

Thornhill Trails Study – PART 2 –

Public Consultation - Summary

The following is a summary of the second phase (Part 2) of the Thornhill Trails Study at two open house meetings on November 18, 2021 and November 22, 2021, held at Maple Ridge Leisure Center and online from November 18, 2021 until December 13, 2021.

The open house on **November 18** was attended by approximately 25 people, who asked questions and discussed the trails study with parks staff and left 11 hard copy comment forms.

The open house on **November 22** was attended by approximately 30 people, who asked questions of parks staff and left 8 hard copy comment forms.

Project information and a link to a comment form was also shared online by way of emails to contacts at both the Haney Horsemen Association as well as the Fraser Valley Mountain Bike Association. Laminated posters explaining the trails study and providing the survey link were also posted at all main trail entrances onto Thornhill. 255 responses were received through the online form by December 13, 2021. 4 people also emailed in separate comments and 20 people in total provided hard copy comment forms that were also captured in the summary below.

In total 279 written comment responses were received (255 online, 4 emailed, 20 paper)

Responses were then divided into residents (217 address within Maple Ridge) and non-residents (62 address elsewhere) to further review the data.

78% of respondents indicated their address was in Maple Ridge (Residents)

22% of respondents indicated their address was elsewhere (non-residents)

Non-resident addresses varied from neighboring municipalities (Pitt Meadows, Mission) to encompassing many of the lower mainland cities.

Question 1: Were you part of the initial Thornhill Trails Study consultation in the fall of 2020?

213 Residents – Maple Ridge

Response	# of respondents indicating	%
Yes	84	39%
No	89	42%
Unsure	40	19%

62 Non-Resident

Response	# of respondents indicating	%
Yes	14	23%
No	30	48%
Unsure	18	29%

275 Total Combined Responses

Response	# of respondents indicating	%
Yes	98	36%
No	119	56%
Unsure	58	21%

Question 2. Which best describes you? (Select only one)

Resident – Maple Ridge (213 responses)

Frequency	# of respondents indicating	%
Mountain Bike Trail User	86	40%
Hiking Trail User	67	31%
Equestrian Trail User	41	19%
Other (defined below)	19	9%
Trail Runner	5	
Area Resident	4	
Mountain Bike and Hike	3	
Equestrian and Hike	4	
All trail user types	3	
Gravel biking	1	

Non-Resident (62 Responses)

Frequency	# of respondents indicating	%
Mountain Bike Trail User	45	73%
Equestrian Trail User	14	23%
Hiking Trail User	0	0%
Other	3	5%
Disc Golfer	1	
Mountain Bike and Equestrian user	1	
Workplace nearby	1	

Total combine responses (275 responses)

Frequency	# of respondents indicating	%
Mountain Bike Trail User	131	48%
Hiking Trail User	67	24%
Equestrian Trail User	55	20%
Other	22	8%

**Question 3. What do you like about the proposed trail plan?
(221 responses) – Open ended question**

Response categorized by theme	# of respondents indicating
Clearly designated trail user types	60
Nothing / negative feedback noted	26
It formalizes these trails	25
Likes that it uses the existing trail network / no loss of trails	22
Like that it's a fair / equitable distribution of trails	18
Generally like it	13
Good wayfinding/ mapping	12
Safe routes for all users	10
Good variety of trail options	8
Like the collaboration with other user groups	8
Like that the area is proposed for multi-use	8
That horse primary trails / loops are included	7
Don't know	6
Appreciate that something is being done	5
Like the planned improvements	4
Like that pedestrians have their own trails	3
Clarifying who maintains what is helpful	2
History of trail building by Haney Horsemen	1
The plan will encourage better behavior	1
Like that bike trails are included in the plan	1

**Question 4. Do you have any suggestions to improve the proposed trail plan?
(261 Responses)**

Response	# of respondents indicating	%
All Users – 261 total		
NO suggestions, the proposed plan meets many of my needs and balances the needs of others	134	52%
YES, I would like to add suggestions	127	48%
Mountain Bike Users – 128 total		
NO suggestions, the proposed plan meets many of my needs and balances the needs of others	83	65%
YES, I would like to add suggestions	45	35%
Hiking/ Pedestrian Users – 58 total		
NO suggestions, the proposed plan meets many of my needs and balances the needs of others	27	46%
YES, I would like to add suggestions	31	54%
Equestrian Users – 53 total		
NO suggestions, the proposed plan meets many of my needs and balances the needs of others	15	28%
YES, I would like to add suggestions	38	72%
Other Users – 20 total		
NO suggestions, the proposed plan meets many of my needs and balances the needs of others	9	45%
YES, I would like to add suggestions	11	55%

YES answer Responses categorized by theme (127 Responses, 48%)	# of respondents indicating
Further separate trail users (no shared trails), separate areas (West/East)	22
General site/ trail improvements (signage, parking, etc.)	19
Provide more horse primary trails (some suggest on east side)	14
Further collaboration needed for future maintenance plans	11
Provide more space for mountain biking trails	10
Make the proposed trail map clearer for uses. Map clarity issues	9
Limit trail crossing points (safety issues), install speed reducing features	9
Balance primary user type trails equally	7

Fewer mountain bike primary trails	5
Don't decommission any trails	4
Provide more walking/ hiking trails	4
Leave mountain bike jumps in place (restore Ridgeline with jumps)	3
Leave all mountain biking trails as they are	3
Allow off leash dogs on Thornhill in certain areas, trails or at certain times of day	3
Restrict mountain bikes to west of 256 th St	3
Develop a "Thornhill Crunch/ Grind"	3
Keep all horse trails as they are	3
Limit trail development (Environmental / Aquifer issues)	3
Don't allow development in the City owned Urban Reserve Area	2
Work with Haney Horsemen to maintain the horse trails	2
Provide all ages, all abilities bike routes	2
Re-route trails so they don't cause erosion	2
Do not allow horse users on trails	2
Designate horse trailer parking areas	2
Designate the 264 ST./ 103 Ave entrance as Horse Primary	2
Create one way trails	1
Provide more beginner (green level) mountain bike trails	1
Develop more trails on the north side of Thornhill	1
Develop uphill routes through the forest	1
No washrooms	1
102 Ave needs road/ bike infrastructure improvements	1
More education and enforcement for shared trails	1
Prohibit further trail building	1
Focus on gaps in the "developer built trails"	1
Priority trails for E-Bikes	1
Do not allow mountain bikes	1
Limit access to Maple Ridge residents only	1
More multi use access on the west side of 256 St	1
The City should maintain the informal trails	1
Acknowledge the 3 "Heritage Equestrian Trails"	1
Publish trail use/ counter data	1
Create "Exclusive" horse trails, no pedestrians, bikes, dogs,	1
The trails study should be done by Horse Council BC	1
Provide a north/south horse trail that's not on 256 St	1
Focus on greater community trail connections to Thornhill, from Kanaka Creek, Dunlop Creek, Turkey Trot, Lockwood, etc.	1

Question 5. Do you think this proposed trail plan will result in a safer trail experience for trail users at Thornhill?

(260 Responses total)

Response	# of respondents indicating	%
All Users – 260 Total		
YES	193	74%
NO, and offered an explanation	67	26%
Mountain Bike Users – 127 total		
YES	116	91%
NO, and offered an explanation	11	9%
Hiking/ Pedestrian Users – 58 total		
YES	40	69%
NO, and offered an explanation	18	31%
Equestrian Users – 54 total		
YES	27	50%
NO, and offered an explanation	27	50%
Other Users – 21 total		
YES	10	48%
NO, and offered an explanation	11	52%

NO, and explanation Responses categorized by theme (67 Responses)	# of respondents indicating
Bikes and Horses don't mix well (incompatible uses)	16
Further separate trail uses needs to be proposed to be safer	9
Too many trail crossing points	7
No safety concerns that need addressing in the first place	5
No confidence that people will follow rules/ signs	5
Trails need to take into consideration climate change impacts and erosion	3
Improvements will bring more people causing problems	3
Trails need to be marked clearer	3
No ideas – more information is needed	2

Proposal seems confusing	2
Informal trails should not be shared with mountain bikers	2
Lack of respect from mountain bikers	2
Decommissioning trails will put further strain on multi use trails	2
Generally less safe	2
Good start, but more issues need to be further addressed	1
Increased trail maintenance is needed	1
Because horses are still allowed	1
Need to be mountain bike ONLY trails	1
Enforcement needed for off leash dogs	1
Mountain bikers don't stay on their designated trails	1
Concerned about destruction of the environment, animal habitat and negative impacts to the neighbourhood	1
Need more non-bike routes for safer access/ egress	1
Hikers will continue to use bike primary trails	1
Un-qualified people may try to build jumps	1
Separating uses will lead to friction between user groups	1
Downhill trails should be bikes ONLY, other bike trails should be multi use	1

Question 6. Do you think this proposed trail plan will result in a more inclusive trail experience for trail users at Thornhill?

(256 Responses)

Response	# of respondents indicating	%
All Users – 256 Total		
YES	204	80%
NO, and offered an explanation	52	20%
Mountain Bike Users – 127 total		
YES	122	96%
NO, and offered an explanation	5	4%
Hiking/ Pedestrian Users – 56 total		
YES	39	70%
NO, and offered an explanation	17	30%
Equestrian Users – 53 total		
YES	30	57%
NO, and offered an explanation	23	43%
Other Users – 20 total		
YES	13	65%
NO, and offered an explanation	7	35%

NO, and explanation Responses categorized by theme (52 Responses)	# of respondents indicating
The plan is too focused on mountain bikers	10
Still too dangerous for horses and hikers. Mixing is not safe	7
Separating uses will lead to conflict when people don't follow the signs	5
Unsure	4
Equestrians won't be able to safely use the trails	4
Trail users are self-interested and don't care about others	3
Need more yield signage	3
Shared use trails will confuse people leading to conflicts	3
There no conflict currently / its inclusive already	3
Groups of mountain bikers are intimidating	2

Separating uses is less inclusive (limits trail use) than making all trails available for all	2
Multi use trails need to be wider to accommodate multiple user types	2
Trail usage needs enforcement	1
Too confusing who should use which trail	1
Because it's not inclusive	1
Bear Ridge, Georges Way and Thornhill trail are under Metro Vancouver's Experience the Fraser trail	1
Trail designations need to be more balanced to be inclusive	1
More education is needed for trail etiquette	1
Horses are not appropriate for these kinds of trails as they require special precautions from all other users	1
Somewhat	1
Not enough mixed use/ shared use trails	1
Need more pedestrian/ hiking only trails to be inclusive	1
Removing the jumps that attract people from the lower mainland	1
Too small of an area for horses	1
Increased traffic will diminish quality of life	1

Question 7. In the fall of 2020 respondents to the Thornhill Trails Study survey told us what would support them as a trail user in this area which is shown in the list below. What do you think the City should prioritize from the list below? (Select your top 5 only)

265 Combined (Resident and Non Resident)

Improvement	# of respondents indicating
Improved signage and wayfinding	152
Improved parking and staging area at 256 St.	140
Formalize an agreement for trail maintenance (with the FVMBA)	108
Separate trail users (Mountain bikes/ Equestrians/ Pedestrians)	104
More trail building / expansion of trails	97
Provide a trail map	95
Retain the natural environment / limit further trail development	91
Provide garbage and recycling cans	77
Trail maintenance on informal trails	63
Provide a washroom / outhouse	59
Sanction the informal trails	58
Better enforcement of bylaws, creation of rules, off leash dogs, dirt bikes, litter	53
Safety improvements for trail crossings/ limit speed	53
Increased trail maintenance on City trails	40
Provide drinking fountain/ water access	17
Provide benches and seating areas	10
Improve accessibility of the trails	8

Question 8. Overall, do you have any other comments to share?

143 additional individual comments

Question 9. How did you find out about this project?

278 Responses Combined

Engagement Method/ Tool	# of respondents indicating	%
Facebook	108	39%
Word of Mouth	82	29%
Emailed invitation	39	14%
Posters around Thornhill	33	12%
City of Maple Ridge Website	16	6%
TOTAL	278	100%