

Report for Wonderland Lake ISP Engagement Window #3

Response Counts

Completion Rate:

83.8%



Complete



268


Partial






52

Totals: 320


1. Do you support the proposed following action to "Wetland and Shoreline Habitat and Wildlife Conservation and Protection on the North, West, and South Sides of the Lake"? ISP Action #5: Opportunistically add more structure in the lake for fish and amphibian habitat (e.g. downed trees, logs)



Value		Percent	Responses
Support		60.7%	190
Somewhat support		20.8%	65
Do not support		18.5%	58

Totals: 313

2. Why do you not support "ISP Action #5: Opportunistically add more structure in the lake for fish and amphibian habitat (e.g. downed trees, logs)"?



Value	Percent	Responses
I do not like this approach to improving fish and amphibian habitat	50.0%	29
Other - Write In (Required)	53.4%	31

Other - Write In (Required)	Count
No need to add additional man made habitat to lake	2
All for increasing habitat options for fish and other life forms. I do not believe allowing belly boats would be a threat to the lake or its inhabitants. I use one in a number of waters and fish and birds have no fear of me fishing from such a small slow boat. Such a regulation puts the vast majority of fish habitat rendered inaccessible to anglers. The fascinating and deeply experiential aspect of angling, of getting to know and appreciate a water body, requires exploration of fish habitat options. I can understand limiting shoreline access in sensitive areas. But prohibiting belly boats is wrong, rendering "angling" at WL essentially prohibited.	1
Best to leave it be	1
Do not support disrupting habitat.	1
I do not like the appearance of downed logs. I looks unkempt.	1
Totals	31

Other - Write In (Required)	Count
I do not support more fisherman coming	1
I don't support adding extraneous material to the lake	1
I don't think why we need to add debris to the lake	1
I think it would be better to restrict fishing to fly fishing only and add more ranger patrol to enforce existing rules. Currently many fisherman and their families leave plastic bags and piles of fishing line behind them.	1
I want to see the lake kept natural and relatively undeveloped. It's perfect as it is.	1
I would like to see less fishing there, and the adding of debris to the lake will make it cloudy	1
I've lived close to the lake for 38 years and love it wild the way it is.	1
It is very unclear what you are proposing. Lots of complicated language, but very few specifics. There should be an obligation to have a clear proposal to proceed.	1
It was not made clear that you would not be adding any concrete or physical structures, so I voted no.	1
It will just bring more activity to the area – not in a good way!	1
Keep it natural	1
Leave as is	1
Leave it alone ... focus on other issues	1
Low levels of oxygen in the lake toward the end of summer will not support more wildlife.	1
More fishing means more people. Wildlife run from people, not a good udea	1
Not clear to me what "structures " are by the question.	1
Please make no changes	1
The addition of trees and logs would exacerbate the current issues with the quality of the water and the fish population. Failure to follow accepted conservation measures, such as dredging, to deal with the extreme sedimentation issue (the lake has decreased in circumference at least by 1/3 in my 32 years on its shores) is what is having the greatest negative impact on what is a surprisingly robust fish population in this pond	1
Totals	31

Other - Write In (Required)**Count**

The question is a poor one. I AM in support of protecting all shores and the wetlands between the lake and roadway while ALSO providing a few paths to the water from the dam and a few rocks or natural benches.

1

There is enough habitat for fish with reeds and cattails

1

This does not take into account the east side of the dam. That also should be part of the protection plan. The east side is a migratory component and grassland ecosystem that supports the north, west, and south sides of the lake.

1

Want Wildlife sanctuary like it is.

1

do not add downed trees and logs. Water levels sink so low by end of summer that these logs might be beached and breeding insects not welcome here. Thanks

1

do not support more fishing at the lake, the fishermen population has degraded the lake shore


1




this is a misleading choice and tries to steer answers. YES to protecting ALL the shores AND the wildlife corridor between the Lake and roadway. Fine to add minimal paths and a bench or some rocks to make sitting and fishing a little more hospitable.

1

Totals**31**


3. Do you support the proposed actions for "Access to, Conservation of, and Activities on the east side of Wonderland Lake (along the dam and peninsula)"?



Value		Percent	Responses
Support		42.9%	121
Somewhat support		28.4%	80
Do not support		28.7%	81

Totals: 282

4. Which ISP actions of "Access to, Conservation of, and Activities on the east side of Wonderland Lake (along the dam and peninsula)" do you not support?




Value

Percent Responses

Value	Percent	Responses
ISP Action #12: Designate and construct 2-3 fishing access paths, consisting of rocky steps, from the Wonderland Lake Trail down to the water's edge along dam	80.0%	64
ISP Action #13: Do not prohibit (allow at own risk) ice skating	33.8%	27
ISP Action #14: Do not designate an area on the Wonderland Lake dam for sledding (sledding remains prohibited)	35.0%	28
ISP Action #15: Restore peninsula habitat	21.3%	17
ISP Action #16: Restore shoreline along the peninsula to manage erosion, improve habitat, and provide a waterfront visitor experience that discourages wading/water access	37.5%	30

5. Why do you not support "ISP Action #12: Designate and construct 2-3 fishing access paths, consisting of rocky steps, from the Wonderland Lake Trail down to the water's edge along dam"?







Value	Percent	Responses
On the dam, access from the Wonderland Lake Trail down to the rocks by water's edge is satisfactory.	68.8%	44
Other - Write In (Required)	34.4%	22

Other - Write In (Required)	Count
All for increasing access for anglers. But prohibiting belly boats makes the vast majority of fish habitat inaccessible to anglers. The fascinating and deeply experiential aspect of angling, of getting to know and appreciate a water body, requires exploration of fish habitat options. I can understand limiting shoreline access in sensitive areas, esp in such an urban landscape. But prohibiting belly boats makes essentially useless as an angling water.	1
Fishing should not be allowed.	1
How will these be designed. How will the structural integrity of dam be maintained	1
I am concerned about how these steps will be constructed... will they be dug into the damn. That sounds(irregardless of engineering) like soil erosion and time could erode them and into the damn leading collapse of the damn.	1
Totals	22

Other - Write In (Required)	Count
I don't think fishing should be allowed at all	1
I oppose additional features that would encourage more fishing activity along the dam because already there is lots of maneuvering and difficulty passing with the many walkers, runners and cyclists on the dam path. It's already the busiest area. I also worry about being hooked by a fisher casting as I walk by.	1
I prefer not to have more fishers	1
I would prefer to discourage fishing along the damn	1
I'm not in favor of further encouraging fishing. During the pandemic we see lots of people fishing and unfortunately they leave a lot of materials after they are done, bait, fishing lines, drinking cans, food scraps. I would rather focus on a 'leave not trace' message to people who want to fish.	1
It's a wildlife sanctuary ... for wildlife. Please don't disrupt it by encouraging more access.	1
Leave as wildlife sanctuary and enforce.	1
Let it be+	1
NO Fishing; no new hardscape	1
No pier or dam required - stop fishing altogether	1
None	1
People will continue to use the paths already formed even if steps are available Would prefer to have fishing prohibited.	1
The lake is a preserve it is NOT FOR FISHING. The fishermen destroy the habitat.	1
The more fishing the less wukdkife it's that simple	1
This lake is too crowded, and it will become over run with homeless and drug users. Boulder Creek is a nightmare and over run by drug users and homeless	1
Unfortunately, people create their own trails, and they still will if you make access paths.	1
leave as is	1
no steps of any kind	1
Totals	22


6. Why do you not support "ISP Action #13: Do not prohibit (allow at own risk) ice skating"?



Value		Percent	Responses
I don't want to see people on the lake		55.6%	15
Ice skating on the lake is unsafe		74.1%	20
Other - Write In (Required)		33.3%	9

Other - Write In (Required)	Count
Adversely affects wildlife	1
Children will die. I knew a 13 year boy who died this way on another lake.	1
Disturbs wildlife; unsafe.	1
Important note - it is borderline impossible to understand "not supporting do not prohibit". It might be worthwhile to pause the project and focus on clear communications.	1
It will cause damage to the shorelines, and disrupt wildlife.	1
They trample down the natural habitat through the snow on the way to the lake with the ice skate which is not a good thing	1
What does 'allow at own risk' legally mean?	1
Will attract recreational use not in alignment with a nature preserve	1
access to the lake in the winter is treacherous because the roads are not plowed and parking would be a nightmare. In addition I am very concerned right now about the parking on Utica Ave for the trailhead. Utica Ave is in a residential area that does not have egress from the west side. Therefore the increased parking on Utica Ave has created a regress and safety threat. Parking at the Utica Ave trailhead should be prohibited.	1
Totals	9

7. Why do you not support "ISP Action #14: Do not designate an area on the Wonderland Lake dam for sledding (sledding remains prohibited)"?




Value	Percent	Responses
I enjoy sledding at Wonderland Lake	14.3%	4
Other - Write In (Required)	89.3%	25

Other - Write In (Required)	Count
Do not support	1
I don't think there should be sledding at the lake area	1
I like things the way they are right now.	1
Important note - it is borderline impossible to understand "not supporting do not prohibit". It might be worthwhile to pause the project and focus on clear communications.	1
Keep it prohibited	1
No need for sledding there. There is sledding nearby	1
Not safe	1
Totals	25

Other - Write In (Required)	Count
Other hills better suited for sledding	1
Other places to sled	1
People will sled wherever they want regardless.	1
Plenty of other places to go	1
Popular recreation activity for kids; no reason for prohibiting it was given	1
Preservation of land	1
Sorry, I misinterpreted the question, sledding should remain off limits, it damages the land there, and it attracts too many ya hoos...last winter I saw a large group of unmasked 20 somentings yucking it up and blocking the trail	1
Support less activevuse	1
There are other places to sled	1
There should be a designated place for sledding in this park.	1
Unsafe	1
Very simple it disturbs the wildlife. You keep wanting to make this into a park. It is not a PARK. I need to get that	1
destroys land	1
do not designate sledding	1
less impact	1
no people on the lake	1
not necessary	1
please preserve the natural environment	1
Totals	25


8. Why do you not support "ISP Action #15: Restore peninsula habitat"?



Value	Percent	Responses
I do not think the habitat on the peninsula is in need of restoration	88.2%	15
Habitat restoration efforts restrict the areas I want to go on the peninsula	11.8%	2
Other - Write In (Required)	11.8%	2

Other - Write In (Required)	Count
Can this be restored?	1
The birds, ducks and wildlife use the beach and shoreline.	1
Totals	2


9. Why do you not support "ISP Action #16: Restore shoreline along the peninsula to manage erosion, improve habitat, and provide a waterfront visitor experience that discourages wading/water access"?






Value	Percent	Responses
I don't think erosion into the lake is a problem	43.3%	13
I don't like the habitat restoration (vegetation) along the shoreline	13.3%	4
I don't like the design of the waterfront visitor experience	60.0%	18
Other - Write In (Required)	20.0%	6

Other - Write In (Required)	Count
I do not like the plan, and believe it is not conducive to the waterfowl	1
I don't like any fencing on the peninsula...otherwise, I do support the measures proposed	1
In favor of leaving it natural	1
Leave it wild.	1
Please leave it alone.	1
The proposed plan has excessive fencing.	1
Totals	6


10. Do you support the proposed actions to "Education Experiences and Interpretive Signs"?



Value		Percent	Responses
Support		39.3%	110
Somewhat support		34.6%	97
Do not support		26.1%	73


Totals: 280




11. Which ISP actions of "Education Experiences and Interpretive Signs" do you not support?



Value	Percent	Responses
ISP Action #17: Add interpretive signs with messaging about the value of wetlands and shoreline habitat to convey the specialness of Wonderland Lake along the South and East shoreline	84.9%	62
ISP Action #18: Add temporary education sign(s) on the peninsula about and during the restoration	56.2%	41


12. Why do you not support "ISP Action #17: Add interpretive signs with messaging about the value of wetlands and shoreline habitat to convey the specialness of Wonderland Lake along the South and East shoreline"?



Value		Percent	Responses
I do not want to see more signs on the landscape		91.9%	57
Interpretative signs are not necessary		37.1%	23
Other - Write In (Required)		17.7%	11

Other - Write In (Required)	Count
I don't believe that more signs will solve this problem. More ranger patrols and enforcement of existing rules will solve this problem. Including actually fining people for the numerous off lease dogs that swim in the lake.	1
I used to think the signs at Coot Lake were nice, but now they are faded and ugly. Interpretive signs seem to have a short shelf life, so not worth it.	1
Look stuff on the internet when you get home.	1
People who stop to read will block the path	1
Please don't turn this area into Disneyland	1
Sign sign, everywhere a sign . . .	1
Signs detract from the nature experience!!!	1
Signs ok at trailheads	1
The lake does not need infrastructure or signage it is already built up enough.	1
These signs always end up in disrepair	1
maybe a do not enter sign on the south side, because they should be wandering around on the south side, it's off bounds	1
Totals	11


13. Why do you not support "ISP Action #18: Add temporary education sign(s) on the peninsula about and during the restoration"?






Value	Percent	Responses
I do not support the associated peninsula restoration action	17.1%	7
I do not want to see more signs on the landscape	97.6%	40
Other - Write In (Required)	7.3%	3

Other - Write In (Required)	Count
Keep the peace ... it's a wildlife sanctuary. Groups of people in buses is counterproductive and disruptive.	1
Leave as wildlife sanctuary and enforce.	1
The peninsula is a delicate ecosystem. Adding signs is not going to help keep that ecosystem healthy. What is really needed is signs that are posted at the entries to the peninsula that indicate what is prohibited -- and that includes bikes. Right now bikes routinely go onto the peninsula -- your signs are too small and not seen by even hikers.	1
Totals	3


14. Do you support the proposed actions to "Wonderland Lake Trailhead and Foothills Nature Center/Facilities Improvements"?



Value		Percent	Responses
Support		38.6%	107
Somewhat support		25.3%	70
Do not support		36.1%	100


Totals: 277

15. Which ISP actions of "Wonderland Lake Trailhead and Foothills Nature Center/Facilities Improvements" do you not support?



Value	Percent	Responses
ISP Action #22: Install additional and updated bike racks at the trailhead	39.0%	39
ISP Action #23: Add public restrooms near the trailhead at the Foothills Nature Center shed site	87.0%	87
ISP Action #24: Provide a small gathering area with shade trees and small rocks for visitors and small groups near the trailhead kiosk	50.0%	50
ISP Action #25: Add a water fountain at the Wonderland Lake Trailhead/Foothills Nature Center near proposed restrooms	59.0%	59


16. Why do you not support "ISP Action #22: Install additional and updated bike racks at the trailhead"?



Value	Percent	Responses
Additional bike racks are not needed	71.8%	28
Bike racks should be located in areas other than the trailhead (ie: access points)	23.1%	9
Other - Write In (Required)	25.6%	10

Other - Write In (Required)	Count
Bike racks detract from the "nature" experience	1
Bike racks will not be used. People already ride their bikes and are unlikely to change their bad habits. They also just leave their bikes at the trailheads. If you really want them to leave their bikes at the foothills nature center trailhead then you need to prohibit them at the other trailheads.	1
Do not support	1
I guess a bike rack is a good idea.	1
Leave as wildlife sanctuary and enforce.	1
The lake is already crowded enough and no one rides there bike there i rarely see bikes locked.	1
We should maintain the habitat - not increase usage by humans	1
You are not addressing the issue of increased parking in the neighborhoods. Not everyone will ride a bike	1
this is a nature preserve, bike racks take away from that, unless they are located at the nature center	1
this just encourages more bike theft in this town	1
Totals	10

17. Why do you not support "ISP Action #23: Add public restrooms near the trailhead at the Foothills Nature Center shed site"?




Value	Percent	Responses
Public restrooms are not needed at Wonderland Lake	72.4%	63
I have concerns about safety	51.7%	45
Other - Write In (Required)	40.2%	35

Other - Write In (Required)	Count
Any restroom should be located closer to parking lot, and not on east side of shed since that is only place to warm up/ warm down and stretch pre- or post-workout in the shade.	1
Attractive to homeless who have started camping in area. An indoor monitored bathroom is support	1
COVID, too much traffic, smell	1
Can't we just leave one piece of nature alone. Why do we always have to place concrete all over "natural habitats".	1
Do not want to encourage camping etc by those who are already trying to camp in the area. Would support if the restrooms were closed overnight.	1
Totals	34

Other - Write In (Required)	Count
Don't disturb beauty and peace of the area by encouraging people to spend the whole day camped out at the lake	1
Homeless travelers will be using these. They are currently using the ones NW of this area and leave the place a mess	1
I am concerned that public restrooms will be targets for vandalism, homeless residents and drug users	1
I have concerns about public restrooms attracting homeless people and encouraging a tent encampment which I consider to be a safety and health issue	1
I would only consider a bathroom if it was located within the nature center and only available when the nature center was open.	1
It will become an encampment for the homeless.	1
It will just attract a homeless encampment	1
It would encourage people from the homeless shelter to hang out here to do drugs	1
Leave as wildlife sanctuary and enforce.	1
May invite persons not interested in passively recreating at Wonderland	1
On-going maintenance requirements & costs.	1
Public bathrooms in this location will likely be taken over by homeless individuals due to their proximity to the homeless shelter and the use of this area as a transit corridor for the homeless. If that happens, the general public will receive little benefit and the transient population may become more prominent at this trailhead, discouraging its use. Most people using this system either live in the area or are walking around the lake. It's a short trail system with limited need for bathrooms. People extending their use on to the trails to the north have access to bathrooms in Foothill Community Park.	1
Public restrooms and shade structures will be taken over by Boulder's increasing homeless population. Are not necessary. Will be full of litter and tents, just like Boulder Creek and library area. Since homeless camping ban is not enforced, why provide even more public facilities for homeless to take over in Boulder.	1
Safety and access concerns. There are already many campers at Wonderland Lake. The campers appear to be homeless, and we have the shelter several blocks North. A public toilet that is open and an outdoor structure will further promote the homeless to camp here. Camping presents dangers to people and property that is near the lake.	1
Totals	34

Other - Write In (Required)	Count
There is already an overly large burden of homeless people in north boulder. Adding restrooms would be a further attractant.	1
There is no need for more infrastructure at all. There is restrooms at foothills community park which is 0.5 mi away this is a waste of infrastructure and money. And they always smell.	1
These would create a magnet for the homeless population.	1
They will create smells and garbage.	1
Wonderland is for temporary use - visitors are running/walking/moving through. No Need for stagnant spaces ie restrooms. Site has been more than satisfactory without rest rooms. Rest rooms present odor, maintenance, and dont make sense in a COVID world.	1
Wonderland lake is for activity not loitering all day	1
Worried about vandalism and making this a homeless hangout	1
clean up the human waste on hill behind the lake, and don't attract vagrantsthe hill	1
it will attract the homeless and turn it into a hangout	1
public restrooms take away from the natural environment, most people use it as a thruway	1
this is not an amusement park	1
traffic, smell, it will attract more people, interfere with nature overall. Access is nice, but we also have to respect nature.	1
vagrants, there are restrooms in the north park	1
worried about homeless hanging out here and vandalism	1
you invite the homeless and drug users in with restrooms	1
Totals	34


18. Why do you not support "ISP Action #24: Provide a small gathering area with shade trees and small rocks for visitors and small groups near the trailhead kiosk"?






Value	Percent	Responses
I do not want a gathering area at Wonderland Lake	88.0%	44
I do not like the shade trees	6.0%	3
I do not like the rocks	10.0%	5
I'd prefer a different location for the gathering area (within the trailhead vicinity)	4.0%	2
Other - Write In (Required)	28.0%	14

Other - Write In (Required)	Count
I don't want wonderland lake to be the new hangout for the transient community traveling up and down Broadway.	1
It is fine as it is.	1
It will be a gathering place for more homeless people.	1
Leave as a wildlife sanctuary and enforce.	1
Please leave Wonderlake alone. It is perfect the way it is.	1
Please leave it alone. Please. Groups are	1
Preserve the area for wildlife	1
The area is not in need of additions. This is a huge waste of money!	1
There are sufficient shaded "gathering" areas near the Foothills Nature Center. Considering the COVID mandates and the potential for extending into the future, is it wise to encourage even larger gathering spaces?	1
There is no need for a designated gathering area I rarely see big groups. Stop trying to develop everything.	1
it's fine the way it is	1
no structures should be built	1
not necessary	1
teachers have been coming here for years with students, no extra gathering place is necessary	1
Totals	14


19. Why do you not support "ISP Action #25: Add a public water fountain at the Wonderland Lake Trailhead/Foothills Nature Center near proposed restrooms"?



Value		Percent	Responses
A public water fountain is not needed at Wonderland Lake		74.6%	44
I have concerns about safety		33.9%	20
Other - Write In (Required)		27.1%	16

Other - Write In (Required)	Count
Although I do really like a water fountain idea we have many homeless campers who are frequenting WL and the hills above. Adding water just serves as an attractant. Most people day hiking etc bring their own water and that should be sufficient	1
Another feature to attract homeless people. And expense for the City to maintain.	1
Attractive water source for homeless who have started camping at the lake and on the hills above	1
Encourage folks to bring their own water by not having this. It is also unsanitary.	1
I do not support a bathroom	1
I have concerns about a public water fountain attracting the homeless population to be used as a shower/bath tub and consider this to be a health and safety issue	1
In this era of Covid we do not need this as a vehicle for spreading the virus	1
It will encourage encampments. It's not necessary.	1
Leave as a wildlife sanctuary and enforce.	1
No new hardscape; no construction.	1
Preserve for wildlife	1
The simplicity of nature without more structures is very appealing to me.	1
Wonderland Lake doesn't need ANY change	1
in a COVID world we do not need to spread diseases through water fountains. most water fountains across this town and in public places are no longer in use.	1
people can bring water bottles, and should learn to bring their own water	1
people should come prepared - its not a large area	1
Totals	16

20. Which name change option do you support?




Value	Percent	Responses
Option 1: No Name Change with Updated Signs	23.6%	64
Option 2: Name Change Applied to Closure Area Around the Lake	18.1%	49
Option 3: Name Change Applied to Entire ISP/Wonderland Lake Area	52.0%	141
None of the above (please explain why)	6.3%	17

Totals: 271

None of the above (please explain why)	Count
A Wildlife sanctuary HAS MEANING even if the City refuses to acknowledge this. Google it. This is bull\$hit	1
Doesn't mean anything	1
I don't care	1
Just leave it as it is as a wildlife sanctuary and enforce.	1
Leave it be	1
Totals	17

None of the above (please explain why)	Count
Not needed	1
Please leave Wonderland Lake alone. It is quite perfect the way it is.	1
Prefer to keep name as is	1
The amount of effort and space devoted to this issue is ridiculous. If 900 people want you to update the name, do it already. It really doesn't matter to the average user. We love Wonderland Lake whether officially called a sanctuary or not!	1
These designations are extremely stupid. Why even both putting forth so much effort toward something that shouldn't even be happening in the first place	1
This question is not clear. It is not clear that a name change would be Wildlife Sanctuary but it is clear that such a title would have not influence on any management to support such a name change. I would like the name change to apply to the Entire ISP/Wonderland Lake Area. With that I would also encourage that this area be available for the entire community but realize it is a pocket area in a neighborhood. Creating a high level public access does not seem appropriate. In other words, making this a high level public access area like Chautauqua would not be appropriate.	1
Who designated this as a passive recreation area anyway. That must've been made up by the city is certainly didn't come from the residence of the area or anyone who enjoys wonderland wild	1
don't care	1
it's self aggrandizement. it's a mud hole in a desert that provides a modicum of wildlife opportunities to people that live in suburban sprawl, calling it a sanctuary is ignoring the fact we've paved over the prairie that once was here	1
name change may ATTRACT more visitors	1
no need	1
sounds like more sense to call it Habitat Conservation Area	1
Totals	17


21. Which part of Boulder do you live in?



Value	Percent	Responses
City of Boulder - North Boulder	88.5%	232
City of Boulder - other area/neighborhood	5.7%	15
Boulder County	5.7%	15

Totals: 262

22. What is the PRIMARY activity you enjoy in Wonderland Lake? Please choose one.




Value	Percent	Responses
Hiking / walking	58.4%	153
Dog walking	11.8%	31
Fishing	0.8%	2
Running	11.5%	30
Biking	3.1%	8
Observing nature / wildlife	11.1%	29
Contemplation / meditation	1.9%	5
Social gathering	0.4%	1
Other - Write In	1.1%	3

Totals: 262

Other - Write In	Count
I cannot choose one. I have been a steward and neighbor of Wonderland Lake since I moved to the hood 32 plus years ago. I primarily enjoy ALL activities listed, and others	1
I cannot separate primary to one activity. This location provides me with hiking, walking, running, and meditating while observing nature and wildlife and photography.	1
Photography/videography. I do not fish there bc of access restrictions makes it a very uninteresting place to fish.	1
Totals	3


23. What activities do you enjoy in Wonderland Lake? Select all that apply.



Value	Percent	Responses
Hiking / walking	94.3%	247
Dog walking	41.2%	108
Fishing	8.8%	23
Running	37.0%	97
Picnicking	8.0%	21
Biking	38.5%	101
Observing nature / wildlife	85.1%	223
Contemplation / meditation	54.6%	143
Photography / painting	22.1%	58
Social gathering	9.5%	25
Other - Write In	4.6%	12

Other - Write In	Count
Communicate w/ husband	1
I would enjoy fishing if I had access to the fish habitat that exists there. Belly boats should be allowed.	1
Kids playing	1
Play structures	1
Sitting on a bench or rock with elders we need more benches!!	1
birdwatching	1
picnicing but there is no place to easily picnic	1
playground	1
swimming ;)	1
taking children to the park	1
watching neighbors fish and kids sled ride	1
Totals	11


24. Age Range?



Value	Percent	Responses
18-24	1.5%	4
25-34	6.2%	16
35-44	10.8%	28
45-54	18.1%	47
55-64	23.9%	62
65+	39.4%	102

Totals: 259


25. Which gender do you identify with?



Value	Percent	Responses
Female	55.0%	142
Male	43.4%	112
I do not identify with either gender OR I do not identify with one gender more than the other	1.6%	4

Totals: 258

26. Which race or ethnicity do you most identify with?



Value	Percent	Responses
White	79.0%	203
Hispanic or Latino	1.9%	5
Black or African-American	1.2%	3
Two or more races	0.4%	1
Other	0.8%	2
Prefer not to say	16.7%	43
Totals:		257