

## Island View Beach Regional Park – 2017 Park Management Planning Process Stakeholder Recommendations and Regional Parks Response

At its meeting in January 2017, the CRD Regional Parks Committee passed a motion to give the Friends of Island View Beach (FOIVB) and Rocky Point Bird Observatory (RPBO) and other stakeholder groups an opportunity to work together to recommend changes to the draft park management plan. The FOIVB and RPBO invited two additional stakeholder groups to participate in this process, the Capital Region Dog Owners (CRDO) and the Victoria Natural History Society (VNHS). The stakeholder groups were unable to agree on a consensus submission and separate submissions were received from FOIVB/CRDO and RPBO/VNHS.

- Neither the FOIVB nor the RPBO submissions addressed the entire IVB draft management plan. Only certain elements were addressed, most noticeably around: **access, zoning, dogs, environmental protection, fencing, signage, climate change, mosquito control, drainage**, and the **berm**.
- Areas of general agreement between the two documents include:
  - Support for a multi-use equestrian trail in the wetland, with two beach access points.
  - Support for provision of dog waste bags and an increased number of garbage cans.
  - Support for development of access trails from Lamont Road and Island Beach Estates into the park.
  - Support for the development of two small parking areas at the south end of the park for boat and horse trailers, and repairing the boat launch.
- Areas of partial agreement include:
  - Controlling trespass onto the Tsawout land at northern boundary of park. FOIVB recommends fencing the northern boundary, while RPBO promotes no trails to northern boundary.
  - Support for a sand restoration area. Both submissions acknowledge the need for some restoration of the sand ecosystem, but differ as to the boundary of the restored area and the restoration focus.
- Areas of disagreement between the two documents include:
  - Protection area for ground nesting birds. FOIVB recommends protecting areas in the south of the park to protect birds; RPBO recommends protecting areas in the north of the park for birds.
  - Fencing the berm and restoration on the “beach”. The FOIVB contest the natural boundary of the park, claiming that it extends only to the berm, thus any coastal restoration is outside of the park. FOIVB do not support fencing along the Coast Loop Trail, as that would restrict public access to the beach. The RPBO support restoration of the sand ecosystem at the NE end of the park to protect sensitive coastal habitat, including the beach adjacent to the Coast Loop Trail.
  - Climate change and sea level rise. FOIVB states that IVB will be lost to flooding in the next 30 years. FOIVB recommends that no major expenditures be made in the park, other than for the equestrian trail. RPBO is silent on this point.
  - Partially flooding areas of the park with sea water. RPBO would like to see a feasibility study looking at periodically flooding the lands bordered by the Coast Loop Trail to kill invasive plants. The FOIVB does not endorse this, claiming that it will change the park environment and is too costly to undertake.

Regional Parks staff have considered the FOIVB and RPBO submissions in the preparation of the 2017 draft management plan. The following table summarizes key elements of the two submissions and CRD’s proposed approach in the draft management plan.

## ISLAND VIEW BEACH REGIONAL PARK

### STAKEHOLDER RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN

ISSUE	FOIVB/CRDO RECOMMENDATIONS	RPBO/VNHS RECOMMENDATIONS	2017 DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN	RATIONALE
<b>Access - Beach</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not support fencing the berm or a sand restoration project on the beach which would restrict the public's access to the beach.</li> <li>• Do not support designated access points from the Coast Loop Trail to the beach.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support designated beach access points with signage about wildlife and plants in the area.</li> <li>• Provide signage at beach access points to reduce negative interactions between dogs and migrating Brandt geese.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are five designated beach access points recommended (no change from 2016 draft plan).</li> <li>• Two of the access points would allow equestrians, and all five would allow hikers/dogs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designated beach access points will reduce trampling of sensitive beach vegetation and provide enhanced access to park visitors (i.e., through removal of impediments and regular maintenance).</li> </ul>
<b>Access - Boating</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transfer the public boat launch and the two ½ acre parcels to Central Saanich.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the development of two parking areas at the end of Island View Road. Use one for parking horse trailers and one for parking boat trailers.</li> <li>• Support repair of the boat launch.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CRD will investigate the possibility of transferring the boat ramp and two ½-acre parcels to the District of Central Saanich.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The boat ramp is outside of park boundaries and not the responsibility of the CRD to maintain or operate.</li> <li>• The two ½-acre parcels do not play a significant role in either recreation opportunities or environmental protection.</li> </ul>
<b>Berm</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>No specific recommendations in the submission.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support maintenance of the berm, with beach access points accompanied by signage about wildlife and plants in the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The berm will be maintained as per the Regional Parks Committee policy direction in March 2013.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A commitment has been made to maintain the berm in its current form.</li> </ul>
<b>Climate Change</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FOIVB state that the 2015 report by the CRD consultant Aecom, suggests Island View Beach Regional Park will be lost to the rising sea within 30 years.</li> <li>• FOIVB state that Island View Beach is one of the most vulnerable areas of the CRD and the park will be flooded in a short time; therefore, it is difficult to recommend any major expenditure other than the equestrian trail, and to protect the berm for as long as reasonably possible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>No mention of climate change.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CRD will continue to collect, analyze and apply data on climate change and sea level rise as it relates to the park and surrounding landscape.</li> <li>• The CRD will include information about climate change and sea level rise in public outreach and communications materials.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Models predicting climate change and sea level rise are uncertain and changing. It is unclear what impacts will affect the park, and within what timelines.</li> <li>• The best approach is to develop adaptation strategies to respond to climate change/sea level rise as the impacts become more apparent.</li> <li>• During the timeline of this plan (~10-15 years), the recommended plan policies and actions are conservative enough that they shouldn't negatively impact future adaptation strategies</li> </ul>

ISSUE	FOIVB/CRDO RECOMMENDATIONS	RPBO/VNHS RECOMMENDATIONS	2017 DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN	RATIONALE
				(i.e., such as limited infrastructure development along the shore).
<b>Dogs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make the existing public recreation area a no-dog area.</li> <li>• Make the meadowland to the west of the tenting area a no-dog area.</li> <li>• Create a seasonal no-dog area in the meadowland immediately north of the other no-dog area for ground-nesting birds, April-July.</li> <li>• Create a Wildlife Refuge in the area naturally bounded by the northern ditches.</li> <li>• The north-east sand restoration area will provide a further dog-free area.</li> <li>• Create a new, dog-friendly picnic area to the north of the campground.</li> <li>• Allow dogs to be off-leash and off-trail in the remainder of the park.</li> <li>• The CRD should post signs in the park, urging dog owners not to allow their animals to chase birds at any time of year on beaches (outside of park).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be a dog-friendly area (dogs off-leash all year) on either side of the most northerly parking lot. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This provides space for a dog-friendly picnic area between the parking lot and the beach.</li> <li>○ It also provides access to a large area behind the campground tent area that is off-leash for dogs all year (exact dimensions TBD).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Dogs can be off-leash and under control along the Coast Loop Trail all year. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This allows dogs to be off-leash all around the northern parking lot and continue onto the loop trail.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Dogs should be on leash on the beach from March 1-May 15 to protect the Brant. Dogs can be off-leash from May 16 -February 28/29. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Signage at the beach access points will provide educational information about the Brant.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• In the wetland area of the park, dogs should be on-leash for the four months when ground nesting birds are present (April-July). They can be off-leash the rest of the year. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There could still be discussion around having designated areas for dogs off-leash in the summer and exclusion areas for ground-nesting bird protection.</li> <li>○ This could involve regions with no paths and/or signage/fencing/gates to delineate the excluded areas.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The only areas of the park that dogs are proposed to be prohibited are the southern day-use area from June 1-September 15, except to use the restroom and kiosk, and in the active restoration area at all times.</li> <li>• Dogs will continue to be allowed in all other areas of the park that people are allowed. Dogs will be required to be on-leash in the wetland area of the park between April 1 and July 31 to protect ground-nesting birds and in the campground area when the campground is in operation.</li> <li>• The CRD does not have jurisdiction to manage dogs in the foreshore area.</li> <li>• A dog-friendly day use area will be established north of the campground, where dogs can be off-leash and under effective control at all times.</li> <li>• Information about proper dog management will be included in park outreach and communications materials.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IVB is a favorite destination for people with dogs, and during the public consultation there was strong support for designating areas where people could be with their dogs. The management plan attempts to provide this opportunity for park visitors.</li> <li>• The public consultation process also included many comments from people who would like to be able to enjoy some areas of the park without dogs present, or with dogs on-leash. This plan attempts to provide some of these opportunities for park visitors.</li> </ul>
<b>Drainage</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>No specific proposals in submission.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be a feasibility study into the salt water flooding of the lands bordered by the coastal loop trail.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The drainage system will be maintained on a yearly basis, according to the recommendations of an expert hired to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Regional Parks Committee passed a motion in July 2012 to maintain the existing drainage system and monitor</li> </ul>

ISSUE	FOIVB/CRDO RECOMMENDATIONS	RPBO/VNHS RECOMMENDATIONS	2017 DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN	RATIONALE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not support feasibility study for occasional flooding of areas as proposed by RPBO.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This would be carried out once or twice a year by opening the flapper valve. It would help kill invasive plants.</li> </ul>	<p>assess the drainage system for blockages and other issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The CRD will follow the July 2012 Regional Parks Committee direction to maintain the drainage system.</li> </ul>	<p>its effectiveness in reducing mosquito habitat and its effect on the coastal wetland ecosystem.</p>
<b>Equestrians</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support a multi-use equestrian trail. Recommend a different trail alignment to hug the ditch (with firmer ground) to avoid going through the “swamp” which would be wet and cost prohibitive.</li> <li>Set season of use for equestrians by ground conditions, not fixed dates.</li> <li>Consider gravel surface for short section to improve accessibility for other users.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support a pathway for horses in the inland portion of the park with two beach access points.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A seasonal equestrian trail is proposed for the park. Equestrians will be able to access the beach from this trail, across the Coast Loop Trail at two points; one in the south and the other in the north.</li> <li>Specific start and end dates for the seasonal equestrian trail use will be determined through an annual assessment of ground conditions by park operations staff and the Capital Region Equestrians (CRE) in order to not damage the trail in wet conditions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Equestrians were historically allowed in the park (i.e., cross-country course), and it was determined that there would be no negative environmental impacts from the development of a seasonal wetland loop trail.</li> <li>Allowing equestrians back into the park on a seasonal trail provides additional visitor activities in the park.</li> </ul>
<b>Ecological Restoration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restore coastal sand ecosystems in the NE corner of the park. Believe that this area of the beach is endangered because there is no replenishment sand and the ecosystem is becoming less favorable to the at-risk plants. Will need intervention to save the habitat for at-risk species.</li> <li>Question the cost and limited benefit of trying to restore the eastern-edge of the coastal sand area and recommend it for a trail to the north that would exit to beach 50 m south of Tsawout boundary.</li> <li>Do not support removal of beach logs as they are outside park, their removal may jeopardize the berm, and would be costly.</li> <li>Assert that much of the coastal area proposed for restoration by RPBO is outside park boundary and should</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the restoration of the sand ecosystem at the NE end of the park. It will be fenced along the southern edge. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restoration will be promoted along the shore side of the Coast Loop Trail by clearly delineated beach access points and a fence at the bottom of the berm on the shore side.</li> <li>There will be no fences on the beach side of these areas, but signage will educate and encourage public participation in the restoration project.</li> <li>There will be no fence on the west side of the berm</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ecological restoration is proposed to be focused on the coastal sand ecosystem at the northeast corner of the park and along the narrow coastal sand ecosystem strip between the berm trail and the beach.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focuses ecological restoration effort on the most important habitat areas for known federally-designated at-risk plants and animals.</li> </ul>

ISSUE	FOIVB/CRDO RECOMMENDATIONS	RPBO/VNHS RECOMMENDATIONS	2017 DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN	RATIONALE
	therefore not be included in the park management plan.			
<b>Fencing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FOIVB considers that this would restrict the public's access to the beach. They also consider that the beach restoration areas identified in the plan are outside the park.</li> <li>If isolated pockets of "at risk" plants are found, they can be fenced individually.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See "Dogs" above.</li> <li>See "Environmental Restoration" above.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The only fence proposed in the 2017 plan is along the eastern side of the Coast Loop Trail at the base of the berm.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fencing is proposed to be installed in locations necessary to prevent random access by people and dogs through the proposed active restoration area. Beach access through this area from the Coast Loop Trail will be provided through designated access corridors.</li> </ul>
<b>Garbage</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dog waste bags should be provided by CRD.</li> <li>More garbage containers are needed throughout the park.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the availability of dog disposal bags and increased garbage cans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change to current waste management practices.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional Parks Operations staff's experience suggests that providing more garbage cans often encourages more waste to be deposited by visitors. This increases costs for operating the park.</li> <li>The public should be encouraged to pack out their garbage and use existing cans to deposit waste they are not able to remove.</li> </ul>
<b>Mosquito Control</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No specific recommendations provided.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support continued mosquito control. Minimal usage of Bti can be achieved by removing standing water in the fields (ditch maintenance).</li> <li>There should be an investigation into reducing the amount of Bti and the length of spraying period that is actually needed to keep the mosquitoes under control.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain the direction of the Regional Parks Committee of July 2012 to "continue the mosquito abatement program and monitor its effectiveness in reducing mosquitoes."</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Per Regional Parks Committee policy direction in 2012.</li> </ul>
<b>Trails</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FOIVB encourages the use of informal beaten trails – they do no damage to the vegetation and the cost to the CRD is minimal.</li> <li>Mow one side of all the ditches at the beginning of each year.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inland paths will be upgraded and/or created in the "back 40" area of the park. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These trails will be created alongside the ditches wherever possible in order to 'double' as ditch maintenance routes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two designated trails will be provided – the Coast Loop Trail and the Wetland Loop Trail.</li> <li>Park visitors may utilize unofficial trails in the NEZ area of the park year-round.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed trail system increases opportunities for visitors to access the wetland area of the park.</li> </ul>

ISSUE	FOIVB/CRDO RECOMMENDATIONS	RPBO/VNHS RECOMMENDATIONS	2017 DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN	RATIONALE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create two new access places from the inner loop trail to the meadowlands at Lamont Road and at the next northerly ditch.</li> <li>• A trail from Lamont Road should be built into the park.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the main trails do not extend to the far reaches of the NW corner of the park, then, along with the Sand Restoration Project in the NE corner, there will be a wide expanse of natural land at the north end of the park adjacent to the Tsawout lands.</li> <li>• Trails would be created to allow access to the park from Lamont Road and from the housing developments further south. They would intersect with the main trail system.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Park visitors must stay on the Wetland Loop Trail in the EPZ year around.</li> <li>• Dogs won't be allowed to use the Coast Loop Trail in the southern day-use area June 1-September 15.</li> <li>• The CRD will work with the District of Central Saanich during the development of their parks and trails master plan to explore the feasibility of the development of a new pedestrian access into the park from Lamont Road to provide nearby residents and visitors with an additional entry into the middle of the park along the Lamont Road right-of-way.</li> <li>• If a new access point is developed on the Lamont Road Right of Way, consider developing additional trails through the Natural Environment Zone to connect to this location.</li> </ul>	
<b>Tsawout First Nation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fence the entire northern boundary.</li> <li>• Utilize the restoration area to create a buffer on the north-east only. No buffer is needed on the north-west as no trespass occurs there.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No fencing is proposed for the northern boundary of the park.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional Parks will work with the Tsawout to determine whether a fence at the northern boundary of the park is an appropriate method to address the Tsawout's interests.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Tsawout have not provided an opinion on whether they believe a fence along the northern boundary is an appropriate measure to achieve their interests. The CRD is committed to working with the Tsawout to identify the most suitable management approach at the northern boundary of the park.</li> </ul>



**FOIVB/CRDO MAP**



**RPBO/VNHS MAP**

\*note: "consensus" refers to consensus plan agreed by table participants as of March 23. This plan was subsequently rejected by membership of some of the groups participating.