

**Omand Park Bridge  
Active Transportation Infrastructure Stimulus Project  
Community Meeting and Open House, March 18, 2010  
Flip Chart Notes**

Note: The following microphone comments were recorded during the Community Meeting. Please note that some of the comments lose their clarity without the context in which they were made.

Page 1:

- Omand's Park for all seasons
- learning environment
- improved accessibility for all
- space for everyone
- "historical" site – meeting place
- outdoor entertainment
- our tax dollars
- remove existing bridge and rejuvenate
- support new bridge – difficult to navigate
- Portage detour not safe/dirty/dusty
- need bridge option that considers all issues
- elevate existing bridge – respect nature of park
- we want a park with a bridge – not a bridge with a park
- leave bridge and improve Portage route
- improve path and maintain

Page 2:

- condition of path/infrastructure (poor)
- fate of existing bridge?
- speed of cyclists
- ongoing mobility issues with park
- meaningful public input?
- role of Community Committee?
- gap between AT-ISP and Community Input
- other ways of spending money
- path across creek should be for walking
- cyclists should go out to Portage
- where is ESA?
- would accessibility be maintained?
- path clearance in winter
- flooding is temporary – more exercise
- Aubrey Pedestrian Bridge
- Omand's Creek – destination

Page 3:

- Is Option "D" a viable project, or Option "E"?
- How much weight does opposition carry?
- environmental value of Omand's Creek
- play in natural spaces
- not keen on any option
- Don't rush to spend money on a project we would regret
- Wolseley School student responses (letters read)
- activity under bridge – "culture jam" the space

**Omand Park Bridge**  
**Active Transportation Infrastructure Stimulus Project**  
**Community Meeting and Open House, March 18, 2010**  
**Flip Chart Notes**

- “under the boardwalk” – bridge in ruins
- government pressure to build bridge
- spend on real problems in community
- live within our means
- universal design – not just a matter of a new bridge
- build bridge in middle of park (further north)
- Portage not a good option
- move money to Redwood Bridge
- not many sliding hills around

Page 4:

- Laura Secord School student responses (letters read)
- “suck it up and ride around”
- big bridge will detract from beauty
- fit bridge to environment
- going “down” to the water (experience)
- playground for all seasons
- tons of memories
- distance between government and people
- no vision
- park maintained by residents
- process – poor
- A.T. about people walking – not just cycling
- horrible process – backwards
- bridge- walk *over* park, not *through* it
- What are problems you’re trying to fix?

Page 5:

- creek – disrespected
- neighbourhood park shared by city
- slow down – take time
- resent divisiveness
- let “community” build the bridge i.e. design
- lower the bridge – 25 year flood
- danger to sliders
- destroy beauty of valley
- devious politics
- risk of motorized traffic
- install video cameras and lights
- use Portage A.T. option
- water quality – poor. Federal money needed to fix sewers
- where was favourably response from neighbourhood?
- garbage under Portage Bridge
- bridge would be a thruway – need to “experience” path
- can’t do everything for everyone
- private land – how does it impact design options – path through private area