

KanQuiz Results

This document is a summary of responses to a survey conducted online by the Save Kananaskis group. We asked for input on a variety of topics from creating a park to forest management. This, in response to a call from the Kananaskis administration for comment on a management plan review. We sent them a spreadsheet with 135 completed surveys on January 15, 2008. We got input from mountain bikers, environmentalists, nature lovers, families and even a few industrial users. We admit to a bias to end industrial use of Kananaskis. That said, we tried to present a representative summary of the responses. We also tried to include comment from industrial users even though they wouldn't have counted in a statistical average.

As of January 23, 2008 we received 151 completed surveys. All respondents said they would like to create a park and six said they thought logging in the park would be OK. A few didn't choose.

During this current round of controversy (January 2008) over the start of logging in Sibbald and the destruction of a portion of the Trans Canada Trail (Lusk Creek/Old Baldy Pass), the overwhelming majority of respondents said there should be no industrial activity in Kananaskis.

Part 1 - The Save Kananaskis Questions.

How often do you visit in the summer/winter?

Respondents were either frequent or regular visitors in the summer with a smattering of occasional and the odd infrequent responses. Things were a little more mixed in the winter, ranked; regular, occasional, infrequent and the odd frequent.

What's your favourite?

trail:

Pick a trail, any trail, and it's someone's favourite. Not really a fair question. Quite a few people couldn't choose; they like them all. We were surprised by the number of times trails in Sibbald were mentioned.

activity:

Most respondents hike or mountain bike and ski in the winter. There was a bit of everything; scrambling, horseback riding, photography, camping, snowshoeing, walking, jogging, rock/ice climbing, mountain climbing, canoeing, running, Kayak, swimming, sight seeing, backcountry camping,

motorbiking and rafting. No one mentioned hunting or fishing, although when questioned specifically about these activities, many thought them OK.

place:

The favourite place question was again unfair. We got a bit of everywhere with Kananaskis and West Bragg Creek predominant. The top of a mountain or hill seems to be a popular destination, although Barrier Lake and Elbow Falls were mentioned a few times. Interesting that Allen Bill and Elbow Falls, the most frequently visited, were not mentioned most frequently. It appears that our respondents might be characterized as the "hard core" - both because they can get to the top and because they do it a lot.

wildlife:

Bears won out as the favourite wildlife, with moose not far behind. The diversity of wildlife present in Kananaskis was present in the quiz. Here's a sampling: wolf, moose, elk, cougar, deer, voles, bighorn sheep, mountain goats, chipmunks, lynx, grouse and birds in general, wild horses, cutthroat trout and fish, insects and squirrels.

The most beautiful thing in Kananaskis?

The mountains and trees won out with expansive views, everything and all of Kananaskis frequently mentioned. Here are a few notable quotes; the trees after a light snow fall, clouds and sunrise from a mountain top, untouched natural landscapes, rivers, solitude 20 minutes from home, beautiful vistas & wildlife viewing, relaxation, exercise, the water, the air, the wildlife, the peace and quiet, wild flowers, silence in the trees, marsh and meadows.

What's the ugliest?

No contest - clear-cuts are the ugliest thing in Kananaskis, with human impacts and oil and gas mentioned less frequently. A few extraordinary items: cattle, cowpies, machinery, compressor plants, Bragg Creek, tree tags.

What's the most fun you've ever had there?

Many people noted unique hiking and biking adventures; often under difficult conditions. It's impossible to report all the unique individual comments; here are a few: being completely content . . . stress free, censored!, hiking and a picnic with a moose looking on, camping with my friends, racing sticks in the streams with my kids, doing my fieldwork, I ride K-country several times a week all summer, Take school groups there twice annually to expose them to arguably the most beautiful place on earth.

Ever had a bad day?

Most people want to be able to continue to enjoy Kananaskis as it is without logging. Some wanted more mountain biking and trails, another wanted to have a say, and be heard!!! Several said, show it to my kids, grandchildren and future generations in 40 to 50 years.

What activities do you enjoy?

We should have had an "all of the above choice" for the "what activities" question. Many enjoy several activities (an average of 5). Five respondents use OHVs, a few hunt (8) lots more fish (17) and lots ride horseback (16), but hiking, biking and skiing top the list.

Other activities?

Those who didn't have enough to do cited paragliding, walk the dogs, ice climbing, kayaking, bird watching, snow shoe, photography, painting, taking my blind and special needs friends for walks and X-C skiing and refresh my soul as things they'd like to do.

If you had a \$million to spend, what would you do with it?

The common idea was to spend the \$million to protect K-country from logging and restrict oil/gas development. There was a more or less even split between those who would use the money to keep it as it is (hire conservation officers, restrict access, educate people and maintain it) and those who would use it to upgrade trails, facilities (toilets, campgrounds), education and interpretation and repair the damage done.

Would you pay an entrance fee?

101-Yes, 25-No, 9-no answer.

What's missing?

The political will to preserve the area as a park! Strict usage policy. A lot of people like it just as it is.

What shouldn't be there?

We don't need industrial development, particularly logging and oil and gas, or commercial development like golf courses and hotels. Several people mentioned motorized vehicles and cattle.

What's broken? How can it be fixed?

Our attitude - need to value wild spaces as they are, not as a resource to be mined / logged. We need a government that listens to the people. We need better trail maintenance. Reforestation.

What's most important?

A large majority (75) said nature conservation was the most important interest in Kananaskis. Recreation (37) came next with all of the above (16) which would add industrial development and agriculture pulling up the rear. One person said agriculture.

Do you depend on Kananaskis for income?

Eleven people said they earn income from Kananaskis. Four people through recreation. Three people said logging. One of those said the Tag-A-Tree signs were ugly and we don't need environmentalists. The other said we need better integration of users, ongoing monitoring and good forest management practices. The third said, both recreation and industrial activity should be acceptable and there is no problem with the multi-use policy. Of the two who earned income from oil & gas, one saw a need for a better balance between user groups, the other thought the multi-use policy wasn't working and that there should be less development and more preservation.

Part 2 - The Kananaskis Administration topics

What is the best way to ensure a diverse and healthy environment for plants and animals?

Stop logging and keep development to a minimum. Stop leasing the land to ranchers for grazing.

Exclude industrial users; allow natural disturbances to continue (i.e., fire, insects, forest diseases).

We must be sure to manage these resources in a way that is sustainable for the long term, and not for quick economic gain. If resource extraction is unavoidable, it must be done with minimal impact.

Create parks, protect wildlife and plants through legislation, limit development.

severely limit human incursion into such areas, with any human activity being no-impact, to low-impact. this means no hunting, fishing, logging, mining, recreational vehicles, etc....

Would it cost too much though.

Understand that KC's biodiversity depends on the all of the natural flora and fauna working together. When one or many parts are removed the systems suffers as a whole.

A comprehensive management plan that includes recreation, habitat protection, and forestry in balance that results in a mixture of habitats and forest cover, while generally protecting watershed and recreational values.

don't take their current environment away from them; it's pretty simple really; leave it alone; the concept of man needing to manage everything is very misguided.

Halt all logging / mining / gas exploration. Restrict motorized vehicle access. Halt all activities that

interfere with watershed quality.

I realize in the growing population and growing needs of this nation and world for that matter, we cannot expect the Kananaskis to be completely devoid of people and interactions thereof but there has to be some accountability and sustainability so that we have a future. I propose that we have the Kananaskis set aside as a national park so that we can control the impact that we have. Having vehicles and ATV in the countryside should be regulated. If we are to have resources taken from the country it should be selective so that other activities can be maintained, such as hiking, biking, and climbing. There are compromises and ways to make this an environment that can be shared.

Minimal human development. Allowing recreational access for people to see the environment and understand why it must be conserved.

Leave it alone.

Manage the ecosystem with a big picture perspective

Monitor use and adjust management plans

Set up specific land use areas limiting the ability of industry to lay waste to pristine wildlife.

Logging plays a crucial role as there is an absence of fire on landscape which mother nature uses to replenish the forest. Logging essentially allows for this diversity by giving the forest to restart as was initially intended.

Implement a moratorium on logging and oil and gas exploration. Also, continual environmental and biodiversity assessments to hone in on places that need added protection or repair.

The Elbow and Bow Rivers supply Calgary's water. What should we do to ensure the quality and quantity of water?

create a park and prohibit industrial uses and development.

Maintenance of riparian buffers that meet or exceed standards to prevent erosion and sedimentation.

Future investment

The watershed needs to be protected from clearcutting, and siltation. The Oil & Gas industry seems to be detrimental too. The stuff I see in the creeks now that used to run clean makes me sick. The water looks like it is toxic!

Protect the environment surrounding the headwaters and tributaries of the Rivers. Designate those areas Protected Parks where no industrial activity can occur and limit access and extraction points to the waters for agriculture

Improve human sanitation (toilet facilities), careful siting of forestry activities, elimination of gravel road surfaces, and water quality monitoring.

Keep it clean

Leave the environment the way it is...it evolved that way for a reason.

No motorized vehicles within 500 m of open water, (bridges on main access roads excepted), no logging, limit access to water from livestock (to ensure bank integrity).

Not log anywhere near them - this causes the watersheds to lose stability. The pollutants and debris that arise from logging also affect water quality.

Limit the amount of cattle waste which gets into the rivers

Keep the watershed fully in-tact. The forest is a huge filter, and I'm amazed that while the Bow river is fully allocated the government is permitting the removal of vegetation that helps ensure seasonal flows and water quality.

Legal protection of the rivers and their watersheds. Serious fines and jail time for abusers and polluters. Access points developed for the public to access the river to use it, and outhouses at the access points, but the rest of the shoreline to be protected from access to reduce erosion.

Stop logging. Calgary should invest in securing its watershed

keep the commercial impact to the river up stream of calgary to a minimal.

Minimize cattle operations upstream. Cattle waste is the number one cause of water contamination in the Elbow river.

RESTRICT horseback riders from letting their animals defecating or urinating atleast 150m from any bodies of water. ENSURE that any companies near any bodies of water aren't polluting it in any way. We are inhabitants of this planet and we MUST take care of it for now and the future

protect the eastern slopes

Absolutely NO to logging anywhere near there.

Water quality is a factor of downstream use and as long as all users ensure they do their part to protect the streams no issues should arise.

Stop watering the golf course in K-Country! Also, heavier restrictions on industry in the parks, especially oil and gas.

if we desire to have a continued supply of good drinking water, we should be protecting the rivers from pollution from the start to the end

STOP CLEAR CUTTING! It doesn't make sense and it has a net negative impact on river health that has a direct negative impact on ecological and human health.

What can be done to make your time in Kananaskis more rewarding - events, activities, information, guides, tours, etc.

Leave it as it is.

Increased signage in common areas and trails to make the public more aware of the natural resources and history in the area. Things such as interpretive trails, yearly festivals that promote sustainable use of the area, and interpretive guides or an information center.

More educational nature events for a variety of ages at a low cost or no cost. Providing information in the form of brochures, articles.

A once-a-day bus charter from Calgary in the morning & back in the evening during the summer season, for those without cars. Or, if this is not feasible, create a web site to coordinate carpooling.

That's up to me. I go out there to enjoy nature, not somebody's idea on entertainment

I enjoy the informational walking trails

You could allow the Trans-Rockies race organizers let in more riders so they can break even for the costs involved. We lost that race to BC cause the Gov't is "protecting" the environment.

Group camp fees are making it difficult for social youth groups to come out to KC. These fees are regulated through the Provincial Government and the private contractors. A discount for non-profit groups like Scouts needs to be arranged.

Less people. Let's not make this into another amusement park. This should be kept as a mostly wild and natural area.

Nothing I reward myself with the views and senery whilst climbing.

I enjoy it as it is but it could always use more frequent trail maintenance.

leave it alone

I just like how it reminds me that I'm a part of nature to - that I belong and that I'm also a steward.

Information centre has lots of great infomation. could post daily reports for K country on a website.

nothing. I don't like too much programming. That's what Banff is for. Maybe more & better maps.

More public info on the natural areas, how the public can protect them while in the park and what they can do as a volunteer or donator to protect the area and nature in it while not in the park.

Information officers, nature walks, more support for outdoor groups

Races - mtn bike and running

Re-opened shut down information buildings. Also need more signage or replace existing signage which is old.

I'm a freeride/downhill mounain biker, some trails would be great

Keep it open and free for use

More guided tours would be great as well as interpretive trails. More trail for young families as well.

Make it into a full park status area, that way we can enjoy it for generations to come

inform the public of the vast and beautiful wilderness on their doorstep. If people are going to take action then they need to know what they stand to lose, and why they should care. Apparently

(although our government does not reflect this) the environment and its protection are the most important topics for Canadians. Why not capitalize on this fact. Develop an MPHIA type program for guides, interpreters and any other official who comes in contact with the public. Dissemination of information is paramount to get people involved

Who should have access, to do what? Is the multi-use policy working?

(Editor's note: This question was ambiguous. Many thought multi-use referred to ATVs, horses and bikes; not industry, agriculture and recreation. So some of the comments for this important question are obscure and inconsistent with the respondent's other comments)

We can't have indiscriminate logging and development. We have to think about our stewardship of the land.

The multi-use policy is not working because it is destroying the environment. Access should be limited to only those who are there to enjoy, not harm, the surroundings.

The policy is working currently, but if the slated deforestation is carried out, it won't be working.

Obviously not, logging activities exclude everyone else from favorite trails (i.e., Baldy Pass)

Create different areas with different objectives. Some area for ATV, some for hiking and riding, some restricted access to preserve nature. Stop the industrial activities. Fix what is destroyed from logging with a REAL policy for reforestation and reclaim of the trucking roads

The multi-use policy is working but the off road vehicle sector should be managed more effectively.

Yes, the multi-use policy is working because certain uses are separated and have their own places.

Generally, yes...the multi-use policy is working. Wildlife populations are strong, there is a diversity of recreation, the forest mix is moving away from single age monoculture due to small scale forestry activity and old resource roads are getting a second life as part of trail networks.

No - too many conflicting priorities

Multi use recreation policy works. Industrial use should be eliminated.

At present permits and trail limits seem to target the wrong clientele. School groups are most often appropriate users - trail limits SEVERELY affect what schools are able to offer in KC.

Increased adult presence results in increased sub costs etc., while the trail limits split groups up which, in my opinion, increases chances of problems. Increased potential for problems results in increased liability potential....

The multi-use policy was great for a while, but with such a growing population, it no longer works. Only recreation (except off road vehicles because they tear apart the trees and ground) and animals should be allowed in K-country.

Multi-use is a great idea. We just need to work to make it work.

Up to now, the multi-use policy seemed fairly balanced, though the resource extraction seems to be winning over other uses at the moment.

Considering the growing population in the Calgary area, Kananaskis should be a park with some well regulated activities that can be carried out. More control of the public areas, more information to the public in order to create a safe environment for people and nature

The mutli-use policy does not work. Remove resource extraction especially logging. Severly restrict ATV and grazing use and somewhat restrict equistrain use as it makes a degrades trails and riparian ares.

No, can't please everyone, need to make some hard decisions and phase out cattle, logging, oil and gas

I believe dirtbikes and ATV's MUST have the latest epa compliant spark arresters, it is proven they work. I also believe they must also stay on marked trail. TREAD LIGHTLY

VERY LIMITED or selective Oil & Gas activity may be permissible ONLY in previously disturbed areas. No new clear cuts should be allowed, only a selective logging approach should be considered for such threats as pine beatles, or to minimize fire dangers.

Everyone should have access to K-Country. It is crown land and owned by all Albertans. Both recreation and industrial activity should be exceptable and I see no problems with the multi-use policy.

If you clear-cut, that's it: no other recreational use is possible because you have removed the vegetation!

NO! the multi use policy is not working. Who shouldn't have access? INDUSTRY until they agree to include themselves in progressive methods and education outlined in question one. User groups who are wiling to manage themselves in a manner that promotes conservation of the natural environment, and who are willing to become involved in education and or practicing suatinable habits.

Do we need new and/or better recreation facilities? What?

No.

We need to keep them updated and safe but I'm not sure that we need more than are already there.
trails - some new, some improved.

An interpretation/information center would be very beneficial to help direct users to the many available resources in the area. In the more popular gathering places, increased facilities like public washrooms and group picnic areas could facilitate more events in the area.

The land and sky are in fact the recreation facilities required. Please avoid building tourist attractions and large tourist draws. This undermines the real reason for being in Kananaskis.

No. No more golf courses, ski hills, or helicopter traffic. They seem too invasive.

I don't think it's necessary, but it might be nice to have a place for people to relax, have a snack indoors and create central gathering places.

Yes. The trail network needs more maintenance and additional official trail links need to be recognized (where good trails already exist unofficially), or constructed, where those links don't properly exist.

more camping facilities, more golf courses

We do not need more structure-type facilities (no more buildings) but additional trails that are properly built would be great. That doesn't mean crushed rock or pavement but narrow single track trails.

i'm a purist. I don't need more info centers or tours to make Kananaskis a better place. trail upgrades for hiking, cont'd admin of the parking areas/bathrooms etc

No, keep maintaining what is there

I think expanding some of the campsites would be a good idea, and I really miss the day use picnic areas that had fire pits/stoves.

Most facilities are doing just fine the way they are, but with more and more people visiting Kananaskis, new and/or better facilities might be a good idea in some places.

No But pooping in remote areas needs to be dealt with. Need remote outhouses that are emptied.

The facilities are fine as they are. This is a wild area, the facilities should accommodate the visitor load, but preserve the surroundings.

No.

no

More camping and more supervision of these sites. Also more school sites for outreach camps / daysites for school children. We need less special interest camps.

Yes. Huts and info centers. Better signage. Help educate people while they are out on the trails.

The camping spots in Peter Lougheed are beautiful. It's just tough to get in there.

The current facilities, I feel are excellent. To make them any more amenable would be a waste of money and intrude to far into the wilderness aspect of K-country.

On the whole I would say that Kananaskis has some of the best recreational facilities around.

Are you concerned about your safety or the impact of industrial/agricultural activities?

Safety - no. Industrial activity - absolutely none unless limited tree cuts are necessary for wildlife management purposes and even then only on a highly controlled and very targeted basis.

Very concerned, I am surprised the development has gone this far, it's appalling

I am concerned about how the current logging in the area is going to affect the habitat connectivity for

a lot of the local wildlife, and the impact it is going to have on the water quality. As well, from the oil and gas extraction in the area, I am concerned about the potential for sour gas blowouts that may occur while I am hiking and biking in the valleys.

Very concern about industrial activities. HS2 wells easy to access, if someone want to play with gas pipe we could be in trouble What about a drunk ATV driver that smash into a valve ?

Yes, about the impact of industrial/agricultural activities, so-called 'pine-beetle remediation', motorized vehicles

No

My safety? NO, Impact? Yes

Somewhat. I don't like logged out areas, cause the confusion all the roads cause getting us lost out in the middle of nowhere even when we have a map.

Low impact activities ie hiking, biking, x country skiing are endangered and impacted by industrial activity. Have you ever come around the corner of an old fire road on your Mtn Bike and been nearly run down by a well site operator in his 4 x 4 Pick up?

Yes, I'm concerned about my safety from the sour gas wells in the area, as well as from the effects of logging on the water and air and aesthetics of the area.

Yes - cows chasing me

I am VERY concerned about the impacts of INDUSTRIAL activities - some grazing is not a bad thing, but there should be no industrial use of this area.

of course! these are potentially dangerous and destructive activities. there is a way to balance these issues however.

I would be concerned about my safety in an area that was being actively logged - this restricts my travel in Kananaskis country.

as long as everyone is kept accountable and is reasonable in their use - no.

Yes - industrial and agricultural activities significantly impact the area

Cows in Kananaskis? I hate to think about what's being washed into our watershed from those cows. And Clearcuts on the pretty mountain sides? I am definately concerned about my mental health in this issue.

ABSOLUTELY!!! This has been a concern for my family and I since we moved to Alberta seven years ago.

I am concerned about my safety when ATV's are around and also during hunting season. I am not in favour of ag or industrial use as it degrades the critical habitat of the eastern slopes.

No, your website show pictures of signage put in place to ensure all trail users are aware of any industrial activities in the area.

Absolutely. The logging trucks pose a constant threat, as well as the questionable environmental

policies that surround the various oil and gas explorations within K-Country.

I'm not concerned about my safety however I am concerned about the industrial/ agricultural activities. I will start to get concerned if logging continues to clear cut undermining stable slopes in areas where recreational usage occurs. I would also be concerned about the proximity of a sour gas well in close proximity to a water source that is paramount to ecological integrity and that also is a source of water for a greater population of people. I don't trust industry to make good decisions with the environments and the people's best interests in mind. In fact it has already shown that it does not make good decisions ie. the reason for this survey

What is the role of First Nations in Kananaskis?

The First Nations have never shown any regard for the environment; their impact must be minimized.

First Nations have a lot of valuable input towards the historical use of the land and the wildlife and plant life that interact in the area. They have been able to live sustainably off the land for a long time, and they can provide valuable input for the way we use the area also.

Their role is important and special but they should be held to the same level of commitment to avoiding resource and tourist over-development.

Don't know

I am not aware of any First Nation input right now, but would encourage it and give it priority over that from others, as long as their priority is to protect the area. If they want to promote development, I would try to prevent that.

I don't know but I was saddened to see a gigantic gambling facility being built next to Highway #1.

If portions of K Country are deemed historically sacred then First Nations Should have a stewardship role to ensure future development and industrial destruction are eliminated

Keep Kananaskis a public land for the recreation and enjoyment of all.

I don't know.

Unfortunately, I have seen only the negative sides of the First Nations use. They are as bad or worse abusers in terms of disrespect for the land, garbage left behind, animals shot out of season etc, than the non-First Nations users.

they are users in every sense (economic, land and recreational). their opinions and input are extremely important.

they're in it for revenue, so they're biased towards resource development, through logging, gravel Operations, etc.

I think First Nations have an opportunity for economic development. From creating campsites on their land, to hosting guided tours and seminars.

Don't believe there is any... They could help promote & educate what that land was used for hundreds

of years ago, but I don't see them interested in that.

They should have a say and be at the table for all planning and long term planning along with Environmentalists, municipalities etc.

They could have an interpretive centre

The same role as any Canadian citizen or respectful visitor to the area.

it isn't there park. they have their land and have put up a casino. they should not be involved with the park

They should provide valuable input and help to manage the land.

Support, knowledge, employment and preservation.

To protect and respect the land. I have reservations about their right to hunt year round.

not much that i can see, except for them allowing clear cutting

If this is their land then they should be involved in maintaining it, otherwise, give them jobs in a new Park to help preserve it.

I'm not entirely sure what area of Kananaskis is comprised of traditional First Nations Lands. However traditionally these people were stewards of the land. Unfortunately through oppression, segregation, and loss of tradition and culture they were quickly bought out and left to dwell, for instance, in the hole we call the Morley Reserve. They should be encouraged to help develop education programs that not only enlighten those who are not First Nations about their cultures and traditions but also the ways in which they live with the land rather than way the land is being exploited.

How important is the visual appeal of Kananaskis?

Extremely.

Immeasurable!

paramount - it is critical to the trail experience.

Hugely...for those who use it for recreation, for surrounding communities who depend on it as a visitor attraction, for real estate values in the area.

Huge!!!! It is one of the most beautiful places in the world.

Extremely important. Who would want to go hiking or skiing in an area that is clear-cut?

Very Important! Every European I've met says how much they like it because it is pristine. They all say Protect it, cause once it's gone, it's gone forever.

To a local who's been visiting KC for the last 19 years the visual appeal of KC is one of nostalgia or solace for me.

Relatively high... but it's not supposed to be a National Park. Think long-term and think about an

evolving landscape. I'd rather see a bit of logging than a widespread pine beetle-wildfire disaster. Don't forget that most of the popular hiking/skiing areas are or were actively logged and or mined over the past 50 years. This is both why they have trails and why the areas have

Very important.

Extremely

natural is beautiful

Very Important

Extremely important.

Of the utmost importance, people do not travel to places to see cut blocks, they go for the nature

The visual appeal is a big part of how people feel when they visit Kananaskis. If it looks ugly people won't feel as good or want to visit Kananaskis as much. This will affect the people themselves, and tourism.

Vital. It is a jewel

It's everything!!! The only reason about 500,000 Calgarians visit Eastern K-Country (Elbow Valley) is BECAUSE of the visual appeal - I doubt very much that these Calgarians flock to see the newest cut block on their weekend camping trips...

Paramount!

Very, it is a great area to enjoy and have access to. If it starts to look more commercialized it will become like areas up around Hinton where logging and oil use give the area a feel of industrial rather than natural

duh!!!

High importance to refresh my own soul and be proud of what my province has done.

It is the first forest you come across as you leave Calgary on the trans canada highway and as such it serves as a vibrant link to the foothills. It is very important

Very important. Eco-tourism works elsewhere in the world, why not here?

I like to think that the views are what draw people to the Kananaskis. Without the view what would draw people in. Its well known that Canada's Rocky Mountains are some of the most spectacular and sought after scenery in the world. The limited and narrow scope of a few industry businesses threatens to ruin one of our countries greatest natural assets. It might interest you to know that Tourism is one of the fastest growing industries in the world. Why not create a sustainable tourism plan for the area that would help produce revenue for the communities in Kananaskis, the provincial and the federal government. If we don't promote tourism and get people to come see this natural wonder then we leave it wide open to industry to do what they will. A need has to be created.

The forest is important for the health an appeal of Kananaskis. Is it being managed well?

Clear-cutting is forest destruction.

Not at all. Clear-cut logging, cattle grazing, and oil & gas well sites/pipelines all degrade forest health. We need natural process to determine forest health (as they have for the past millenia).

Evidently not at the moment.

no.

Yes

Not Really. IF they logged it like the firebreaks in Canmore were done, it wouldn't be a problem for me. The areas still are forested, but a lot of trees were taken, and the underbrush was cleared, but the area is still beautiful to look at. Five yrs later, it would look like it was left alone.

It depends on what your definition is for manage? If logging is a form of management then I do not think so. It is perhaps time for a shift in thinking and realization that Natural ecosystems can manage themselves if given the chance

Clear cut logging is not forest management, it is economic management. All logging requires access roads and disturbs wildlife habitat and should not be permitted in this area.

Absolutely. Albertans are very lucky to have a company like Spray Lake Sawmills having the harvest rights in the area. Their employees are local, live in the areas and have a genuine concern for the wellbeing of the entire K-Country

no, clear cutting is not good management of forest.

Not sure. I don't think clear cutting is the way to go. Naturally forests go through stages of death, but the falling of trees provides nutrients through decay back to the soils and allows for primary, secondary and tertiary flora and fauna development

Not at all. Mutli-use activities just doesn't work as a model anymore in this rapidly growing province.

Again, I think the logging operations are not being managed properly.

No. Too much clear-cut logging.

Until recently it appeared yes; however, the most recent plans and activity are over the Top and should be stopped. If the government has to compensate the forestry industry or Oil and Gas Co's for stopping their activities here then as a taxpayer I would support that.

I think it has been but I worry about the long-term effects of the logging industry.

Currently, under Ted Morton, it is being abysmally managed. Case in point, the logging debacle undergoing right now, which flies in the face of science. This is a shameful display of short-sightedness.

Not from the information I have read, not from the pictures I have seen, and not from my physical experience. Clear cutting is a poor way to manage what could be a renewable resource. A quick buck

in somebodies pocket does not equal a benefit to the environment or the user groups involved with the area.

Ranchers use Kananaskis to graze cattle. Is that a problem or benefit?

Both.

It's a problem. Cattle grazing is a novel disturbance, with different impacts from native grazers. Instead, native herbivores (ungulates, ground squirrels, etc) are to be preferred.

not a concern at this point

no problem, but not a benefit.

I can't see how grazing is ever a benefit other than to the cattle rancher. I understand some of these leases have been in place for sometime. My suggestion is honour them, of course, but when they run out, don't renew

I think it's a benefit, there are many open meadows and they help keep the fire hazard down.

Environmentally a benefit, for users I can see some believing it is a problem

I think that watersheds are being compromised because of cattle (as well, the trees which are killed when their bark is stripped). Then, of course, there's the amount of manure one stumbles over/through on many of the trails. That, too, is disconcerting...I don't really see any benefit at all! What's wrong with all the rangeland to the east of K-Country (away from the forests)? Seems like there's a lot more grass to eat out there...

Grandfathering existing leases and restricting additional lease areas would likely be good. Monitoring impacts would be good.

Both good and bad. They need the natural resources, but at the same time they use up and pollute the natural resources.

Can be a problem as cattle have negative impacts on watercourses and tend to over browse certain areas and neglect others

Problem: water shed protection and the damage they do to the wet trails is terrible

not a benefit as they are not a native species to the Kananaskis ecosystems

If done right it could be a huge benefit. Cattle need to be moved around a lot so grass is not trampled. It will then regenerate very quickly, providing even more grazing.

Again it depends on the sustainability of the operation. If cattle grazing in the area are causing irreparable damage and the river systems, flora and fauna are suffering as a result then yes, I would say it is a problem.

Benefit

Do we need to know more about the area? About what; ecology, tourism, industry, agriculture?

Ecology and tourism.

What we really need to know is who in this right-wing provincial government and the conservative caucus benefits financially from allowing oil & gas exploration, forestry, ranching, agriculture, bear hunting licenses etc. Once this becomes public knowledge, we might be able to sway public opinion towards protecting Kananaskis.

Absolutely

We know very little about the ecology of the area, so it is hard to believe we could accurately manage resource extraction when we don't understand how the system works in an unperturbed state. I think the current levels of tourism can be sustainable if limited to specifically designated areas. The interaction of industry and agriculture on the landscape is definitely something to investigate.

tourism! let's make the money that way and allow recreation rather than logging the area.

we need to learn more about tourism and especially ecology (specifically the pine beetle)

Ecology. If people understood the delicate balance that exists between species (plant and animal) in the Kananaskis region, they may be driven to protect the area from logging.

I suspect we already know what we need. The area needs to be isolated from industrial and agricultural activity!!!

We can always learn more about the ecology of a place but aside from that there is nothing.

We need to know far more about ecology, the current state of the park, and how to maintain its beauty and foster positive growth.

YES! I realize logging companies had access to the area designated as Kananaskis well before the area was designated as such, however nothing remains static and policies must change as does everything else. Trying to manage an area like it was managed sixty years ago is stupid. We have more information now and new techniques developed to replace older more destructive ones. Why wouldn't we use them. Ecology is dynamic, industry tied to the area seems to be static. Learning is a continual process, as we learn more about ecology we need to re-assess how industry operates in a given area, and we need to re-assess what options tourism has and how it can function. If cattle grazing is doing no good for the area then we need to re-assess how it is done.

Fishing and hunting is restricted in some areas. Is this good or bad?

Very good.

It's good to control the amount of fishing and hunting done - but only so animals remain stable and their species flourish.

Good, it is a very delicate balance.

Good, BUT restriction are useless if not enforced!!!

These activities are unnatural (whatever hunters and fishermen may claim to the contrary) and should not be allowed. Maybe, as a compromise, it might be allowed without too much damage in some fringe areas. might

Hunting & fishing should be managed in the Forest Land Use areas, including some restrictions, based on habitat and wildlife management needs. However, there is no need to ban these activities.

Good. Hunters shouldn't be allowed near people. Fishing is OK

Management of these activities is necessary in order to prevent over harvesting. Given that, unless the habitat is better managed and preserved there may not be any hunting or fishing to be undertaken

I think its a good thing because some areas are much more delicate of an ecosystem than other areas. Hunting and fishing are great outdoor activities. But they must be managed

Fishing is ok but no hunting should be allowed.

Fishing and hunting should be used as a measure to cull animal and fish populations that are high for a given area. If restrictions are in place to allow a population to grow then those restrictions make sense and I would say they are a good thing.

Yes

very good

good

Good.

Good

This is good, there should be no hunting at all in the area.

Some special events are restricted. Should there be more or less access for large groups and commercial operators?

Less access by large groups and commercial groups

I think large events and commercial operators can be accomodated in specific areas if the facilities

and resources are available to them. These events can be low impact if restricted to certain locations if the facilities are upgraded to accommodate them. I have trouble believing large groups could have the same impact as the current resource extraction is having in the area. There seems to be a disconnect here.

It depends on what activities. Historically large trail runs, bike races have taken place without in my opinion a huge impact. However if we allow unrestricted camping, motorized ATV access we will end up with a mess. If any future development is to take place it should be small scale, eg back country type accommodation. Large hotels and golf courses are not needed. K country is close enough to Calgary that it is accessible for day trips for tourist operations

Some non-profit events can help keep Kananaskis interesting to a broader audience, but commercial use should be stopped.

There must be strict guidelines about all individuals and groups using the park to adhere to low impact standards, any operator or special event must respect these standards.

The system is good the way it is.

Less access.

It depends on their footprint- if it can be kept small and is respectful of the environment then maybe

It is pretty good the way it is.

more if at all possible. I think the loss of Trans Rockies was short sighted. We can't ride a few bikes but logging's OK...?!

Less for any sort of commercial things.

More access as long as they are properly planned and approved

Access for large groups and commercial operators should be completely restricted. Typically, commercial operators are concerned ultimately with finances and the environment second. This ethic allows the park to suffer.

Are these large groups and commercial operators using durable surfaces, are they in an area where they will not be trampling sensitive flora and fauna. I think if sites are built to host large groups and commercial operators, such as Patties Flats, then they should be more than welcome to use them. How many of these sites should be developed would depend on the number of user groups wanting into the area and an assessment of ecological factors that would be threatened from further development of these sites

Is it time to change boundaries and jurisdiction? How?

I believe the foothills region is a very fragile and increasingly limited resource. If we could make the rest of the Kananaskis area into a park to help preserve many of the features that draw us all there,

then many more Albertans will be able to enjoy it long into the future.

Some area could be consolidated. We had to apply to two different jurisdictions for approval to host a MTB race on Moose Mountain simply because Moose Packers and Tom Snow trails are in different zones.

create a park, involve local groups and community in the handling on their neighborhood. Don't let oil company and loggers to handle something that is for everyone to enjoy. Don't be ridiculous about the percentage of K country protected, is mostly above the tree lines !! Protect What is used and enjoyable, the forests

Not sure about boundaries, but the mandate should be changed. I'd rather have a park than multi-use area.

not sure but if it will protect k coutry for future - yes. how - i am not qualified to answer this.

It seems there is conflict between the present Kananaskis administration and the objectives of Sustainable Resource Development Department. I dont think the Minister truly understands the meaning of the word sustainable. This is a problem! If anything, give more jurisdiction to the K. Admin. to protect the park and surrounding areas in perpetuity.

The boundaries of the park need to be increased to enclose all of the luciose forest we have.

More of K-country needs to be designated as park.

Yes.

No idea!

No, the area is just fine the way it is.

increase the boundaries of protected areas in kananaskis, and start to invest in the area as a natural park as opposed to a resource to be exploited

I'm not sure how to aswer this other than to say I think at least temporary protected status is needed until we can all sit down at the table and hash this one out. Currently everything is happening out of desperation while the forest is being chopped down. From past experience, acting in haste is no way to make decisions that will affect future generations. A moratorium on logging and other industrial activities in Kananaskis should be made and a round table meeting should ensue to get all of the cards on the table.

Should we protect cultural, historical, palaeontological resources?

Absolutely!

Of course - within realistic limits.

Yes, if they exist.

These resources should be preserved in the same sense as the natural resources should be preserved so future generations can share in these resources.

Yes, all of those.

Ask experts in this field and they'll tell you. Then LISTEN!

Very much so!

Identify those location and include them within protected areas.

Yes

Yes, the cultural, historical and palaeontological resources are important and worth protecting. They are less important than the environment itself, but more important than resource exploitation.

Definitely

within reason and agreement of all user groups.

Yes- of course- this is canadaian heritage

Yes. These things are important.

yes no culture,history,palaeontology there is nothing

To some degree

Yes. So long as it's not, for example, theFirst Sour Gas Well' on Moose Mtn., etc.

Yes we should. They are part of us and our heritage

Absolutely. They are irreplaceable

Of course.

Yes.

yes

Depends on what it is,...but generally yes.

Absolutely ! What a dumb question !

absolutely. again, the First Nations position/advice must be considered as their history of the land in which we live has been theirs and they understand it's nuances best

Absolutely, these are an important part of the history that helped develop this land.

Definitely. Without knowledge of the past, we are lost for the future.

YES! How else are we to understand the significance of the area to all user groups such as the First Nations.

Protect everything you can.

What new facilities and/or programs are needed?

Some huts for a hut-to-hut experience might be wonderful. Simple, inexpensive and possibly commercially operated, summer and winter (if we get any snow!).

More parks, maintained trails, appropriate toilets

I'm happy with existing facilities

More education programs are needed (not only within the boundaries of Kananaskis, but also in the regular elementary and junior high school curricula) to counter the dominant redneck mentality about making a quick buck out of everything.

Education Programs. Some bike riders think killing trees and making jumps is OK, when it is not! I disagree with them building trails wherever they think they can!

Generally, many unofficial trails need to be formally recognized as official trails and then be properly signed and maintained.

no new facilities.

No new facilities are needed. But a program about the benefits of intact, contiguous forests is desperately needed. A Ministry of Environment should be one which espouses conservation and protection of wild places. All I've ever heard from the government is how forests should be managed' (for profit-sake, one may surmise)...

New trail maintenance programs are needed.

Eco Tours, back country tours

Current facilities are excellent. More programs are needed to promote an appreciation for how special this area is.

Education programmes regarding the intricacy of ecology in Kananaskis country, our impact as humans using the area, and our responsibility in conserving it. It may have escaped some people but without an environment to support us we will cease to exist. It's that simple.

Comments

K-Country is interesting because it represents a chance for a large population to connect with the wilderness. It gives young and old alike a chance to learn about and interact with the ecosystem, to catch a glimpse of the many unique species found here.

Interesting? Everything about K-Country is interesting and worth preserving. What is wrong with it? Put simply, nothing....rather it is the individuals who are deciding its fate that are in the wrong.

Kananaskis is a middle ground between the relentless development of Calgary and the severely restricted use of the National Parks (e.g. Banff park).

k-country is a unique and accessible backcountry. it is beautiful and occasionally remote, and my

favorite place in the world. logging it clear is a travesty for both users and the environment. creating a national park and disallowing access would be an equal tragedy. there is room for all user groups if the plan is fair and balanced.

Stop clearcuts. If it must be logged use selective methods. I think its too late already, they ruined a beautiful place.

The natural areas are most interesting. Water is important and will become more so in the future and everything possible should be done to protect it and conserve it and its watersheds in the area. Wrong? Lack of legal protected status.'

I think the biggest problem is to many user groups and they are all on different pages. There needs to be more communication between groups and an effort to give the best for all groups, which will require some sacrifices for all parties to make sure it's fair for all.

GOOD: The fantastic scenery and recreational opportunities in a wilderness setting. BAD: Grazing cattle and clearcut logging. There is nothing appealing about these.

the mountains, the peacefulness, the animals, the clean water

K-Country is interesting for its diversity, sheer beauty, and it's accesibility for recreationists to play in a relatively wild area. What's wrong with K-Country is not the park itself, but governments bowing to commercial pressures. We need true stewardship and protection here - not short-sighted profiteering.

I just like riding my bike there. less trees means I'm going somewhere else plain and simple.

About the Kan Quiz

The quiz is available here: <http://www.savekananaskis.ca/forms/kanquiz.htm>

The quiz and this summary of results was prepared by:

Doug Sephton

403-949-4274

info@savekananaskis.ca