within the two Public Land Use Zones have great potential for day use but are virtually undeveloped. The size and amenities offered in day use areas will vary, dependent on their location, popularity, site features and existing road access.

- Crowsnest Mountain (Livingstone)
- North West Branch (Oldman River Falls) (Livingstone)
- Sharples Creek Road - East (Porcupine)

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the management direction for day use areas? Choose any one option.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

16. Do you have any additional comments on establishment of day use areas as outlined in the draft Livingstone-Porcupine Hills Recreation Management Plan?

Day use areas in Backcountry typically brings tourist type day adventurers out into the backcountry, and typically brings more of the "leave your garbadge here" vs the "Pack it in Pack it out mentality". You are creating the very issues your intending to prevent.

These opportunities have been already provided for in Castle Parks, Waterton, Jasper, Banff or any other of the other 400+ areas in Alberta for this experience. This type of recreation does not have to be provided for - everywhere. Keep it in the areas that are designed for this type of recreation.

17. Nature-based Tourism

Section 4.4 starting on page 34 of the draft plan provides detailed direction for the management of nature-based tourism. A summary is provided below.

Nature-based tourism is an important contributor to local and provincial economies and is recognized by the South Saskatchewan Regional Plan as such. Section 4.4 of the draft plan identifies the role of Livingstone and Porcupine Hills in supporting diversified local economies through nature-based tourism. Specifically, it identifies the role of public lands and nature-based tourism as “to maintain, within a working landscape, the natural setting, important destinations, and infrastructure that facilitates a variety of positive outdoor recreation experiences including commercial recreation and nature-based tourism experiences. In particular, the development of sustainable trails, staging areas, and supporting recreation infrastructure is needed to support the future growth of tourism opportunities.”

Strategies and actions to support desired nature-based tourism opportunities include working with communities to develop tourism plans and working with First Nations and stakeholders to identify potential future development nodes and areas on public lands.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the management intent for nature-based tourism? Choose any one option.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

18. Do you have any additional comments on the future direction for nature-based tourism opportunities?

Eco-Tourism in Backcountry typically brings tourist type day adventurers out into the backcountry, and typically brings more of the "leave your garbadge here" vs the "Pack it in Pack it out mentality". You are creating the very issues your intending to prevent.

As stated above, these opportunities have been already provided for in Castle Parks, Waterton, Jasper, Banff or any other of the other 400+ areas in Alberta for this experience. This type of recreation does not have to be provided for - everywhere. Keep it in the areas that are designed for this type of recreation - so that you can properly support the current users on Public Lands.

19. Other Recreation Activities

Section 4.5 starting on page 36 of the draft plan provides detailed direction for the management of other recreation activities. A summary is provided below.

This draft plan recognizes that there are many other recreation activities that occur on the landscape. In this section the plan provides more information and includes the management direction for activities such as special events, commercial recreation activities, hunting and fishing, target shooting, mountain related activities, and water access for recreation. The plan commits to working with users and commercial operations to identify and formalize water access, ensuring the designated trail network considers the access needs of hunters and anglers and exploring options for formalizing mountaineering and ice climbing routes.

Please note: Target shooting and special events are discussed in more detail in the questions below.

Do you have any additional comments on managing other recreational activities in the Livingstone and Porcupine Hills?

The management plan of this Area is almost identical to Castle Parks, and thus does not appear to be supporting or providing for the users of Public Lands. Planning should seek to include the various "recreation" groups and representative organizations and rely on them to educate, monitor and enforce the use of these practices and the rules of the recreational area. Involved stakeholders will ensure success. Marginalizing the current users will only result in more issues, instead of working to resolve any existing ones.

20. Target Shooting

Section 4.5 starting on page 37 of the draft plan makes recommendations for managing target shooting. Target shooting includes the following: sport-based target shooting using rifles and handguns, trap and skeet shooting, and other types of skill-based shooting done for purposes other than hunting. These activities have historically taken place on public land among areas with recreational and other activity. Subsequently, public safety has been identified as a concern. The plan directs that signs or notices will be posted prohibiting target shooting near Public Land Recreation Areas, camping zones, designated staging and day use areas and designated trails.

The safe use and discharge of a firearm can still be conducted elsewhere within the Public Land Use Zone. Hunting would be permitted throughout these areas, unless explicitly restricted and not part of the prohibition on target shooting.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the recommendations for target shooting? Choose any one option.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

We agree that target shooting in camping zones should not be done for safety reasons, but we recommend working with the local and organized associations and groups representing this sport for their input and recommendations.

21. Special Events

Section 4.5 starting on page 36 gives recommendations for the management of special events. A special event is any organized event that requires special provisions or conditions that are not under the authority of an existing disposition. Events may range from local or family functions (e.g. wedding, family reunion) to large provincial, national and international events (e.g. rallies, international races). They may require use of public facilities or require additional amenities to be brought in (e.g. waste services, parking, etc.). Alberta Environment and Parks requires that special events for commercial purposes receive prior authorization. Authorizations follow established government policy and processes and will align with direction and management intent for each recreation management unit, including limits on the number of events in certain areas (e.g. maximum of 2 events per year in the Porcupine Hills).

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this direction for special events?
Choose any one option.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

22. Do you have any additional comments on the management direction for special events as outlined in the draft Livingstone-Porcupine Hills Recreation Management Plan?

This plan does not provide for what definition of group is. This could also be 5 family camping units enjoying a family event, and management intent seems to be a moving target.

Additionally, it is simply limiting the event as to imply that the activity is bad. Activities should not be limited in amount, they should be provided conditions on having them and the expectation/requirements for doing so.

If the activity/organizer provides a social/economic benefit from those that attend, and respects and comply with all conditions - why would we want to prevent them from doing more?

23. Partnerships

Section 4.8 starting on page 40 of the draft plan provides detailed direction for the developing and encouraging partnerships and stewardship activities. A summary is provided below.

Many organizations work in the areas to provide recreation opportunities and environmental stewardship. Partnerships can be formed to develop, manage, and steward the recreation system as well as to restore riparian areas and old trails. They could also deliver education and messaging (in partnership with government) to support responsible and sustainable use of public lands, and complete monitoring to assist in evaluating the recreation system. The draft plan commits to working with a multi-stakeholder group to support implementation along with pursuing partnerships to establish, maintain and monitor recreation infrastructure, for education and outreach.

How do you see partnerships contributing to recreation management in the Livingstone and Porcupine Hills areas?

Marginalizing the users and work already done by the volunteers by user clubs for the mitigation already done on the trails, is not be the best way to build trust nor get others to invest in time and partnerships. It should be noted that the actions of many ENGO's only work to close access, and once succeeded they move on to the next project without ever actually contributing to the landscape.

24. The draft plan acknowledges the cultural importance of these two areas to First Nations. The two Public Land Use Zones have traditionally and continue to be used by First Nations communities to exercise their Treaty rights and traditional land use activities. Treaty rights include the right to hunt, trap and fish for food, while traditional land uses are broad and include gathering for food or medicine and cultural practice sites.

Throughout the plan there is recognition of these uses and how recreation management can support continued First Nations access while raising awareness for all visitors to the area on First Nations culture, history and current practices. Also within the plan several strategies outline this recognition and awareness. These include reflecting Indigenous history and culture through signage, education and outreach materials, and training for Government of Alberta staff.

What else can be done to promote cultural awareness and knowledge of Treaty rights and traditional land use to Albertans and visitors recreating in these areas?

While fully support, we hope you have asked and consulted with First Nations for their input. Highly recommended you take their input on this, not the input of others - as done with motorized.

Section 4: Monitoring

Measuring performance – please review Section 6.0 starting on page 64 of the draft plan.

Measuring performance is an integral part of planning to enable monitoring, evaluation and reporting on the progress as well as the effectiveness of a plan. Performance data and information helps guide decision-making and supports continuous improvement towards achieving plan outcomes. To facilitate performance measurement, a performance management system is being developed and will be a fundamental part of the implementation of the Livingstone-Porcupine Hills Recreation Management Plan.

25. What contribution can stakeholders and partners provide in future monitoring (e.g. trail use counts & field surveys)?

OHV groups have been very active in developing, managing, and stewarding riparian areas and old trails. They have delivered education and messaging supporting the responsible and sustainable use of public lands, and in turn, are having access (and 70% of their trails) on these lands revoked. These groups seek the very same objectives to ensure environmentally, sustainably responsible use - but are being marginalized by this plan.

They have proven their commitment to the landscape, by countless hours and infrastructure for use by all Albertans. I believe that working with these and other actual recreational groups on the landscape would be highly beneficial, and work to unite those on the landscape vs dividing them.

Section 5: Specific Direction

In Section 5.1 starting on page 44 of the draft plan provides more specific management intent for the Livingstone area by dividing it into four areas as well as providing a map of each.

- [Livingstone and Porcupine Hills Recreation Management Units - PDF \(2.26 MB\)](#)

The four areas are as follows:

- Crowsnest Recreation Management Unit
- Livingstone Range Recreation Management Unit
- Dutch-Oldman Recreation Management Unit
- Willow Creek Recreation Management Unit

This more detailed direction is in addition to the management intent provided in section 4.0 of the draft plan.

In the following questions you will have the opportunity to provide your thoughts on each Recreation Management Unit (RMU) listed above.

The Crowsnest RMU, described starting on page 49, presents unique opportunities for diverse and interconnected trail systems for four season recreation, including both non-motorized and motorized trails. This area will take advantage of its proximity to the Municipality of Crowsnest Pass and enable a large variety of options for Albertans and visitors, including commercial recreation and tourism opportunities. The area also contains important wildlife corridors and areas of high ecological sensitivity and care will be taken in the extent, location and design of recreational opportunities to accommodate those values.

26. To what extent do you support or oppose the management direction for the Crowsnest Recreation Management Unit? Choose any one option.

- Strongly support
- Somewhat support
- Neither support nor oppose
- Somewhat oppose
- Strongly oppose

The entire trail network in Tent Mountain/West Castle has been removed from this draft. This area provided for not only local business opportunities (eg Inn on the Border) but connectivity to BC's extensive trail networks. This plan has run Castle parks to the border, without classifying it as a park.

Other areas have had the existing OHV trails reduced to single, not connecting routes, with dead ends. As an area that was stated to be supportive of the existing OHV recreation, this draft simply removed 70% of the trails and does not provide in supporting the recreation.

28. The Livingstone Range RMU, described on page 50, has high scenic values and draws a variety of non-motorized users including hikers, equestrian users, hunters and anglers. Water-based recreation along the Livingstone and Oldman Rivers is also popular. This RMU will be managed with few to no motorized opportunities, and few formal recreational activities, to maintain a backcountry experience and reflect the natural values of the landscape.

To what extent do you support or oppose the management direction for the Livingstone Range Recreation Management Unit? Choose any one option.

- Strongly support
- Somewhat support
- Neither support nor oppose
- Somewhat oppose
- Strongly oppose

29. Additional Comments?

Again, this plan removed over 70% of the existing OHV trails without consideration of those currently enjoying and using these areas. Many existing trails and routes in the Livingstone Range area have been removed, as well as the current users recreation. Many of these trails had infrastructure and volunteer hours invested, and removed regardless for others to use.

We do not support the exclusion of recreationalists as a means of management, and believe the plans are discriminatory and disrespectful of the current users on the landscape.

30. The Dutch-Oldman RMU, described starting on page 53, is comprised of several watershed basins including Racehorse Creek, Dutch Creek, Hidden Creek, Upper Oldman River and other minor drainages.

The overall management intent is to provide opportunities for rustic motorized camping and motorized recreation at designated locations and on designated trails (winter and summer) supported by necessary staging areas. Non-motorized forms of recreation can occur throughout the entirety of this Recreation Management Unit. Winter long distance trails, technical single track trails and a variety of OHV and camping opportunities will be enabled. Certain areas of this RMU will permit fewer motorized access opportunities to address known resource concerns including Westslope Cutthroat Trout habitat.

To what extent do you support or oppose the management direction for the Dutch-Oldman Recreation Management Unit? Choose any one option.

- Strongly support
- Somewhat support
- Neither support nor oppose
- Somewhat oppose
- Strongly oppose

31. Additional Comments?

While we are concerned of sensitive areas remaining intact, there are many means of mitigation to ensure inclusive use on the landscape.

Simply investing and supporting the existing trails, would have provided for multi use - instead of just removing trails.

32. The Willow Creek RMU, described starting on page 55, is a popular day use and camping area supporting a variety of recreation opportunities. The area will be managed to provide year-round opportunities. The area will allow continuation of motorized recreation using the designated trails. Existing equestrian use will be supported, including upgrading staging areas with specific amenities required for riders. There is significant opportunity for enhanced hiking trails and the potential for development of these trails will be explored with partners.

To what extent do you support or oppose the direction provided for the Willow Creek Recreation Management Unit? Choose any one option.

- Strongly support
- Somewhat support
- Neither support nor oppose
- Somewhat oppose
- Strongly oppose

33. Additional Comments?

We support the intent of providing for continued Motorized recreation, we are very concerned that the actual users, groups and associations representing the recreation are not being part of the planning process. Additionally, not once in the history of this Government has a "proposed" future trails has ever actually happened. We are concerned that this is being said only to gain support for this draft plan, then the recreation will not be supported or provided for. This would be very much in part with the statements and actions regarding OHV use in Castle, then banning/phasing them out after the process.

34. In Section 5.2 starting on page 57, the draft plan provides more specific management intent for the Porcupine Hills area and provides a map showing activity intent. This more detailed direction is in addition to the management intent provided in Section 4.0 of the draft plan. The Porcupine Hills is a cohesive and highly connected landscape and therefore is managed as one RMU.

The overall management intent for the recreation system in the Porcupine Hills is to provide opportunities that take advantage of the high scenic values and interesting and unique terrain for formalized and dispersed non-motorized trails, day use, as well as camping. The focus will be on providing a rustic and natural visitor experience, without significant modifications to the landscape. A designated motorized recreation trail system will provide experiences for OHV users, focusing on families, casual riders and shorter distance rides. Similarly, rustic motorized camping will be within designated zones and Public Land Recreation Areas.

To what extent do you support or oppose the direction provided for the Porcupine Hills Recreation Management Unit? Choose any one option.

- Strongly support
- Somewhat support
- Neither support nor oppose
- Somewhat oppose
- Strongly oppose

35. Additional Comments?

We support the intent of providing for continued Motorized recreation, we are very concerned that the actual users, groups and associations representing the recreation are not being part of the planning process. Additionally, not once in the history of this Government has a "proposed" future trail ever actually happened. We are concerned that this is being said only to gain support for this draft plan, then the recreation will not be provided for. This would be very much in part with the statements and actions regarding OHV use in Castle, then banning/phasing them out after the process.

36. Table 14 (on page 60) lists actions and strategies that are specific to each Recreation Management Unit. They include area-specific actions around non-motorized and motorized trails, camping areas, day use and other recreation opportunities.

Are there additional Recreation Management Unit specific strategies and actions that should be considered?

While supportive of including the recreational uses as listed, if not providing the experiences the users seek - this will create more issues instead of solving them. This area was stated to be supportive for OHV recreation due to the removal of all the OHV trails and access in Castle Parks. This area has had the existing trail network removed by over 70%, and does so without have having consulted or collaborated in planning with the current users and stakeholders providing volunteer stewardship and mitigation of these trails.

Section 6: Additional Comments

37. Please provide any additional comments on the draft Livingstone-Porcupine Hills Recreation Management Plan.

This plan does little to provide for or respect the current recreational users and stakeholders, and the reasons those recreate on Public Land vs Parks. I am also discouraged with only 30 days public input into such a sweeping plan that removes over 70% of the existing trail network, and takes Albertans Public Lands and delivers a Park Management plan to them.

You have not provided any contributions in supporting the current users experiences, and have pandered to the pressures of ENGO's not even contributing on the landscape or economics. No collaboration with the majority of current users on the landscape is clearly evident.

While fully supportive of an inclusive management plan that respects those on the landscape, by balancing enviromental, social and economics - this plan unfortunately does not offer this outcome. This plan as presented marginalizes and discriminates against current users, masked as promoting diversity for other users. I do not support this plan as presented.