

Brewster Travel Canada
Glacier Discovery Walk Project
Consultation and Aboriginal Engagement Report

October 28, 2011

Executive Summary

Brewster Inc. (Brewster) is proposing the development of the Glacier Discovery Walk (GDW), a new visitor experience at the Tangle Ridge Viewpoint on the Icefields Parkway (Highway 93) in Jasper National Park.

Brewster is committed to building strong relationships with all parties potentially impacted by their projects and providing timely and meaningful consultation with stakeholders and Aboriginal communities. The following Consultation and Aboriginal Engagement Report is part of Brewster's submission to Parks Canada to meet the terms of a screening-level Environmental Assessment under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* and details public and Aboriginal engagement activities undertaken between January 1, 2011 and October 19, 2011 inclusive. At the time of writing, engagement activities are ongoing.

The public consultation and Aboriginal engagement programs were developed and tailored to recognize the unique physical, cultural, and policy environment of Jasper National Park and to ensure that Brewster's corporate policy, principles and objectives were achieved and that the program was in compliance with regulatory expectations.

Public Consultation Program Summary

Key stakeholder groups that were identified as interested parties and engaged in the consultation program included:

- Residents of the Town of Jasper and the Bow Valley Corridor including Banff, Lake Louise and Canmore
- Jasper National Park users across Alberta
- Municipal, provincial and federal government representatives for Jasper National Park and Banff National Park
- Environmental Non-Governmental Organizations (ENGOS) with an interest in national park policies, conservation issues, wilderness protection or ecological concerns
- Tourism guiding and outfitting organizations operating in Banff and Jasper National Parks

The public consultation program for the GDW consisted of the following seven main activities.

- 1. Circulation of Project Information Materials:** January 12, 2011 – Ongoing
Provided regular GDW Project updates to key stakeholders and members of the public who signed up for a mailing list. Included a Project introduction package, Project update newsletter and Environmental Assessment updates.
- 2. Consultation with Key Stakeholder Groups:** January 12, 2011 – Ongoing
Involved Project introduction phone calls and emails as well as offers to meet directly with Brewster to discuss the proposed Project.
- 3. Open Houses:** January 31, 2011 – February 3, 2011
Involved public open houses in the four communities most impacted by the proposed Project: Jasper, Banff, Calgary and Edmonton. The open houses offered members of the public an opportunity to review more detailed Project information and to meet directly with representatives of Brewster and members of the GDW design and construction teams.
- 4. Dedicated Toll-Free Phone Line:** January 18, 2011 – Ongoing
A toll-free phone line has been set up to enable members of the public to directly access Brewster for inquiries regarding the GDW.
- 5. Dedicated Project Email and Website:** January 18, 2011 - Ongoing
A Project website and email address have been set up to enable members of the public to gain additional information about the Project and directly access Brewster for inquiries regarding the GDW.
- 6. Jasper Public Environmental Assessment Forum:** Tentative date: November 14, 2011
A public forum is planned for Jasper to provide interested residents with results of the Environmental Assessment and an opportunity to meet directly with technical experts to ask questions regarding the results.
- 7. Participation in Other Consultation Opportunities:** January 12, 2011 – Ongoing
In addition to the engagement opportunities initiated by Brewster, Brewster participated in several public meetings and forums at the request of stakeholders.

Aboriginal Engagement Program Summary

Brewster, in association with Parks Canada, has initiated an Aboriginal engagement program to engage Aboriginal communities with interests in the Jasper National Park area. Aboriginal engagement activities included written Project notification; meetings with Brewster representatives to discuss the Project and any questions or concerns arising from the GDW; site visits and a presentation to the Jasper Aboriginal Forum.

Brewster views all engagement activities to date as a first stage in an ongoing process and will seek further opportunities to engage interested parties in the GDW Project as it proceeds.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Executive Summary | 2 |
| Table of Contents | 5 |
| 1.0 Introduction and Overview | 6 |
| 2.0 Public Consultation Program Design..... | 6 |
| 2.1 Goals..... | 6 |
| 2.2 Project Area Characteristics and Stakeholder Identification..... | 7 |
| 2.3 Consultation Program Design | 8 |
| 2.3.1 Communication and Information Materials..... | 8 |
| 2.3.2 Consultation Activities and Timeframes | 10 |
| 3.0 Public Consultation Program Implementation and Outcomes..... | 10 |
| 3.1 Consultation with Key Stakeholders..... | 10 |
| 3.2 Public Consultation..... | 11 |
| 3.2.1 Open Houses..... | 12 |
| 3.2.2 Toll-free Phone Line | 21 |
| 3.2.3 Email and Project Website..... | 22 |
| 3.2.4 Consultation with Key Jasper Guide and Tour Outfitters..... | 39 |
| 3.3 Participation in Other Engagement Opportunities..... | 40 |
| 4.0 Aboriginal Engagement Program..... | 42 |

1.0 Introduction and Overview

Brewster Inc. (Brewster) is proposing the development of a new visitor experience at the Tangle Ridge Viewpoint on the Icefields Parkway (Highway 93) in Jasper National Park. The proposed development, known as the Glacier Discovery Walk (GDW), will consist of a 400 m guided interpretive walkway and a glass-floored observation platform extending 30 m over the Sunwapta Valley.

Brewster is committed to building strong relationships with all parties potentially impacted by their projects and providing timely and meaningful consultation with stakeholders and Aboriginal communities. To this end, Brewster undertook a stakeholder and Aboriginal engagement program in advance of the formally mandated Canadian Environmental Assessment (CEA) Agency consultation program with the goal of enabling stakeholders and interested parties to become informed about the Glacier Discovery Walk Project (the Project) and to address or resolve issues and concerns through an open and collaborative process.

Under the direction of Brewster Inc. personnel, the stakeholder engagement program was designed and implemented by TERA Environmental Consultants (TERA), formerly Fulcrum Strategic Consulting Inc. The following *Consultation and Aboriginal Engagement Report* provides an overview of the engagement activities undertaken and the results of those activities. As the consultation program is ongoing at the time of writing, the following report incorporates all activities from the commencement of the engagement program in January 2011 through to October 19, 2011.

2.0 Public Consultation Program Design

The public consultation program was developed and tailored to recognize the unique physical, cultural, and policy environment of Jasper National Park. The following sections summarize the goals, stakeholder groups and activities that were undertaken as part of the public consultation program.

2.1 Goals

The public consultation program for the GDW was designed to ensure that Brewster's corporate policy, principles and objectives were achieved and that the program was in compliance with regulatory expectations. In addition, the program was tailored to meet the unique characteristics of Jasper National Park.

Specific goals for the design of the public consultation program were:

- Identify all potentially interested parties and provide opportunities for engagement at levels appropriate to their interests
- Provide an opportunity for potentially affected parties to become informed about the Project in advance of the formal Environmental Assessment (EA) review and comment period
- Initiate consultation activities prior to the formal EA review and comment period to enable stakeholder input to be considered in Project design
- Provide various communication channels to make information available to stakeholders and Aboriginal peoples
- Notify all potential stakeholders and affected Aboriginal peoples about the Project and their opportunity to participate in a manner appropriate to their needs

2.2 Project Area Characteristics and Stakeholder Identification

The proposed GDW will be located at the current site of the Tangle Ridge Viewpoint on Highway 93 (the Icefields Parkway) in Jasper National Park. The viewpoint is approximately 6.5 km north of the Glacier Discovery Centre. Jasper National Park is a protected area of provincial, national and international significance for its ecological, conservation, wilderness, recreation and tourism values.

Because of its role as a major recreation and tourism destination for residents across the Province, the engagement area was broadened from the local area around Jasper to include Banff, Calgary and Edmonton. In addition, it was anticipated that the Project would be of special interest to environmental and conservation organizations with an interest in the ecological preservation and park management policies of Banff and Jasper National Parks.

Given these aspects, the following stakeholder groups were targeted for engagement in the public consultation program:

- Residents of the Town of Jasper
- Residents of the Bow Valley Corridor including Banff, Lake Louise and Canmore
- Residents and Jasper Park users across Alberta
- Municipal governments for the towns of Banff and Jasper (see Appendix A for list)
- Provincial and federal government representatives for Jasper National Park and Banff National Park (see Appendix B for list)

- Environmental Non-Governmental Organizations (ENGOS) with an interest in national park policies, conservation issues, wilderness protection or ecological concerns (see Appendix C for list)
- Other stakeholder organizations and associations representing interests in Banff and Jasper National Parks including tourism, guiding and outfitting organizations and associations (see Appendix D for list)

The list of key stakeholder groups was reviewed with Parks Canada in advance of the initiation of the engagement program. In addition, once key stakeholders were contacted they were invited to identify additional stakeholders who should be notified and, where identified, these groups or individuals were contacted.

2.3 Consultation Program Design

2.3.1 Communication and Information Materials

Communication materials were prepared to provide stakeholders with information about the Project. These materials were provided to stakeholders by mail and email, during personal meetings, in hard copy at Open Houses and electronically through a dedicated Project website.

Communication materials included:

- A slide presentation for stakeholder meetings (Appendix E)
- A Project fact sheet (Appendix F)
- A Project introduction letter for Key Stakeholders (Appendix G)
- Open house Project story boards (Appendix H)
- Open house notification newspaper advertisement (Appendix I)
- Open house follow-up newsletter (Appendix J)
- EA delay announcement (Appendix S)

The following table illustrates the circulation methods and timing of the above-mentioned communication materials.

Table 1: Project Communication Materials Circulation

| Communication Document | Circulation Method | Date | Target Stakeholders |
|--|------------------------------|--|--|
| Project Presentation | In person | Jan. 12 – ongoing | Key stakeholders who participated in one-on-one meetings with Brewster |
| Project Fact Sheet | Direct email | Jan. 12 – 14, 2011 | Key stakeholder list: ENGOs, local government, tourism associations, tourism operator associations |
| | Published on Project website | Jan. 18, 2011 | General public |
| | Available at open houses | Jan. 31 – Feb. 3, 2011 | Open house attendees |
| Project Introduction Letter | Direct email | Jan. 12 – 14, 2011 | Key stakeholder list: ENGOs, local government, tourism associations, tourism operator associations |
| Project Story Boards | Available at open houses | Jan. 31 – Feb. 3, 2011 | Open house attendees |
| Newspaper Advertisement | Jasper Fitzhugh | Jan. 20, 2011 Jan. 27, 2011 | Jasper and area residents |
| | Banff Crag and Canyon | Jan. 18, 2011 Jan. 25, 2011 | Banff and area residents |
| | Canmore Leader | Jan. 19, 2011 Jan. 26, 2011 | Canmore and area residents |
| | Rocky Mountain Outlook | Jan. 20, 2011 Jan. 27, 2011 | Bow Valley Corridor residents |
| | Edmonton Journal | Jan. 22, 2011 Jan. 29, 2011 | Edmonton and area residents |
| | Calgary Herald | Jan. 22, 2011 Jan. 29, 2011 | Calgary and area residents |
| Open House Follow-up Newsletter | Direct email and mail | March 3, 2011 via direct email March 7, 2011 via mail | Registered open house attendees Key stakeholder list First Nation Groups |

| Communication Document | Circulation Method | Date | Target Stakeholders |
|------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--|
| EA Delay Announcement | Direct email | April 6-7, 2011 | Registered open house attendees Key stakeholder list First Nation Groups |

2.3.2 Consultation Activities and Timeframes

The public consultation program for the GDW consisted of six main activities:

1. **Consultation with Key Stakeholder Groups:** January 12, 2011 – Ongoing
2. **Open Houses:** January 31, 2011 – February 3, 2011
3. **Dedicated Toll-Free Phone Line:** January 18, 2011 – Ongoing
4. **Dedicated Project Email and Website:** January 18, 2011 – Ongoing
5. **Jasper Public EA Forum:** planned date: May 24, 2011
6. **Participation in Other Consultation Activities:** January 12, 2011 - Ongoing

The following section describes the implementation and outcomes of each of these engagement activities.

3.0 Public Consultation Program Implementation and Outcomes

The following section provides a description of the engagement activities that were undertaken as part of the public consultation program for the GDW.

3.1 Consultation with Key Stakeholders

Consultation with key stakeholder groups was initiated on January 12, 2011. Key stakeholder groups were contacted by phone with a follow-up email sent including the Project Introduction Letter (Appendix G) and a copy of the Project Fact Sheet (Appendix F) attached. Both the phone calls and follow-up emails described the Project and issued an invitation to meet directly with representatives from Brewster to discuss the Project further. Of the 27 organizations contacted, 9 indicated an interest in meeting, 3 indicated that they would attend the Open House and that would be sufficient, 2 indicated that the Project was not within the scope of their organization and did not require a follow-up meeting, 1 indicated that the materials provided were sufficient, and 10 did not respond to inquiries. In the cases where no reply was received, one additional follow-up phone call was conducted to confirm lack of interest in meeting. Appendix K contains the record of correspondence with key stakeholder groups.

Following the initial notification of key stakeholders, meetings were conducted with interested organizations. 8 meetings were held between January 21, 2011 and February 14, 2011. Key topics addressed during these meetings include the following.

Concerns Raised by Key Stakeholders:

- Concerns regarding the privatization of a public viewpoint
- Concern that the GDW could set a precedent for further development in Jasper National Park
- Concern about potential impact of the structure on views in the surrounding area
- Concern about the infrastructure associated with the GDW and whether or not that is needed to accomplish the educational goals of the Project
- Concern about potential impacts on wildlife habitat

Questions Raised by Key Stakeholders:

- Clarification on how the GDW will address human and wildlife safety in the area
- Desire for assurances that the interpretive aspects of the GDW will adhere to high interpretive standards
- Desire for clarification of the impacts on wildlife and wildlife mobility
- Desire for information on impacts of the Project on nesting species and flight paths
- Desire for clarification regarding the need for the GDW

Benefits Identified by Key Stakeholders:

- Project has the potential to have a significant benefit in drawing tourism traffic to the area
- Identified interpretive aspects as a key benefit of this Project
- Identified that the restriction of individual vehicles at the site is a benefit for human and animal well-being
- Potential for better management of garbage at the site will likely reduce scavenging by birds and other animals

Please see Appendix L for summaries of these meetings.

3.2 Public Consultation

Brewster established the following main communication vehicles for public consultation:

- Open houses
- A dedicated toll-free phone line

- A dedicated Project email address
- A dedicated Project website
- A Project fax number
- Jasper public EA forum

Results from these public engagement communication channels are outlined below.

3.2.1 Open Houses

In order to provide members of the public with an opportunity to understand Project plans and to provide input into the Project concept and design, Brewster held a series of open houses throughout Alberta during the week of January 31, 2011. Open houses were held in the following communities:

- 2:00 PM – 8:00 PM January 31, 2011 – Jasper Activity Centre, Town of Jasper
- 2:00 PM – 8:00 PM February 1, 2011 – Mt. Royal Hotel, Town of Banff
- 2:00 PM – 8:00 PM February 2, 2011 – Marriott Hotel, Calgary
- 2:00 PM – 8:00 PM February 3, 2011 – Coast Edmonton Plaza Hotel, Edmonton

Notification regarding the open houses was accomplished through advertisements in local newspapers including:

- The Jasper Fitzhugh
- The Banff Crag and Canyon
- The Rocky Mountain Outlook
- The Edmonton Journal
- The Calgary Herald

The advertisement(s) ran for two weeks prior to the open houses. Copies of the advertisements along with publishing dates can be found in Appendix I. In addition to the paid advertisements, Brewster circulated a media advisory (Appendix M) to the above-mentioned papers in the week prior to the open houses and the following newspapers ran articles in advance of the open houses:

Table 2: Pre-Open House Media Coverage

| Media Outlet | Circulation Area | Date |
|----------------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Jasper Fitzhugh Newspaper | Jasper and area | January 27, 2011 |
| Crag and Canyon Newspaper | Banff and area | February 1, 2011 |
| Edmonton Journal Newspaper | Edmonton and area | February 1, 2011 |
| Edmonton AM – CBC Radio | Edmonton and area | February 2, 2011 |

Open houses were well-attended in all four locations. Please see Table 3 below for attendance statistics from each open house.

Table 3: Open House Registered Attendance Statistics

Please note that all attendees at the open houses were invited to sign-in to register their attendance. Not all attendees chose to register so the numbers below likely do not reflect the full number of attendees.

| Location | Date | Number |
|------------------------|------------------|------------|
| Jasper | January 31, 2011 | 57 |
| Banff | February 1, 2011 | 47 |
| Calgary | February 2, 2011 | 14 |
| Edmonton | February 3, 2011 | 22 |
| Total Attendees | | 140 |

At the open houses, attendees were provided with a copy of the Project Fact Sheet. In addition, the open house featured Project Story Boards (Appendix H) throughout the room as well as copies of the 30%-schematic drawings of the proposed structure. Technical experts and representatives from Brewster were available to discuss the Project and answer any questions stakeholders may have had.

Stakeholders were also provided with a comment form to identify any additional comments, concerns or questions regarding the Project that they would like to leave with the Project Team. Stakeholders were invited to leave the comment forms at the open house or to submit them later via email or fax.

Response for the Project from open house attendees was mixed. Some members of the public expressed significant concern about the Project, some had specific inquiries or questions and

others were supportive. Comments received from open house attendees and responses provided by Brewster are summarized below. Table 4 provides a summary of the concerns/questions and responses provided by Brewster at the open house. A more detailed summary of comment forms received is included in Appendix N. To protect the privacy of stakeholders, and in accordance with Alberta's *Personal Information Protection Act (PIPA)*, copies of the original comment forms will be provided to Parks Canada under a separate cover.

The main concerns raised by attendees at the open houses included:

- Role of private industry in National Parks
- Public access to the viewpoint for non-paying visitors
- Use of shuttle busses to access the site/restrictions on personal vehicle access to the site
- Traffic management and logistics
- Aesthetics of the design and structure
- Visual impacts of the structure
- Project need/Project justification
- Impacts on wildlife habitat, mobility, etc.
- Transparency of the public engagement process
- Ongoing viability of Brewster operations/concerns about other Brewster sites

Comments in support of the GDW focused on the following aspects:

- The need for additional visitor experiences along the Icefields Parkway
- The location of the Project on a previously disturbed site
- The minimal environmental impacts
- The use of shuttle busses to access the site
- Opportunity to reduce traffic collisions and impacts at the area
- The creation of a safe, accessible walkway for park visitors

Key questions that were raised by open house attendees that are being examined by the Project Team include:

- Potential for private vehicle access to the site outside of operating hours and off-season for hikers, rock-climbers and scramblers
- Potential for access to the site for bicycles
- Specific requests for topics/knowledge to be included in interpretive information
- Suggestions regarding garbage and recycling management at the site

Brewster has made every effort to ensure information was provided in response to every question, issue or concern. In many cases, Brewster representatives were able to address questions and concerns at the open house. In some cases additional information was provided following the open houses. In addition, Brewster incorporated a number of suggestions made at the open houses into Project plans including requests for bicycle access, off-season personal vehicle access to the parking lot and a means for members of the public to access the site without using Brewster's free private shuttles.

While Brewster has made an effort to respond to every question, Brewster does note that some concerns raised have not been addressed to stakeholder satisfaction. The role of private industry in the park and the precedent this proposed Project could create for future development, for example, are policy level issues that cannot be resolved by Brewster or Brewster's design team.

Table 4: Summary of Open House Concerns/Questions and Brewster Responses

| Summary of Comment | Project Team Response ¹ |
|--|--|
| Common Concerns from Open Houses | |
| Role of private industry in National Parks | Parks Canada, in its <i>Icefields Parkway Action Plan</i> , identified the need to redesign the Tangle Ridge Viewpoint to improve safety, reduce wildlife mortality and enhance viewing. Brewster believes that the GDW is in keeping with this policy and supports the stated intent of the <i>Icefields Parkway Action Plan</i> : “to strengthen Canadians’ connection to place, by such means as providing exceptional experiences, telling compelling stories, encouraging people to spend more time on the parkway, and inspiring visitors to move toward a stronger relationship with the land and national parks”. Brewster is committed to ensuring that all our visitor experiences promote Canada’s National Parks values of environmental stewardship and ecological integrity. |
| Public access to the viewpoint for non-paying visitors | The current plan for the Project is to maintain and enhance the exiting public viewpoint leaving it accessible to all members of the public free of charge. The free public viewing area will be complimented by the addition of the professionally guided interpretive walkway and viewing platform accessible to paying visitors. The views from the free public viewing area will be unobstructed by the paid attraction and the overall free experience will be enhanced by the addition of interpretive elements with the goal of ensuring a base level understanding of place by all those who choose to enjoy the viewpoints. Today there is no educational or interpretive information available at this location. |

¹ NOTE: The responses listed below are summaries of the responses provided by Brewster representatives at the open houses. As some aspects of the project design were adjusted as a result of the consultation program, the information provided in these responses may not reflect the current project design and concept.

| Summary of Comment | Project Team Response ¹ |
|--|---|
| Common Concerns from Open Houses | |
| Restrictions on personal vehicle access to the site/traffic management and logistics | During operating hours, the site will only be accessible through a free shuttle bus from the Icefields Centre. The proposed Project will involve the re-design of the entry and exit points to the viewpoint including the development of a left-hand turn lane and an acceleration lane thereby increasing safety at the point of the pull-out. While this Project is not likely to impact overall traffic volumes on the Icefields Parkway, through the use of free public shuttles it will reduce the volume of individual vehicle traffic pulling on and off the highway at the site. |
| Aesthetics of the design and structure | The design team has attempted to incorporate a number of elements intended to help the GDW blend into the natural environment. The proposed design uses glass and Corten steel which is a type of steel that forms a protective coating of rust when exposed to the elements. As the natural weathering process evolves over the first few years, the steel will be transformed into a dark brown colour. This material was selected, in part, because the oxide colour will match the iron oxide staining that is naturally present in the surrounding cliffs. In addition, the proposed design uses irregular lines and patterns in an attempt to mirror the surrounding mountains. |
| Visual impacts of the structure | Brewster is sensitive to concerns regarding the visual impacts of this Project. Brewster will be using materials and design techniques aimed at reducing visual disturbance and helping the GDW blend into the natural environment. Because the GDW sits below the level of the highway, the walkway and viewing platform will be less visible from the road. Brewster is conducting a visual impact study as part of the Project development. Preliminary renderings completed as part of this study which demonstrate the likely points of visibility from the Icefields Parkway were made available at the open house |

| Summary of Comment | Project Team Response ¹ |
|---|---|
| Common Concerns from Open Houses | |
| Project need/Project justification | <p>Brewster feels that the GDW presents a unique opportunity to build on an existing visitor experience while also appealing to and attracting a broader demographic of park visitor. Brewster also feels it meets the vision laid out by Parks Canada in the <i>Icefield Parkway Action Plan</i> to “strengthen Canadians’ connection to place, by such means as providing exceptional experiences, telling compelling stories, encouraging people to spend more time on the Parkway, and inspiring visitors to move toward a stronger relationship with the land and national parks.” The GDW will transform the existing Tangle Ridge Viewpoint and will enable both paying and non-paying visitors to connect with nature in a unique way while learning about the significance of the local ecosystem at the Columbia Icefield. The existing Glacier Adventure Tour is popular with organized tour groups. We believe the GDW will appeal to a broad cross section of independent travelers that currently drive the parkway but do not stop for any type professionally guided interpretive experience on the landscape. The GDW will appeal to a broad range of family groups, younger travelers, new Canadians and urban dwellers looking for an opportunity to engage with the landscape in a more self-directed manner. The GDW will also be fully wheelchair accessible and will enable visitors to Jasper National Park, who are currently unable to access hiking trails, to have a meaningful and educational experience in the Park. Furthermore, a study completed by Brewster, polling over 7,800 individuals, revealed that 88% of Alberta respondents would be interested in an attraction similar to the Glacier Discovery Walk, indicating a large degree of interest in the Project among the regular park visitors who primarily enjoy organized, front country, low impact and safe activities.</p> |
| Impacts on wildlife habitat, mobility, etc. | <p>Wildlife population and mortality statistics as well as impacts of the Project on these populations are being examined by Brewster’s environmental consultants. The results of these studies will be included in the EA which will be made public through the <i>CEA Act</i> process.</p> |

| Summary of Comment | Project Team Response ¹ |
|---|--|
| Common Concerns from Open Houses | |
| Transparency of the public engagement process | Brewster will be reflecting the feedback received from stakeholders in the Consultation Report being forwarded to Parks Canada as part of the regulatory review process. The report will become part of the EA made public through the CEA Agency website as part of the CEA Agency review process. Brewster will also provide a link to the report on Brewster’s website. The public will have three weeks to review the EA and provide comments to Parks Canada that will be considered in their decision-making process. |
| Responsibility for reclamation | Brewster has been operating in Canada’s mountain National Parks for over 119 years. Throughout this operating history Brewster has maintained a deep respect for the landscape and natural surroundings of these parks. In developing the GDW Brewster will assume all responsibility for the maintenance, upkeep and eventual reclamation of the site consistent with all Brewster facilities within the National Parks. |
| Common Questions from Open Houses | |
| Potential for private vehicle access to the site outside of operating hours and off-season for hikers, rock-climbers and scramblers | There has been some confusion with respect to the name of the current viewpoint at the Project location. The proposed location for the GDW is on Tangle Ridge and is commonly referred to as the Tangle Ridge Viewpoint. The Tangle Creek Pullout, which is a common access point to a number of local hiking trails is a separate pull-out further north on the Icefields Parkway. The Tangle Creek Pullout will not be impacted by the proposed Glacier Discovery Walk. Brewster is currently reviewing requests by some stakeholders to provide parking at the site after hours and off-season for individuals wishing to access hiking, scrambling and other back-country routes from this site. |
| Potential for access to the site for bicycles | Brewster is currently examining opportunities to include bicycle parking at the site to accommodate cyclists and cycle tours. |
| Specific requests for topics/knowledge to be included in interpretive information | Brewster is open to input from local environmental, guiding, interpretive and First Nations organizations in the development of the interpretive program for the GDW. Brewster has collected a list of individuals and organizations interested in assisting with this aspect of the Project and will seek to engage these groups if the Project receives approval. |

| Summary of Comment | Project Team Response ² |
|--|--|
| Common Questions from Open Houses | |
| Suggestions regarding garbage and recycling management at the site | Brewster will take full responsibility for the maintenance of the GDW site including management of garbage and recycling facilities. Brewster received a number of suggestions regarding improving recycling programs at this and other Brewster sites and is taking those suggestions into account. |

² NOTE: The responses listed below are summaries of the responses provided by Brewster representatives at the open houses. As some aspects of the project design were adjusted as a result of the consultation program, the information provided in these responses may not reflect the current project design and concept.

Following the completion of the open houses, Brewster produced a Project Newsletter reflecting the feedback received from stakeholders during the open houses and answering some frequently asked questions. This Project Newsletter was circulated to all open house attendees who left contact information as well as all key stakeholders. See Appendix J for a copy of the newsletter.

3.2.2 Toll-free Phone Line

A dedicated toll-free telephone line was created for the GDW public consultation program and went live on January 18, 2011. The number was published in the Project Fact Sheet, the newspaper advertisements and on the dedicated Project website. The voice message box was checked on a daily basis and calls were returned by a Project team member whenever possible by the next business day. A summary of calls received appears in Table 5 below:

Table 5: Summary of Project Voice Mail Correspondence

| Date | Inquiry | Response |
|-------------------|---|---|
| January 26, 2011 | Stakeholder in support of Project. Interested in possible contracting opportunities | Returned call February 2. Passed contact info on to construction team lead. |
| January 27, 2011 | Stakeholder seeking information about the Banff open house | Returned call February 2. Apologized for not getting back sooner and offered opportunity to speak with Brewster rep to get questions answered. Stakeholder declined. |
| February 2, 2011 | Stakeholder seeking information about the Edmonton open house | Returned call February 3 and answered questions re: time and location of open house. |
| February 8, 2011 | Stakeholder seeking answers to a few technical questions regarding the GDW | Returned call February 10. Stakeholder didn't remember questions. |
| February 14, 2011 | Stakeholder Questions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Please explain the EA review process and expected timelines 2) What size shuttle busses is Brewster contemplating? | Returned Call February 14. Provided details on EA process and indicated that Brewster would provide the answer re: busses. Email Feb 16. Indicated that the busses will be 55 person shuttle busses. |

| Date | Inquiry | Response |
|-------------------|---|--|
| February 27, 2011 | Request from stakeholder for link to EA. Left email address but no phone number. | Mar 2. Sent email reply indicating that EA is not yet ready but that Brewster will notify stakeholder when it is available. |
| April 8, 2011 | Stakeholder Questions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) What happened to the comments from the open houses? 2) Will they be sent to Parks Canada? 3) When will they be released publicly? | April 11 – left voice mail message returning call. April 11 – sent follow-up email indicating that all comments will be forwarded to Parks Canada and included in consultation report which will be released publicly with the EA. Committed to notifying stakeholder of EA release when date is known. |

3.2.3 Email and Project Website

A dedicated Project email account and website were created and went live on January 18, 2011. The Project website contained similar information to what was presented in the Project Fact Sheet, contained a list of Open House dates and locations and a downloadable copy of the Project Fact Sheet. Screen shots of the Project website appear in Appendix 0.

The Project email account was used to gather comments, questions and input from stakeholders. 72 emails were received from stakeholders between January 19, 2011 and October 19, 2011. Table 6 below provides a summary of concerns and questions received via the Project email account. To protect the privacy of stakeholders, and in accordance with Alberta's *PIPA*, copies of the original email correspondence will be provided to Parks Canada under a separate cover.

Table 6: Summary of Project Email Correspondence

| Email Date | Summary of Comments | Project Team Response |
|------------------|--|--|
| January 27, 2011 | <p>Expressed opposition to the GDW. Identified need to improve safety at pullout but didn't feel this was the appropriate way to do that. Concerns included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual impact on surroundings • Increase in tourist traffic • Identified a lack of interest among visitors to Grand Canyon Skywalk • Unable to attend open house | January 30 – email response: explained plan for free viewing area in addition to paid interpretive walk, described attempts to minimize visual impacts of the GDW, identified survey results indicating interest in attending GDW, extended offer to meet one-on-one to discuss the Project. |
| January 29, 2011 | Inquired about location of site relative to Athabasca Falls and asked what will be viewable from the platform | February 4 – email response: indicated the Sunwapta Valley and the hanging glaciers on Mount Athabasca will be visible but the Athabasca glacier is not. |
| January 29, 2011 | Asked for location of Edmonton open house | January 30 – email response: provided open house details |
| February 2, 2011 | Expressed opposition to the GDW and Brewster's existing operations at the Glacier Discovery Centre. | February 8 – email response: indicated that all comments are being considered in Project development and will be brought forward in consultation report. |
| February 2, 2011 | Expressed support for the Project. Indicated appreciation that it will be accessible to individuals who cannot access other trails | February 9 – email response: indicated that all comments are being considered in Project development and will be brought forward in consultation report. |
| February 2, 2011 | <p>Expressed opposition to the GDW. Concerns included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excessive development and tourism in the National Parks • Impact on wildlife and ecologically sensitive areas. | February 9 – email response: Indicated Brewster's commitment to responsible development and minimizing impact on wildlife and environment. Indicated that all comments will be brought forward in the consultation report. |
| February 2, 2011 | <p>Expressed opposition to the GDW. Concerns included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Glacier melting at GDC • Development should be limited in parks • Likely low demand for this • Walkways are not needed when people can take hikes. | February 9 – email response: Indicated that GDW will be fully wheelchair accessible enabling people access to the pathway who are unable to use existing trails. Provided survey results indicating level of interest in visiting GDW. Indicated that all comments will be brought forward in the consultation report. |

| Email Date | Summary of Comments | Project Team Response |
|------------------|--|--|
| February 3, 2011 | Question whether parking will still be available to the public at the site. | February 15 – email response: Indicated that there will be a free shuttle available to all visitors. Also indicated that Brewster is reviewing requests from stakeholders re: access for vehicle parking after hours and off-season. |
| February 4, 2011 | <p>Expressed opposition to the GDW. Concerns included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walkways are not needed when people can take hikes • Nature of GDW as an “attraction” • Privatization of a National Park/restriction of access to free viewpoint • Lack of benefit back to the Park | February 9 – email response: Indicated that GDW includes a free public viewpoint. Indicated that GDW will be fully wheelchair accessible enabling people access to the pathway who are unable to use existing trails. Indicated that Parks Canada will receive a portion of all ticket sales. Indicated that all comments will be brought forward in the consultation report. |
| February 4, 2011 | <p>Questions/Concerns included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will walkway impact slope stability? • What is the history of landslides and avalanches in the area? • What are the interpretive highlights? • Can you see the glaciers from the proposed site? • Indicated some confusion regarding Tangle Ridge Viewpoint and the Tangle Creek Pullout • What are the population and mortality statistics for goats in the area and how will the Project impact these? • Logistics and viability of shuttle use • Will this actually reduce traffic? • What are the benefits to Parks Canada? • Concern regarding the design of the GDW | February 15 – email response: provided detailed response to all questions indicating that many of the technical answers will be in the EA; described preliminary thoughts on interpretive programming; clarified view will be of Hanging Glaciers not Athabasca Glacier; clarified location of viewpoint vs. Tangle Creek Pullout; indicated that mortality statistics will be in EA; described plan for shuttle use; described anticipated impact of road re-design on vehicular safety; indicated benefits to Parks Canada to include improved interpretive experience for parks visitors, upgrade of existing public viewpoint; improvement of road safety in the area and portion of ticket fees to be remitted to Parks Canada; described theory behind design and materials. Indicated that all comments will be brought forward in the consultation report. |

| Email Date | Summary of Comments | Project Team Response |
|------------------|---|--|
| February 4, 2011 | Expressed concern about the GDW. Concerns included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of interest from visitors • Shuttle bus traffic blending with regular traffic • Fee to access the walkway | February 16 – email response: identified survey results indicating interest in attending GDW; described plan for shuttle use; described anticipated impact of road re-design on vehicular safety; Indicated that GDW includes a free public viewpoint. Indicated that GDW will be fully wheelchair accessible enabling people access to the pathway who are unable to use existing trails; indicated that all comments will be brought forward in the consultation report. |
| February 4, 2011 | Expressed concern about the GDW. Concerns included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Privatization of a public viewpoint • Lack of access to the site from private vehicles/use of public shuttles | February 15 – email response: described accessibility of existing viewpoint to public and use of free shuttles to access the site. Indicated that all comments will be brought forward in the consultation report. |
| February 4, 2011 | Expressed support for the GDW. Comments included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feels Project is in keeping with parks policy and park management plans in providing “view from the edge” visitor experiences • Feels the GDW will meet the needs and interests of a large number of Parks visitors. | February 10 – email response: indicated that all comments are being considered in Project development and will be brought forward in consultation report. |
| February 5, 2011 | CC of letter addressed to Parks Canada expressing concern regarding the GDW | Parks Canada provided reply. |
| February 6, 2011 | Emailed open house comment form. See Appendix N for summary of open house comment forms. | No reply required. |

| Email Date | Summary of Comments | Project Team Response |
|------------------|---|--|
| February 6, 2011 | <p>Expressed opposition to the GDW. Concerns included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access for hikers and scramblers • Exploration of nature outside of built environments • Research on level of interest • Study of current use of the pull-off • Entry fee • Loss of access to viewpoint/free shuttle • Walkway drainage • Project name • Colour/building materials | <p>February 23 – email response: provided detailed response; indicated reviewing requests to provide parking at the site after hours and off-season for hikers and scramblers; clarified location of viewpoint vs. Tangle Creek Pullout; indicated that GDW will be fully wheelchair accessible enabling people access to the pathway who are unable to use existing trails; described plan for shuttle use; indicated that a study completed by Brewster, polling over 7,800 individuals on Brewster’s mailing list, revealed that 88% of Alberta respondents would be interested in an attraction similar to the GDW; explained that Brewster has not made a final determination regarding the entry fee for the GDW but it will likely be in the range of \$15-\$30; described anticipated impact of road re-design on vehicular safety; explained that the formal design for drainage has not been completed but provided a high-level overview of current thinking on drainage management; explained name was meant to link this Project with other visitor experiences in the area; described theory behind design and materials indicated that all comments are being considered in Project development and will be brought forward in consultation report.</p> |
| February 7, 2011 | <p>Emailed open house comment form. See Appendix N for results of open house comment forms.</p> | |
| February 7, 2011 | <p>Request for copy of Consultation Report once available</p> | <p>February 10 – email response: Indicated that we will provide Consultation Report once finalized.</p> |
| February 7, 2011 | <p>Request for copy of Consultation Report once available</p> | <p>February 10 – email response: Indicated that we will provide Consultation Report once finalized.</p> |

| Email Date | Summary of Comments | Project Team Response |
|------------------|--|--|
| February 7, 2011 | <p>Expressed concern about the GDW. Questions/Concerns included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Privatization of a National Park/restriction of access to free viewpoint • Appreciated use of free shuttles to reduce traffic in the area • Requested assurance that busses will remain free • Concerned about impact of construction blasting on wildlife • Expressed concern about the transparency of the public engagement process. | February 10 – email response: indicated that all comments are being considered in Project development and will be brought forward in consultation report; provided assurance that shuttles will remain free; indicated that blasting procedures will be conducted in a way that will minimize impact on wildlife. |
| February 7, 2011 | <p>Expressed opposition to the GDW. Concerns included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Privatization of a National Park/restriction of access to free viewpoint • Shuttle use to access the site • Visual impact • Project name • Tree removal • Impacts on animal mortality • Speed limits and signage • Glacier tours/receding glacier | February 28 – email response: explained plan for free viewing area in addition to paid interpretive walk, described attempts to minimize visual impacts of the GDW; described anticipated impact of road re-design on vehicular safety; explained name was meant to link this Project with other visitor experiences in the area; described theory behind design and materials; indicated that no trees would be removed as part of this Project; described anticipated impact of road re-design on vehicular safety and animal mortality; explained that wildlife impacts are being studied and will be part of the Environmental assessment being submitted to Parks Canada; indicated that all comments are being considered in Project development and will be brought forward in consultation report. |
| February 8, 2011 | Expressed support for the Project. Indicated that the GDW will help promote Banff and Canada as a preferred tourist destination. | February 9 – Email response: indicated that all comments are being considered in Project development and will be brought forward in consultation report. |
| February 9, 2011 | Expressed support for the Project. Indicated that projects like this are important to encourage local people to enjoy and visit the parks. | February 9 – Email response: indicated that all comments are being considered in Project development and will be brought forward in consultation report. |

| Email Date | Summary of Comments | Project Team Response |
|-------------------|---|--|
| February 9, 2011 | Letter to Michael Hannan expressing support for the Project. Indicated that projects like this are important to encourage local people to enjoy and visit the parks. | |
| February 9, 2011 | Expressed opposition to the Project. Concerns included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • History of Brewster operations at the GDC • Use of Brewster shuttle busses to access the site • Private corporations in National Parks | February 15 - Email response: described company policy re: staff housing at GDC and lack of tolerance for violent or abusive behaviour among staff; described proposal for use of free shuttles |
| February 9, 2011 | Expressed opposition to the Project. Concerns included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback process | February 22 – email response: indicated that all comments received from stakeholders regarding the GDW would be forwarded to Parks Canada as part of the EA process. |
| February 10, 2011 | Expressed support for the Project. Comments included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enriched experience for visitors to Jasper • Safe, dramatic viewing platform • Appreciates use of an existing disturbed site • Feels environmental concerns have been well-addressed • Guided interpretive walk will help educate visitors • Feels the Project will enhance visitor experience | February 15 – Email response: indicated that all comments are being considered in Project development and will be brought forward in consultation report. |
| February 10, 2011 | Expressed support for the Project. Indicated that it is great for tourists. | February 15 – Email response: indicated that all comments are being considered in Project development and will be brought forward in consultation report. |
| February 14, 2011 | CC of letter addressed to Parks Canada expressing concern regarding the GDW | Parks Canada provided reply. |
| February 15, 2011 | Expressed opposition to the Project. Concerns included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brewster’s existing operations at the Glacier Discovery Centre. • Project benefits • Extra time associated with taking free shuttle | March 9, 2011 –Email response: provided information on the time associated with using the shuttle; Indicated that GDW includes a free public viewpoint. Indicated that GDW will be fully wheelchair accessible enabling people access to the pathway who are unable to use existing trails; Indicated that all comments will be brought forward in the consultation report |

| Email Date | Summary of Comments | Project Team Response |
|-------------------|--|---|
| February 16, 2011 | <p>Expressed support for the Project. Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feels Project is in keeping with parks policy and park management plans in providing “view from the edge” visitor experiences • Public-private partnerships are essential for delivering improvements to visitor experiences | February 22 – Email response: indicated that all comments are being considered in Project development and will be brought forward in consultation report. |
| February 17, 2011 | <p>Expressed opposition to the Project. Concerns included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Privatization of a National Park/restriction of access to free viewpoint | February 28 – Email response: Indicated that GDW includes a free public viewpoint; Indicated that GDW will be fully wheelchair accessible enabling people access to the pathway who are unable to use existing trails; Indicated that all comments are being considered in Project development and will be brought forward in consultation report. |
| February 17, 2011 | <p>Expressed opposition to the Project. Concerns included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation program • Increase in vehicle traffic • Construction impacts on wildlife • Parks Canada’s Policy | February 28 – Email response: Indicated that Project open houses were publicized via a variety of outlets including contacting local interest groups, published ads in the Jasper Fitzhugh newspaper and a media advisory that resulted in a front-page newspaper article in the Jasper Fitzhugh; indicated that the GDW is not anticipated to significantly increase overall vehicle traffic on the Parkway; explained that wildlife impacts are being studied and will be part of the Environmental assessment being submitted to Parks Canada; indicated that Brewster believes that the GDW is keeping with Parks Canada’s “Icefields Parkway Action Plan”; indicated that all comments are being considered in Project development and will be brought forward in consultation report. |
| February 20, 2011 | <p>Expressed opposition to the GDW. Concerns included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nature of GDW as an “attraction” • Privatization of a National Park | February 28 – Email response: Indicated that all comments will be brought forward in the consultation report. |

| Email Date | Summary of Comments | Project Team Response |
|-------------------|---|--|
| February 23, 2011 | <p>Questions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What options exist to access the viewpoint for those not wishing to take the shuttle from the Icefield’s Centre? • How will tour busses access the viewpoint? • What additional interpretive information will be available that is not currently available at the Icefield’s Centre • What are the traffic standards? | <p>March 3 – Email response: Described plan for shuttle use; described anticipated impact of road re-design on vehicular safety; indicated benefits to Parks Canada to include improved interpretive experience for parks visitors, upgrade of existing public viewpoint; improvement of road safety in the area; described preliminary thoughts on interpretive programming; explained that Parks Canada has requested that Brewster design entry and exit points to the GDW site to British Columbia Ministry of Transportation Standards; Indicated that all comments will be brought forward in the consultation report.</p> |
| February 27, 2011 | <p>Expressed opposition to the GDW. Concerns included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excessive development and tourism in the National Parks - development should be limited in parks | <p>February 28 – Email Response: Indicated Brewster’s commitment to responsible development and minimizing impact on wildlife and environment. Indicated that all comments will be brought forward in the consultation report.</p> |
| March 1, 2011 | <p>Expressed opposition to the GDW. Concerns included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walkways are not needed when people can take hikes • Increase in traffic and tourists | <p>March 3, 2011 – Email response: indicated that the GDW is not anticipated to significantly increase overall vehicle traffic on the Parkway; indicated that GDW will be fully wheelchair accessible enabling people access to the pathway who are unable to use existing trails; indicated that Brewster believes that the GDW is keeping with Parks Canada’s “Icefields Parkway Action Plan”; indicated that all comments are being considered in Project development and will be brought forward in consultation report.</p> |
| March 2, 2011 | <p>Question regarding when the EIA would be available for public review</p> | <p>March 2, 2011–Email response: Indicated that draft EA was currently being reviewed by Parks Canada and once deemed “technically complete” (meaning it meets the requirements outlined in the Terms of Reference) it would be released for public review and comment.</p> |

| Email Date | Summary of Comments | Project Team Response |
|----------------|--|--|
| March 2, 2011 | Question regarding pull-out use for vehicles that currently use the spot for emergency repairs or to cool down. | March, 8, 2011-Email response: Indicated that if a break-down occurs Brewster will offer the partial use of the acceleration lane and whatever further assistance is required so as not to impede traffic; Indicated that all comments will be brought forward in the consultation report. |
| March 4, 2011 | Concern raised that bicycle and vehicle access to walkway would be a safety hazard. | March 8, 2011 – Email response: clarified that while Brewster is currently reviewing requests by some stakeholders to provide after hours and off-season parking at the Receiving Area (current viewpoint parking lot) for hikers and scramblers who currently use the pull-off area a staging area there as well as adding bike racks to the Receiving Area for individuals who would prefer to access the free public viewpoint via bike, there will be absolutely no bicycle access or vehicle access to the walkway; Indicated that all comments will be brought forward in the consultation report. |
| March 6, 2011 | Believes GDW will be an interesting experience but would like to know how the proposed Project will improve traffic safety | March 7, 2011 – Email response: described plan for shuttle use; described anticipated impact of road re-design on vehicular safety; Indicated that all comments will be brought forward in the consultation report. |
| March 10, 2011 | CC of letter addressed to Parks Canada expressing concern regarding the GDW | Parks Canada provided reply. |

| Email Date | Summary of Comments | Project Team Response |
|----------------|---|---|
| March 13, 2011 | <p>Expressed opposition to the GDW. Concerns included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retreating glacier – impact on Brewster snocoach tours • Nature of GDW – inappropriate for Jasper National Park • Interpretation should be focus, not a skywalk • Privatization of a National Park/restriction of access to free viewpoint • Impacts to wildlife | <p>March 18, 2011 – Email response: explained that there is no evidence to suggest that Brewster will be unable to conduct the snocoach tours anytime in the near future or even in the next 100 years; described preliminary thoughts on interpretive programming; Indicated that GDW includes a free public viewpoint. Indicated that GDW will be fully wheelchair accessible enabling people access to the pathway who are unable to use existing trails; explained that wildlife impacts are being studied and will be part of the Environmental assessment being submitted to Parks Canada; indicated that Brewster believes that the GDW is keeping with Parks Canada’s “Icefields Parkway Strategic Concept (2009)”; indicated that all comments are being considered in Project development and will be brought forward in consultation report.</p> |
| March 15, 2011 | <p>Question regarding how the proposed GDW will increase tourism in Jasper National Park</p> | <p>April 18, 2011 – email response: Provided Brewster’s preliminary data re: current visitors and expected impact of GDW on people staying in the area. Explained source of data from Brewster models and 7,000 person marketing survey. Indicated that more detailed info will be in EA and agreed to follow-up with more specific numbers when available.</p> |
| March 16, 2011 | <p>CC of letter to Minister Kent outlining support for GDW. Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feels the Project will be positive for increasing visitation to national park | <p>No reply required</p> |
| March 16, 2011 | <p>CC of letter to Minister Kent outlining support for GDW. Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GDW will provide unique accessible mountain experience for visitors • Appreciates interpretive aspects • Feels GDW is being developed in an environmentally responsible way | <p>No reply required</p> |

| Email Date | Summary of Comments | Project Team Response |
|----------------|--|--|
| March 18, 2011 | <p>Expressed opposition to the GDW. Concerns included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walkways are not needed when people can take hikes, cycle or go horseback riding • Environmental impacts • Extra facilities (parking lots, washrooms) required | <p>March 18, 2011 – Email response: explained that GDW location is on previously disturbed land and washroom and parking facilities will be provided by existing facilities at the Glacier Discovery Centre; indicated that GDW will be fully wheelchair accessible enabling people access to the pathway who are unable to use existing trails; explained that wildlife impacts are being studied and will be part of the Environmental assessment being submitted to Parks Canada; indicated that all comments are being considered in Project development and will be brought forward in consultation report.</p> |
| March 18, 2011 | <p>CC of letter to Minister Kent outlining support for GDW. Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for past projects by Parks Canada that have improved national parks • Brewster’s operating history is one of stewardship • Exciting new visitor opportunity | <p>No reply required</p> |
| March 22, 2011 | <p>CC of letter to G. Fenton. Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified concern that a commercial development adjacent to a popular highway vantage point would not enhance the natural beauty of the area. | <p>March 24, 2011 – email response from G. Fenton indicating that Brewster proposal is consistent with policies and objectives for Jasper National Park. Indicated that Brewster would submit a detailed proposal and formal public consultation report with the EA, which Parks Canada will review, and evaluate the Project’s potential effects on the park environment. Indicated EA will be available to the public at a later date.</p> |

| Email Date | Summary of Comments | Project Team Response |
|----------------|---|---|
| March 24, 2011 | <p>Provided copy of letter to Minister of Environment re: GDW. Identified concern that public input is not being taken into account. Question re: where comments from open houses are going. Indicated that the Project should not proceed.</p> | <p>March 30, 2011 – email response: Indicated that Consultation Report will provide a summary of all feedback received and originals are being sent to Parks Canada under a separate cover. Indicated that public input is having an impact on the Project and that elements of the design are being changed in response to suggestions and requests. March 31, 2011 – reply from stakeholder: indicated that mitigations are not appropriate as the Project should not proceed.</p> |
| March 24, 2011 | <p>Expressed support for GDW. Countered concerns from some stakeholders including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brewster is a major Canadian employer and both Brewster and Viad operate in national parks and therefore understand importance of preservation • Would be a valuable educational opportunity • Thinks development can be constructed with minimal impact | <p>March 30, 2011 – email response: Thanked stakeholder for message of support.</p> |
| March 25, 2011 | <p>Provided copy of email to Jasper Superintendant re: GDW. Concerns included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aesthetics • Commercial development in Jasper • Private enterprise operating in the Park | <p>April 11, 2011 – email response: explained Brewster’s long history of operating in national parks working in collaboration with Parks Canada. Explained that GDW is in keeping with Parks Canada’s Icefield Action Plan goal to provide educational and inspirational park experiences to visitors.</p> |
| March 29, 2011 | <p>CC of letter to Peter Kent, Minister of the Environment, House of Commons. Expressed opposition to the GDW. Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased bus traffic on shuttle route. • Wildlife disturbances and habitat loss • Lack of preservation of natural ecosystems • Loss of public access to viewpoint | <p>Response provided by Parks Canada</p> |

| Email Date | Summary of Comments | Project Team Response |
|----------------|--|--|
| April 5, 2011 | CC of letter to G. Fenton expressing support for GDW Comments included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brewster’s proven track record for sustainable tourism and environmental stewardship • GDW will help enhance front end visitor experiences in Jasper and Banff • Feels concerns re: this sparking new wave of development are unfounded due to the Project’s links to Icefield Centre | No reply required. |
| April 6, 2011 | Expressed opposition to the GDW and requested to be kept informed. | April 18, 2011 – email response: Thanked stakeholder for comments and explained Brewster’s history of working in the Parks and commitment to educate and instill care of the parks. Committed to notify when EA is released. |
| April 11, 2011 | Voicemail message from stakeholder re: open house comments, when they will be released publicly, will they be forwarded to Parks Canada? | April 11, 2011 – email response: all comments are being reflected in the consultation reports being sent to Parks Canada as part of the EA. This report will be publicly available once the EA is released. Committed to notify when EA is released. |
| April 17, 2011 | Expressed concern re: GDW. Comments included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned that GDW will destroy wildlife and vegetation • Concerned about private enterprise in parks • Parks Canada should be reclaiming the Project site | May 9, 2011 – email response: Thanked stakeholder for comments and indicated that Brewster is completing an EA aimed at identifying and eliminating potential impacts. Clarified that the GDW would be constructed with the existing right-of-way, and the land is not a realistic candidate for reclamation due to highway proximity. Committed to provide a copy of the EA when it is available. |

| Email Date | Summary of Comments | Project Team Response |
|----------------|--|---|
| April 18, 2011 | <p>Expressed support for GDW. Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assuming no environmental impacts feels this Project is a good idea • Feels it will help connect visitors to Icefields Parkway • More people are looking for guided opportunities • Many do not feel confident to venture into backcountry and need a more accessible opportunity • Feels that there are a lot of opportunities for backcountry users and that this proposal doesn't impact backcountry experience • Appreciates design and feels it has minimal visual impact | April 21, 2011 – email response: Thanked stakeholder for message of support. |
| April 20, 2011 | <p>CC of letter of support to G. Fenton. Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interested in ensuring that national parks are accessible to all Canadians • Applauds Brewster for having all their attractions wheelchair accessible • Thinks GDW is an excellent opportunity for individuals with mobility issues to have a park experience | No reply required |
| April 23, 2011 | <p>Expressed opposition to the GDW. Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that the Brewster legacy of respecting the landscape has changed and that Brewster is on a path of destruction and environmental degradation in the Rockies • Feels EAs are inconsequential, and that both flora and fauna of the region are no longer safe | May 12, 2011 – email response from M. Hannan. Indicated that Brewster is adhering to policy and supports as stated in the Parks Canada, Icefields Parkway Action Plan, and continues to promote Canada's national parks values of environmental stewardship and ecological integrity. Indicated that an EA is being done to eliminate the possibility of any potential impacts on the surrounding environment. Committed to providing EA when released. |

| Email Date | Summary of Comments | Project Team Response |
|--------------|--|---|
| May 4, 2011 | CC of letter addressed to Parks Canada expressing concern regarding the GDW (this is a second letter from the concerned individual). | May 12, 2011 – letter response from M. Hannan. Clarified that Brewster employs glaciologists who study and monitor the Athabasca Glacier and ensure that Brewster continues to promote stewardship and ecological integrity within the Parks. Indicated that the proposed GDW includes a free public viewpoint. (Initial response was provided by M. Hannan on April 6 via email.) |
| May 19, 2011 | Expressed concern about the GDW. Comments included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request for Project information • Maintaining integrity of the area | May 26, 2011 – email response: Thanked stakeholder for inquiry. Outlined information on the Project and provided the Project fact sheet and update newsletter. |
| May 24, 2011 | Expressed opposition to the GDW. Comments included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project will commercialize and destroy nature | May 26, 2011 – email response: Thanked stakeholder for sharing concerns. Indicated the Project would be constructed within the previously disturbed right-of-way and would not impact land designated for ecological preservation. Ensured that the GDW would be developed in a socially and environmentally sensitive manner. |
| May 24, 2011 | Expressed opposition to GDW. Comments included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parks priority should be ecological preservation • Private enterprise should not be permitted | June 13, 2011 – email response: Thanked stakeholder for sharing concerns. Identified Icefields Parkway Action Plan goal to improve visitor experience. Indicated that GDW is to be constructed within highway right-of-way and would not impact land designated for ecological preservation. Barrier free experience. |
| May 24, 2011 | Expressed opposition to GDW. Comments included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parks should remain as close to nature as possible | June 13, 2011 – email response: Thanked stakeholder for sharing concerns. Identified Icefields Parkway Action Plan goal to improve visitor experience. Indicated that GDW is to be constructed within highway right-of-way and would not impact land designated for ecological preservation. Barrier free experience. |

| Email Date | Summary of Comments | Project Team Response |
|-------------------|---|---|
| June 6, 2011 | Expressed opposition to GDW. Comments included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern re: lack of public access to viewpoint • Traffic congestion at Icefields Centre • Potential construction impacts to bighorn sheep and mountain goats. | June 14, 2011 – email response: Thanked stakeholder for sharing concerns. Clarified that viewpoint will still be accessible to non-paying public. Identified plans to improve vehicle safety and traffic congestion. Indicated studies underway to assess impacts on wildlife. |
| July 3, 2011 | Indicated support for the Project. Would like to know when it will be open to visitors. | July 4, 2011 – email response: Thanked stakeholder for interest. Indicated that the Project is still in planning and approval stages and would provide stakeholder with updates as available. |
| July 12, 2011 | Expressed opposition to GDW. Comments included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to put local environment and geography at risk • American ownership of Brewster | July 20, 2011 – email response: Thanked stakeholder for comments. Indicated that Icefields Parkway Action Plan indicated need to redesign Tangle Ridge Viewpoint and that Brewster believes the GDW is in keeping with the intent of the Action Plan which is to strengthen visitors’ connection to place. Highlighted barrier free nature of GDW and identified Brewster’s long history of operating in Canada’s national parks. |
| July 13, 2011 | Inquiry from stakeholder seeking update on plans for GDW. | July 27, 2011 – email response: Thanked stakeholder for letter. Indicated that Brewster and contractors are still working on EA process with no firm date in mind. Indicated that Brewster will provide update on timelines once they become available. |
| August 31, 2011 | Requested to set up tour for high school students studying complexities of managing and working in a National Park. | August 31, 2011 – email response: Thanked stakeholder for interest and offered opportunity to set up site visit. |
| September 6, 2011 | Inquired as to when GDW will be open to visitors | October 21, 2011 – email response: Thanked stakeholder for interest. Indicated that the Project is still in planning and approval stages and would provide stakeholder with updates as available. |
| October 18, 2011 | Inquired as to when GDW will be open to visitors. | Reply pending. |

3.2.4 Consultation with Key Jasper Guide and Tour Outfitters

Consultation with Jasper tour and guide outfitters was initiated on March 11, 2011. Key guide and tour companies were contacted by phone. The phone calls were initiated to determine concern with the proposed Project and, in particular, better understand any potential impacts the proposed Project could have on their current business and operations. Invitations to meet directly with representatives from Brewster to discuss the Project further were offered. Of the four organizations contacted, Brewster met with one organization, one indicated an interest in meeting but Brewster was unsuccessful in setting a meeting despite follow-up attempts to contact, one indicated environmental concerns with the proposed Project but declined to meet with Brewster representatives and one did not respond to inquiries. In the cases where no reply was received, one additional follow-up phone call was conducted to confirm lack of interest in meeting. To protect the privacy of stakeholders, and in accordance with Alberta's *PIPA*, the record of correspondence with key Jasper guide and tour outfitters will be provided to Parks Canada under a separate cover. Key questions and concerns brought forward during the course of these conversations included the following.

Concerns Raised

- Concerns regarding the privatization of a public viewpoint
- Impacts to wildlife and, in particular, concerns with respect to mountain goat escape routes and connectivity
- Safety issues - concerns that people, who can no longer utilize the pull-out, will now opt to pull onto the shoulder of the road to take pictures and create a safety hazard
- Visual/aesthetic concerns
- Impact to business/current operations – currently use this pull-out for guide operations – business would be impacted if parking at the pull-out was closed
- The addition of a new activity in the area might impact timing of tourists arriving in town and might take away from other activities – Brewster committed to work with local outfitters to adjust itineraries so visitors can participate in multiple activities in the area

Questions Raised

- EA Process – when will the EA be available and how will copies of the report be distributed?

3.3 Participation in Other Engagement Opportunities

In addition to the engagement activities initiated by Brewster, Brewster representatives participated in a number of other public meetings, forums and gatherings to discuss the proposed Glacier Discovery Walk. The following Table 7: Summary of Other Engagement Opportunities provides a summary of those engagement opportunities.

Table 7: Summary of Other Engagement Opportunities

| Date | Organization | Summary of Participation |
|------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| January 13, 2011 | Grande Alberta Economic Region | Presentation to members of the Grande Alberta Economic Region regarding the GDW. |
| March 10, 2011 | Centre Nord High School | Presentation to grade 10-12 students regarding the GDW Project to support a civic action project. |
| March 14, 2011 | Jasper Community Group | Brewster representatives attended a public forum organized by a group of Jasper residents opposed to the Project. Provided Project information and answered questions. |
| March 15, 2011 | Jasper Town Council | Brewster presented Project update to Jasper Town Council. |
| March 30, 2011 | Jasper Chamber of Commerce | Brewster presented Project concept to Jasper Chamber of Commerce. |
| June 10, 2011 | Tourism Jasper | Brewster presented GDW Project concept and update to Jasper Visitor Information Centre at the request of the visitor centre manager to ensure centre staff are able to respond to any tourist inquiries. |
| October 5, 2011 | Jasper High School | Conducted a tour and site visit for 13 Grade 11 students from Jasper High School enrolled in the Stewardship of Protected Lands course. |

4.0 Aboriginal Engagement Program

Brewster recognizes the unique heritage, culture and rights of Canada's Aboriginal and Métis people and took this into account in developing the engagement program associated with the Glacier Discovery Walk.

The Aboriginal engagement program for the GDW Project was managed primarily by Brewster with support provided by TERA during the initial engagement period of January – June 2011.

Due to the unique relationship between local Aboriginal communities and Parks Canada, the Aboriginal Engagement program was undertaken in partnership with Parks Canada. Brewster met with Parks Canada on January 11, 2011 to discuss Aboriginal engagement requirements. At this meeting it was advised that all members of the Jasper Aboriginal Forum be notified of the proposed Project and provided with an opportunity to meet with representatives from Brewster to discuss the Project and provide comments and concerns.

On January 21, 2011 Parks Canada issued a letter via email and registered mail accompanied by a copy of the Project Fact Sheet to all members of the Jasper Aboriginal Forum. A list of Aboriginal organizations that received Project information materials is included in Appendix Q. A copy of the letter is included in Appendix P. This introduction letter indicated that Brewster representatives would be willing to meet with interested Aboriginal groups to discuss the proposed Project.

On March 3, 2011 Brewster issued an Open House Follow-up Newsletter via email to all members of the Jasper Aboriginal Forum. A formal letter accompanied by a copy of the Open House Follow-up Newsletter was sent via registered mail on March 7, 2011. A list of the Aboriginal organizations that received the Open House Follow-up Newsletter is included in Appendix Q. A copy of the Open House Newsletter cover letter is included in Appendix R.

On April 6, 2011 Brewster representatives presented the Project to a Jasper Aboriginal Forum meeting held in Jasper, Alberta. Brewster presented the GDW Project and provided an opportunity for attendees to ask questions and discuss the Project. Representatives from seven of the Jasper Aboriginal Forum member organizations were in attendance as well as representatives from Parks Canada.

As of October 19, 2011, nine Aboriginal communities have expressed an interest in meeting with Brewster to discuss the Project and one Aboriginal organization contacted Brewster regarding potential employment opportunities. At the time of writing, Brewster representatives have met with representatives from eight Aboriginal groups and conducted site visits with representatives from eight communities. Brewster continues to work with all interested Aboriginal communities to identify opportunities to discuss the Project. The Aboriginal Engagement communications summary and meeting notes are being provided to Parks Canada under a separate cover.