

River Park, Sandy Beach & Britannia Slopes

Open Space Workshop – February 12, 2011

Feedback Form Responses

1. Do you feel you had the opportunity to share your thoughts and opinions?

- Yes (15 similar responses)
- Yes, and with each group!
- Good sessions – look forward to more consolidated discussion online. Session need their timing more clearly communicated. Our session ran out of time.
- Not in all areas as I couldn't get to all groups.
- Yes, thanks. Not everyone spoke but those that wanted to had lots of opportunity.
- Yes. The process was very good for allowing people to express & record opinions from many diverse groups.
- Yes, I had the opportunity. But I found that in one group in particular (off leash dog aka River Park Pres-Soc) there was hostility and lack of respect for opinions counter to theirs. I was an outsider to this group and was received with distrust.
- Yes, but that is because I am assertive & loud.
- Somewhat. I had 3 issues so I was able to participate in one completely but I had to come in ½ way through the discussion on my 2nd issue & was unsure about what had already been discussed & if my concern was identified.
- Only on one issue – too many issues to be able to voice an opinion on each – need an opportunity to address these issues again over a period of time.
- Yes – very definitely.
- Yes – actually I was able to listen to other's thoughts and opinions.
- Yes – a bit chaotic. Voiced my concern, others were interested!!
- Yes, but groups were dominated by dominant personalities.
- Yes – and most people think along the same lines.
- Yes, easy to see how session could have been longer – very passionate groups.
- Yes, thanks.
- The group leader did her best. Some people like to interrupt & hear their own voice.
- No, not enough time.

- Yes, but there was much overlap therefore waste of time.
- I really feel like this has been an exercise in spinning my wheels.
- Yes, I was able to express my concerns and thoughts on how to improve the plan for these areas.

2. What did you like about his session?

- I loved that I could participate in all topics even though only one topic brought me to this discussion.
- Opportunity for people to move around. ½ increment announcements would be useful to encourage this movement & track time.
- Opportunity to be heard. Session was cut a bit short.
- Heard other people's views.
- Meeting other community members and friends.
- Community spirit and teamwork.
- Opportunity to hear others opinions & concerns.
- I want to have a voice in this process.
- Hearing some very knowledgeable citizens talk about water quality & sustaining the vegetation. PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE listen to the issues & their ideas. This was a very impressive group.
- Opportunity to meet my neighbours.
- A time to hear other's thoughts.
- Interactive.
- Openness – information share. People are very concerned and want to sustain the natural area & revitalize damage already done.
- Very well organized. General discussion, plus individual group discussions, were civil and constructive.
- I met my neighbours – talk about community engagement = Process was open, friendly, informal, inviting.
- Brainstorming not only about issues but + ideas to help council to be proactive.
- The spontaneous opportunity for issue generation. Very open, flexible format, quite productive.
- P.R.
- Airing of several viewpoints on this issue.
- Freedom to move between topics of interest. Documenting statements. Open invitation for all concerns.

- Surprisingly level-heated discussions overall.
- Group sessions. Note taking.
- The opportunity to break into small groups to discuss and brainstorm ideas/issues.
- Efficiency of discussing major issues. Good facility. Improve audio. Give a podium so not so hard to read papers & hold mic.
- Voicing opinions from everyone.
- That it was open-ended – no political agenda.
- It is good to see the number of people who care enough to come out & participate.
- Open/transparent.
- I like that people have an opportunity to have their say. I'm just concerned that it's much like the workshops we participated in 4 or 5 years ago where many comments were not captured. In the end we didn't get anywhere.
- Opportunity for view exchange from different communities.
- It is good to hear other opinions.
- Lots of open civil discussion.
- Openness that existed between community & parks & staff. Thanks Judy.

3. What could be done differently?

- A lot overlap in the topics.
- Have a facilitator in each subgroup to ensure the discussion stays on topic and everyone gets airtime. More encouragement/structure to change groups.
- Some of the groups should have gone together as most issues in the park are interconnected.
- Pretty good session.
- Where does this activity fit in the overall process? Feels like a one-off event. How do I know this output will be used?
- More time to rotate through a couple of discussion groups.
- Group leaders to have skills to lead group/nail down ideas. i.e. There was a lot of talking but often went into tangents. Maybe have groups led by trained people, not volunteers.
- The issues/topics identified should have been grouped together so that those topics were addressed. I noticed about 25 coloured sheets left behind on the wall. A place to go & discuss that particular grouping should have been provided – it was awkward initially.

- Not clear where input coming from – users vs. residents – very key issue as to who is during this process. Residents need a greater say because impact on them is critical.
- May have had an alternate time but this had good attendance.
- A bit more clear at the beginning.
- Reporting back briefly on each groups' focus to the gathered group. Would have then carried on until 4:30 pm.
- Too much information- not enough time to access it.
- Ways to engage the introverts as well. Perhaps give people in group each a 2 min. opportunity to speak about issue? Make sure everyone has opportunity to identify issue, even after groups have closed, within this venue. Have “open space rules” posted at each group station.
- 1. Needed a 'Part B'. What is most important of ideas generated? Prioritize issues/views for city.
- 2. A lot of issues left on original coloured paper wall – how will those be addressed?
- Discussion hosts with expertise who will be part of decision/report process. This would free volunteer hosts to participate in other discussion groups.
- Would like to have had a summary from Parks as to what they think the major issues are.
- Have another session as I know of some people who would have liked to attend but were unable to on this date.
- Increased mediation for sidetracked conversations. i.e. Parking lot in breakout circles.
- City should put forth options or goals to discuss. Without goals/issues, it's difficult to discuss.
- Why not gather the comments and concerns in advance bring everyone together and address one issue at a time.
- Parks Dept & city outlining possibilities, parameters and existing “rules”.
- Signage written by people too small to be by read when hung on wall – same w/ comments – overhead projector??? And too hard to read on coloured paper.
- More time &/or more workshop days.
- Nothing.

4. Would you participate in this type of session again?

- Yes (35).
- See if anything gets done first to see it is valuable.
- Hopefully we don't have too many more!
- Probably (1)
- No (1)

5. Do you have any additional comments?

- There are less conflicts and different views than I thought there'd be.
- Set ground rules. Define brainstorm-D free flow, no evaluation etc.
- Transcribe EVERYTHING and post for transparency then consolidate & summarize to use on the forum. Looking forward to seeing all the comments & the eventual plan!
- Don't construct facilities to "be a beauty spot to attract the whole city". Regional doesn't have to serve the entire city. No pathway thru' upper part by 14A.
- The groups have a lot of crossover. Please integrate the comments. (Use, traffic, dogs, environment, community, safety, etc., etc.)
- I couldn't find a place to put some of my comments.
- Need another session to address amalgamated issues once they have been reviewed & comments put together. Online forum will be insufficient to facilitate discussion.
- Park Ambassadors should come back. One point – Aesthetics never brought up. I believe that there aren't such diverse opinions/conflicting needs among users. More agreement than disagreement among this group.
- I am curious if what I heard will be the same as what is captured on paper. In the off leash dog discussion there was great support for keeping the areas pretty much the way they are now. If people thought off lease should be reduced in they were not in the off leash discussion.
- Not at this time.
- Most people (or all) were residents of the area – therefore we were mostly in agreement - for example in the traffic/parking committee not one person parks in the parking lot – we are clearly the most interested stake holders.
- Disappointing to see a number of people harbouring a deep distrust of the 'system'.
- Thank you for the binders i.e. Library, community association. Great idea.
- I need to know that we are moving forward.

- Glad there will be printed updates at the library – What about the notice board at River Park? Not all of us have computers.
- What is the point of all this if there is no transparency – We need community rep(s) on the decision making team. Parks Dept are unable to control “people” don’t try.
- Judy is a great facilitator.
- Nice overall “listening” attitude.
- Well organized event – thanks for the cookies too!
- Thank you for opportunity to discuss. I encourage the city to focus on maintenance of all parks within the city. Garbage & pathway maintenance should be priorities.
- Much of the user conflicts are behavioural related. It all rests on their shoulders of the people to be respectful and follow rules. We have to focus on educating users about use and behaviour.
- Learning & listening has happened at all previous meetings, now is the time for decisions and direction in future.