

Preparation of the Regional Parks Strategic Plan Report on the Results of the Stage Two Public Engagement

Capital Regional District | June 2011



Capital Regional District | Regional Parks
490 Atkins Avenue, Victoria, BC V9B 2Z8
T: 250.478.3344 | www.crd.bc.ca/parks



Making a difference...together

Cover Photo of Witty's Lagoon. Photo Credit: Bev Hall

Executive Summary

Regional Parks has prepared a draft strategic plan which will set the direction of regional parks and trails over the next ten years. The strategic plan provides the “big picture” framework for the regional parks and trails system.

A comprehensive public engagement process was developed to provide opportunities for regional residents to contribute their ideas into the preparation of, and comment on, the draft strategic plan. These opportunities included public input during the background information gathering stage (Stage One), and public input into the resulting Draft Strategic Plan (Stage Two).

The results of the Stage One public input are detailed in a separate report entitled “Preparation of the Regional Parks Strategic Plan – Results of the Stage One Public Engagement (2010).” The results of the Stage Two public input are detailed in this report.

Opportunities for the public to provide input into the Draft Strategic Plan included:

- Nine community dialogue sessions
- Two focus groups with area secondary and university students
- One meeting of an Intergovernmental working group
- On-line and hard copy response forms
- One CRD senior managers focus group
- Draft Strategic Plan sent to all First Nation bands within the CRD asking for comments
- Draft Strategic Plan sent to each municipality and electoral area director within the CRD asking for comments
- Draft Strategic Plan sent to each Southern Gulf Islands and Salt Spring Island Director and Parks and Recreation Commission member asking for comments
- E-mail sent to approximately 220 individuals and 47 interest groups providing a link to the Draft Strategic Plan and inviting comments
- Habitat Acquisition Trust (HAT) and the Garry Oak Ecosystem Recovery Team (GOERT) sent a link to the Draft Strategic Plan to all members of their respective list serves

There was an overall low response rate for the Stage Two public input. Very few members of the public attended the community dialogue sessions, and the number of response forms received was low. In addition, with the exception of Salt Spring Island, there was no written feedback from the electoral areas, municipalities, First Nations, or interest groups. However, the information received during the Stage Two public consultation provides important feedback about the Draft Strategic Plan.

The information received during the Stage Two consultation process was first analyzed and then synthesized into four key messages that apply to both regional parks and trails.

These key messages were derived from the frequency with which elements of these messages appeared in the public comments. The key themes are not rank ordered or assigned a priority of importance.

A synopsis of the four key messages for regional parks and trails are:

1. There is broad support for the plan’s “Big Vision”

Most respondents agreed with the overall vision and direction of the Draft Strategic Plan. They found the plan compelling, bold, futuristic, and comprehensive. There were some concerns about Regional Parks’ ability to implement such an ambitious plan, combined with strong support for boldly moving it forward regardless. Many respondents felt strongly that the plan will require on-going collaboration and integration with other initiatives to succeed.

2. Protect the Environment and Provide for Outdoor Recreation Opportunities

There was broad-based support for Regional Parks to protect biodiversity and maintain ecological integrity utilizing science as the basis for decision-making. At the same time, many respondents want to ensure there is a place for people in the parks. They want Regional Parks to find the right mix between visitor use and environmental protection.

3. Regional Trails are part of the regional transportation network

There is a strong awareness of the vital role that the urban/suburban portions of the regional trails play in the region’s overall transportation infrastructure. This is contrasted with the view of regional trails as primarily recreation and green corridors. Widespread support exists for developing trails that link communities together and connect beyond CRD’s boundaries.

4. Make regional trails a priority on Salt Spring Island and the Southern Gulf Islands

Trails are a priority on Salt Spring Island and the Southern Gulf Islands. Residents of Salt Spring Island and the Southern Gulf Islands are very interested in developing trail networks, and they look to Regional Parks to provide leadership in this area. As such, many Island residents would like Regional Parks to become a stronger presence on the Islands.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary..... 2

Table of Contents..... 4

Introduction 5

Methodology 5

Findings..... 7

Summary..... 8

Appendix 1 – Schedule of Public Consultation..... 9

Appendix 2 – Response Form 12

Appendix 3 – Public Comments by Source of Input 14

Introduction

Regional Parks has prepared a Draft Strategic Plan which seeks to set the direction for the regional parks and trails system over the next decade. The Draft Strategic Plan defines the long-term “big picture” framework for our regional parks and trails.

A series of community engagement sessions were held throughout the CRD in May and June, where input was gathered around the Draft Strategic Plan. The sessions were held in Victoria, the West Shore, the Saanich Peninsula, Salt Spring Island, Sooke, and the Southern Gulf Islands.

A youth engagement strategy utilizing focus groups enabled staff to connect with students at one secondary school and at the University of Victoria in May.

A response form was developed to gather public feedback on the Draft Strategic Plan. The response form was available on-line and in hard copy form between late April and early June.

Although the response rate was low from all sources of public input, taken all together, the data that was received provides important information about what respondents think of the Draft Strategic Plan. This report provides a synthesis of the four key messages that emerged from the comments received during Stage Two of the public engagement process.

These four key messages will contribute to finalizing the Regional Parks Strategic Plan.

Methodology

Public comments were anonymously collected from a number of sources, including:

- Nine community dialogue sessions
- Two focus groups with area secondary and university students
- One meeting of an Intergovernmental working group
- On-line and hard copy response forms
- One CRD senior managers focus group

In addition, a copy of the Draft Strategic Plan, or a link to the on-line version of the plan, was provided to:

- Draft Strategic Plan sent to all First Nation bands within the CRD asking for comments

- Draft Strategic Plan sent to each municipality and electoral area director within the CRD asking for comments
- Draft Strategic Plan sent to each Southern Gulf Islands and Salt Spring Island Parks and Recreation Commission member and Director asking for comments
- E-mail sent to approximately 220 individuals and 47 interest groups providing a link to the Draft Strategic Plan and inviting comments
- Habitat Acquisition Trust (HAT) and the Garry Oak Ecosystem Recovery Team (GOERT) sent a link to the Draft Strategic Plan to all members of their respective list serves

Approximately 80 persons attended the community dialogue sessions, and 20 students participated in the youth engagement sessions. In addition, approximately six hard copy response forms and 22 on-line response forms were received.

Trained facilitators captured information on flip charts for the community dialogues. Participants were asked to comment on the following themes:

- Vision for the regional parks and trails system
- Mission of regional parks and trails
- Management Goals for regional parks and trails
- Proposed Regional Parks and Trails System
- Strategic Priorities

Response forms were completed at the community dialogue sessions and received in the mail (see sample response form in Appendix 2). The on-line response forms were available on the CRD website for approximately a one-month period.

With the exception of Salt Spring Island, comments were not received from the electoral areas, municipalities, First Nations, or interest groups. However, between April and May:

- 8,947 individuals viewed the Strategic Plan webpage
- 253 individuals downloaded a copy of the Draft Strategic Plan

All of the data was input into Microsoft Word. A separate document was created for each data source (see Appendix 3 for raw data). Individual sessions of a similar type were combined into a single document (e.g. all community dialogue sessions), and all data was anonymous.

Once the data was in table format, it was separately analyzed for major themes. From this review a list of four key messages was derived. These key messages are presented below.

Findings

Based on an analysis of the data, a list of four key messages emerged. The key messages are presented below in no rank order of priority or level of importance.

The criteria for inclusion in the list of key messages were that the underlying message showed up with heightened frequency throughout the data, regardless of source.

Taken all together, these key messages serve as guideposts for Regional Parks to better understand participants' feelings about the Draft Strategic Plan.

1. Support for the plan's "Big Vision"

The majority of respondents agreed with the overall vision and direction of the draft Strategic Plan. They commented that the draft plan is compelling, bold, futuristic, and comprehensive. There was broad support for the "Nature Needs Half" concept, although many respondents wanted more clarity about the concept and information on how it will be implemented. There was some concern about the ability of Regional Parks to implement such an ambitious strategic plan. Many respondents felt strongly that the plan will require on-going collaboration and integration with other initiatives to succeed, and that it should be linked to an implementation action plan. There was strong support for Regional Parks to boldly move the strategic plan forward and to be assertive in its implementation strategy.

2. Protect the Environment and Provide for Outdoor Recreation Opportunities

There was general support for Regional Parks' primary purpose being to protect biodiversity and maintain ecological integrity. Respondents were also particularly interested in invasive species management and in using good science to guide decision-making. Some respondents felt that Regional Parks needs to develop an active monitoring program and to benchmark progress on environmental goals. At the same time, many respondents want to make sure that there is a place for people in the parks. They want the strategic plan to ensure the right mix between visitor use and environmental protection, and to acknowledge that parks serve a variety of recreational interests and provide for a diversity of experiences. Many felt this needs to be applied in the management of individual regional parks.

3. Regional Trails are part of the regional transportation network

There appears to be a growing awareness of the important role that the urban and suburban portions of network of regional trails plays in the overall transportation infrastructure, as contrasted with their traditional role as primarily recreation and green corridors. There was

widespread support for developing more trails, especially regional trails that link communities together and that traverse the entire region and areas beyond the regional district boundary. Respondents particularly want trails near convenient access points, and emphasize that trail connectivity is the most important and vital component of all. Some respondents stressed that goals are needed for managing mixed use trails, and that clarification on the purpose of regional trails is needed.

4. Make regional trails a priority on Salt Spring Island and the Southern Gulf Islands

Trails appear to be a priority on Salt Spring Island and the Southern Gulf Islands. Residents of Salt Spring Island and the Southern Gulf Islands are very interested in developing trail networks, and they look to Regional Parks to provide leadership in making this happen. In collaboration with Island residents, they would like to see Regional Parks move ahead with regional trail planning, acquisition, development, and operations, and to be more of a presence on the Islands. Salt Spring Island, in particular, feels it is ready to move ahead with trail development, having been at the planning stage for the last 30 years and still unable to complete its vision of a trail from Fulford Harbour to Ganges. Island residents would generally like to see their needs and desires better reflected in the strategic plan.

Summary

Regional Parks recently completed Stage Two of its public engagement process around the Draft Strategic Plan. Stage Two provided the public with opportunities to review and provide comments on the draft plan. Although the public engagement process was comprehensive, the turnout was low at community dialogue sessions and for the response forms. Additionally, no written comments were received from municipalities, electoral areas [except for Salt Spring Island], First Nations, or interest groups within the CRD.

Nonetheless, the information collected from respondents was valuable. It was analyzed and then used to derive four key messages about the Draft Strategic Plan. These key messages will be helpful in finalizing the draft plan. Importantly, most respondents support the Draft Strategic Plan vision and overall direction and would like to see Regional Parks boldly implement the final Strategic Plan.

Appendix 1 – Schedule of Public Consultation

REGIONAL PARKS DRAFT STRATEGIC PLAN

COMMUNITY DIALOGUE SESSIONS

Public Meetings

May 3 - Victoria

Leonard da Vinci Centre (Upper Hall)
195 Bay Street

May 4 – West Shore

Juan de Fuca Recreation Centre (Kinsmen Fieldhouse, located behind JDF Rec Centre Lower Park)
1767 Island Highway

May 5 – Saanich Peninsula

Central Saanich Cultural Centre (Lower Hall)
1209 Clarke Road Brentwood Bay

May 10 – Sooke

Sooke Community Hall (Lower Hall)
2037 Shields Road Sooke

May 11 – Salt Spring Island

SSI Parc Portable (Port Lock Park – Meeting Room)
145 Vesuvius Bay Road

Southern Gulf Islands

May 25, 2011 – Mayne Island

Public Meeting: 1-3 pm

Agricultural Hall
430 Fern Hill

May 30, 2011 – Galiano Island

Commission Meeting: 12:30-1:30 pm

Public Meeting: 2-4 pm
Galiano Community Hall
141 Sturdies Bay Road

June 1, 2011 - Saturna Island
Commission Meeting: 10-11:30 am
Public Meeting: 1-3 pm
Community Hall

June 2, 2011 - Pender Island
Commission Meeting: 10-11:30 am
Public Meeting: 1-3 pm
Community Hall
4418 Bedwell Harbour Road

Intergovernmental Working Group Meeting
1-4 pm

May 26, 2011
Regional Parks' Headquarters; Cedar Room
490 Atkins Avenue

Kludahk Club
7-9 pm

May 26, 2011
Juan de Fuca Planning Office
2-6868 West Coast Road

UVic Focus Group
8:30-10 am

May 26, 2011
McKinnon Room 155
University of Victoria

Claremont Secondary School Focus Group
12-1 pm

May 27, 2011

Claremont Secondary School

CRD Senior Managers Meeting
2-4:30 pm

May 31, 2011

CRD; Room 488

625 Fisgard Street

Community Dialogue Session Schedule and Format

6 – 7 pm	Open House
7 – 7:30 pm	Welcome and Introduction
7:30 – 9 pm	Facilitated Discussion
9 – 9:15 pm	Closing Comments

Appendix 3 – Public Comments by Source of Input

Appendix 3 provides the raw data for comments received by source of input.

The sources of input included in this report are:

- Dialogues with members of the public who attended one of the Community Dialogue sessions (see Appendix 1 for list of sessions);
- Dialogues with secondary school youth and UVic students;
- Comments received via a response form available in hard-copy or on-line;
- Intergovernmental Working Group
- Comments from the Director of Salt Spring Island Electoral Area

The topic areas addressed, in part or in whole, by the sources of input included:

- Thoughts about the proposed vision
- Thoughts about the proposed mission
- Thoughts about the proposed management goals
- Thoughts about the proposed strategic directions
- Thoughts about the proposed regional park and trail system

Comments were recorded by trained facilitators for all the sources of input except for the response forms (e.g. received as verbatim comments). Not all topic areas were addressed by each source of input due to time and interest constraints.

The public comments were used to develop the four key messages detailed in the Findings section of the report. All data is anonymous, and the comments are not presented in any rank order of importance or priority.

2011 Draft Strategic Plan – Public Comments

Community Dialogues

May 3, 2011 – Victoria: Leonardo da Vinci Centre

- Enable small boat access; simple ramps to shore; minimal parking space; pit toilets like at IVB and Coles Bay
- Linear trails linking to GGRT and Lochside; bus routes; near convenient access points
- Minimal development of JdFEA area as a park with: trails, mountain bike trails
- Challenges of population increase while still maintaining protection, access and longevity
- Conservation partnerships: military lands, observatory hill
- Land management: Beaver Lake i.e., Ivy; deal with invasive from baseline of healthy habitat data first; badly infested later
- Protect biodiversity by getting on invasive in marginal infestation first

May 4, 2011 – Westshore: Kinsmen Fieldhouse Juan de Fuca Recreation Centre

- Need for more maps/signage
- What are your plans west of Sooke? Connect the JdF Trail to GGRT?
- Congrats to CRD for your foresight and good initiative
- New to Victoria with my family
- Regional Parks is good in the ways of expansion
- BC Parks now has free parking
- What about creative partnerships? (non tax-related expansion is determined on a shrinking tax base)
- Expand on different uses of the parks, i.e., segregation of activities – dogs and off-road vehicles
- Is there educational opportunities?
- Worthwhile to indicate the zoning systems in the plan (zoning within the classification)
- Land use in Ontario is clearly defined in terms of zoning and use / signage is a good immediate way of knowing what transpires in the park
- Will CRD Parks become free parking?
- Any discussion on a one-time fee for trail use?
- Concession stands at Thetis Lake is good revenue
- Will the other building at Thetis come down?
- Signs exist at Thetis to prevent cliff jumping; why do people still do it?

- A lot of talk re: Colwood Corners GGRT and BC Transit taking over parts of the GGRT; trail needs to remain green
- Regional Parks is doing a great job! Put it into action. Like the long-term plan.
- How does BC Govt. react to Regional Parks? Do they pose any challenges? Is there general support from BC Govt?

May 5, 2011 – Saanich Peninsula: Central Saanich Cultural Centre

- What partnerships does the CRD have? Is there a possibility to protect without acquiring land? Any other options? Acquiring rights?
- Most desirable place for parks are the most desirable to live
- “Protect our Parks” would like to get together with Regional Parks to talk about trails
- Features in the parks – common names for common features; how does CRD name features?
- Very pleased to see the orange corridors on the map
- Is there a good network of volunteers?
- Do mountain bikers want to expand on the regional trails?
- Can the CRD prevent public access into certain sensitive areas of parks?
- Education is key
- Many horses in the CRD; great that parks accommodates horse riding
- Nature programs are first rate! – see more stuff because of the programs. The Times Colonist is great for advertising the nature programs. The interpreters are very knowledgeable. Great that the programs are age categorized.
- What about Nature Houses?
- Partner with the Salmon Enhancement Society?
- Make Matheson more recreational
- Is CRD encouraging people to bestow land?
- Sea-to-Sea Green Blue Belt is a wonderful concept; people just need to see that it is possible.
- Fort McMurray Alberta has similar issues with Crown Land and access to parks and wilderness; Alberta Foothills has some different classifications of parks that allow quads in parks; lots of environmental damage but quads are a great way to travel; CRD needs to figure out a way to accommodate quads.
- Has CRD interacted with DND?
- What is the route of the TCT?
- Good presentation and certainly achievable
- Presentation is a granular 5 yr. vision; what happens after the 1st year? How do you bridge after 5 years to the next? (mid-term to long-term)

May 10, 2011 – Sooke: Sooke Community Lower Hall

- Attendance was zero; no comments

May 11, 2011 – Salt Spring Island: SSI PARC Portable

- Need business directions, specific goals that tie in with the new trails, i.e., partnerships, employment
- Need to see specific trails so that people can plan economic development around those new trails
- Conservative strategy for moving ahead is wrong; more advantageous to be aggressive
- Bold letters in the executive summary stating EXACTLY what Regional Parks will do. (make direct commitments referring to the next five years)
- 2000 Master Plan – almost nothing happened with trails on SSI and now SSI and SGI's have been lumped together.
- Language must be strong and direct (also referring to Business Plan)
- SSI is a cycling destination but people arrive and tear their hair out because there are no cycling trails! Make it a priority to complete trails on SSI and make it a bold statement on the executive summary. (Top 3 priority)
- There is a business case for SSI but not necessarily on Mayne Island
- *Another participant in agreement with previous comments*
- What will it take to strengthen the language – prepare a plan for the SGI Regional Trails
- Accidents keep cyclists off the roads; trails alleviate accidents
- How can this be put into a phased approach to make trails happen on SSI?
- The proposed trail does not go out to Long Harbour and it should
- Based on 30 years of planning, a regional trail should be a priority on SS
- Business case for finalizing the commitment to SSI – building trails
- Use **action verbs** regarding SSI in the Strategic Plan and make SSI a priority
- Make a difference between SSI and the SGI regarding “readiness”
- Connecting does not apply to SSI – SGI; un-lump SSI from the SGI
- What does CRD Parks need to start a business case for SSI, i.e., partnerships
- A lot of head scratching by avid cyclists and hikers on SSI
- Projects that happen that no one knows about – waste of money
- Hikers and cyclists would volunteer their time to help build the trails
- Consensus exists on SSI about the importance of a cycling trail; infrastructure exists to make it happen; trail from Fulford Harbour to Ganges is an Awesome idea
- Will the red dotted line on the map still just be that in 10 years?
- SSI to push and take the lead (ying and yang)

- Walking trail – north/south route; huge long-term investment for tourism and quality of life on SSI
- Capture the “7 Summits” as a trail system
- Salt Springers like the ‘feel goods’
- “Nature Needs Half” – does CRD have this? Is the carbon offset as important these days?
- Great job CRD! Shortcomings, not perfect but incredible efforts and awesome opportunities

May 25, 2011 – Mayne Island: Agricultural Hall

- Cost to produce the draft strategic plan – summary – 2 comments
- Removal of invasive plants; issue on the islands
 - Animals
 - Very limited resources
- Regional trails; proposed trail; page 108; SSI – Gulf Islands
- Land acquisition; Mount Parke – money available
- Islands; have in common

Saturna Island (June 2, 2011)

- The regional parks and trails system is world class
- There is a need for open rest shelters along regional trails
- A report on the history of regional parks should be prepared
- There is a need to move ahead with regional trail planning, acquisition and development on the Southern Gulf Islands – in addition the CRD will need to address how these trails will be operated on the Islands, especially with respect to bylaw enforcement and supervision
- The CRD needs to be congratulated for the acquisition of the Western Forest Products lands

Pender Island (June 2, 2011)

- The Plan should address the protection of the marine and freshwater environment. This could be added as a mission statement. This was presented as prevention of land-originated pollution draining into the aqueous environments.
- The mission statement “contribute to the regional economy” should be expanded by adding “while respecting the other mission statements”. The fear was that a non-commercialism policy was not clear when reading this part of the mission statement.
- Over the next five years Regional Parks needs to explore all possible sources of funding for land acquisition.

- The CRD is to be applauded for the acquisition of the Western Forest Products lands.
- Recreation activities should be accommodated while respecting the need to protect the environment.
- More environmental education programs by Regional Parks should be provided on the Islands.
- More enforcement of bylaws would help protect the regional parks.
- Thank you to Regional Parks for being open to discuss the future of regional parks and trails and for the scope of the draft Plan.
- Work with federal and provincial agencies to protect marine and freshwater ecosystems.

On-line and Hard Copy Response Forms

Do you agree with the overall vision for regional parks in the draft strategic plan?	Yes	
	Yes	We are fortunate enough here that at least half of the area hasn't been developed and can be left in a natural state, albeit that forested areas are second growth and not old growth status.
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	Consumer culture is far from being in harmony with nature and its integration difficult at best. No small task to live and work in harmony with nature
	No	Discriminating against all forms of motorized access is unreasonable. From an ecological standpoint motorized access does not necessarily harm the environment any more than walking or hiking does, a trials motorcycle has VERY soft/under-inflated tires and is ridden very slowly, trials motorcycles will not harm the trails. Sensible rules on noise and size/power/weight for motorized users would be supported but discrimination against all is not the smart/diverse/fair way to go
	Yes	Only suggestion would be to possibly give one example of what conservation is..."conserving" is a broad term and may not be fully understood by the general public
	Yes	
	No	Would like additional principles of Nature Needs Half concept - is this into perpetuity? How do we protect today's values? More inclusive of children & the benefits of natural environments. Are we leaving the

		children a Legacy of green space?
	Yes	See Additional Comments
	Yes	Vision appears to be balanced but rest of the plan reflects strong bias of recreation against conservation!
	Yes	
	No	There has to be allowance for the use of off road motorcycles on CRD Land
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	Conservation of >= 1/2 the land base sounds ambitious; perhaps the term conservation means something more than I understand it? A more definitive goal perhaps?
	Yes	But intertidal and marine areas for conservation are needed. Can CRD collaborate with other agencies
Do you agree with the overall mission for regional parks in the draft strategic plan?	Yes	
	Yes	Connectivity to adjacent regional district is essential, i.e., the Trans Canada Trail to go through to the Cowichan Valley. Connectivity to Metro Vancouver trails is possible. But after crossing the ferry they need better signage as how to access the Boundary Bay Trail and the trails system around Richmond etc.
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	No	Motorized recreation has not been included in an open and inclusive manner by policy makers. Bias exists that does not favour that use. feedback and data have been either misconstrued or blown off all together, and

		environmental issues blown out of proportion when considered within a managed frame work
	No	Discriminating against all forms of motorized access is unfair to the trail-builders (many of whom are motor-access patrons), it doesn't make sense from an ecological standpoint as many forms of motorized access do not harm the environment any more than walking/hiking
	Yes	
	No	Too many points, or perhaps just poorly written (as much of the summary and full document are, where perfect and beautiful presentation fools most readers into thinking that the content is as well-presented). A skilled writer/editor could bring these 15 points down to 6-8 clear, concise, well-focused points that are much more easily kept in mind
	Yes	
	Yes	
	No	#10 Your plan clearly fails to show how this motherhood statement will actually be realized. How will regional parks to contribute to regional economy if visitor use and access is minimized? #13 mission is compromised by overrepresentation of conservationist/. Naturalist groups. Does not appear to be balanced by adequate input from recreational groups 15 info program emphasis is on eco/cultural values - no mention of how/where to use parks (signage, parking)
	Yes	
	No	There has to be land set aside for motorized uses. It is unfair as the off road motorcycle community is one of the largest user groups.
	Yes	
	No	#11 needs to be modified to make it clear that no part of the mission of the CRD Parks includes commercial exploitation. #12 should be modified or perhaps another one added so that there is a statement similar to the following: "work in partnership with all levels of

		government to protect not only the Regional Parks but also the adjacent tidal and riparian areas."
	No	If mission == fundamental purpose then I really don't think "11. Contribute to the regional economy" belongs there ... too vague and not central to my view of parks in general. Incidental contributions are OK (commuting trails, free and healthy recreation outlets etc. can help the economy). A couple points refer to connection of trails and communities, perhaps explicit recognition of the role of routes such as Lochside/GG in the community alternative transportation?
	Yes	But enforcement is needed when rules are broken-i.e., off-leash dogs, off-road vehicle use
Do you agree with the management goals of the draft strategic plan?	?	Basically yes except for No. 7 – to remove invasive plants and animals. Aren't we humans, invasive animals? Just nit-picking – sorry!
	Yes	Removing invasive species is of course desirable. Encouraging more volunteer groups to participate is essential as is already being done at a municipal level in Victoria, Oak Bay, Saanich etc.
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	No	Non-compatible is a farce. The ohv community had coexisted in this area for at least the last 50 years. Most park trails are based on old motorcycle trails e.g. mount Doug park. Thetis lake, Skafe hill, etc. given the limited sampling and selective/leading nature of CRD polls it will be difficult to be treated fairly. I believe it is completely unfair to allow mountain bikes when there environmental footprint is larger than a trials bike for example. Given some legitimate riding area the ohv community is not a compatibility issue, and I

		don't think that it has ever been proposed to mix such uses. As well without dealing with this problem it is going to be at considerable trouble/expense in the future to manage with such expansive parks holdings being difficult at best to police. Spend now to accommodate or spend later to police, take your pick.
	No	Mostly, I do agree. This: "To remove invasive plants and animals." is a risky endeavor that could easily do more harm than good. Also we get back to the "all motorized vehicle" phrase (found here: involves the use of motorized vehicles or equipment ;). This is discriminatory; I don't have a problem with restricting noise but how will maintenance crews get to the trails, with a motor, how will they cut out trails, with motorized equipment. Why is this plan against ALL forms of motorized recreation, not just loud/destructive forms? Traditionally a lot of these areas have been open to motorized recreation and because of the actions of a SMALL minority (giving motorized recreation a bad name) this anti-motor policy is being pushed forward, that is discrimination and should be stopped
	Yes	How are these goals going to be met? Through grant funding or donations? Who will be responsible for enacting these goals? What are the cultural resources that could be protected? Any examples?
	No	'No' isn't quite accurate, because what's in the goals is okay, just as what's in the mission statements is a good, rough-copy start. They need to be tightened up in terms of focus and presentation. The dog's breakfast of feedback received hasn't been processed down and refined enough. A professional writer/editor should have been engaged to make a clear, concise, logical presentation of the written material, just as professional layout & design people were used to make a visually readable, easily comprehensible document.
	No	Would appreciate additional information on

		management goals - how do we ensure the process remains in place to protect green spaces and open spaces that are associated with distinctive ecosystems? How does apply to watersheds and waterways that are associated with ecosystems?
	Yes	
	No	virtually all goals deal with managing natural resource values of parks None relate to goal of managing for recreational opportunities or even acknowledging that is role and responsibility of CRD parks (no reference anywhere to swimming, boating, mountain bikes)
	Yes	
	No	If think a more surgical approach is required. I don't have problem with the removal of invasive plants and animals. However the reference to motorized access is again designed to restrict one of the largest user groups. There are ways to create regulations that allow all user groups access and protection
	Yes	
	Yes	
	No	Mostly OK, but again I think some goal to provide environmentally friendly transportation options is important, all part of the needed connections recognized in other parts of the plan.
	Yes	
Do you agree with the strategic priorities of the draft plan?	Yes	
	Yes	If an activity is deemed non-compatible because of excessive noise that would seem to exclude many motorized vehicles i.e., motorcycles that should be made explicit. This comment should be included in the Management Goals Section.
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	

	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	CRD parks seem to have a very ambitious plan that may be very difficult to implement without considerable capital expense. The other side is how do you get a consumer culture out of the malls and off the iPods and into the parks? I would bet that not many response forms come from that group of people, which means that response data is biased. also it would be nice if the CRD would widen their own sampling numbers to better reflect the needs of the community
	Yes	
	Yes	What would constitute a future land acquisition?
	No	Land acquisitions should not be put ahead of connectivity between parks and the expansion of network trails. Connectivity benefits everyone in the region; land acquisitions such as spending everyone's gas tax contributions on the Juan de Fuca lands is (1) of limited value to most contributors, (b) uses taxpayers' \$\$ to buy back what we used to own, and (c) continues the transfer of public money to the private purse, which is a major destabilizer that undermines our collective, long-term well-being. Private money must be raised to make such purchases. Use public money for the broadest public good.
	Yes	
	Yes	
	No	Plan tends to ignore priority to improve/increase public access and use of parks the Plan does not seem to reflect concept that there are different types of parks that values and roles of each may vary - some are for preservation of natural values with minimal/controlled public access while other may provide for heavier visitation and range of uses. The plan seems to ignore concept of diversity of interest and uses of park visitors

	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
Do you agree with proposed regional parks and trails system map in the draft strategic plan?	Yes	
	Yes	Proposed routes seen to encompass areas of natural beauty and attractiveness. Acquisition of land is essential, essential especially for trail construction to ensure there are no gaps which would render the project futile unless an alternative practical route could be planned for
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
	No	Hard to read the map
	Yes	
	Yes	
	No	
	Yes	
	No	Beyond the scope of the CRD to finance such an ambitious plan, lets meet the needs of the people within the large system we have now
	Yes	
	Yes	These areas would constitute half of the land area for the CRD?
	No	Too ambitious. Cut back on the hoped-for trails to those that is realistically achievable. In aiming for too many - for example, in the Gulf Islands - we may end up with none. Connect Salt Spring first with the Lochside Trail, so it's part of the cyclable/walkable route through the CRD and CVRD. These connecting networks mean more to all citizens than specific parks - witness how positive all CRD taxpayers are about the Lochside and Goose, in terms of general liveability in

		the region and top of the list when telling visitors what's best about living in the area.
	No	There is no reference to Haro Woods or the Finnerty Creek Watershed on your map. This natural green way serves as an important connecting greenway for habitat and birds. Haro Woods is listed as a significant ecosystem on the VNHS registry. Haro Woods has been recognized as a greenway that is worthy of preserving for the future in a 1994 Commonwealth Nature Legacy for the future benefit of children.
	Yes	
	No	We need more parkland in the far western part of the CRD, don't assume this is just a provincial responsibility also park system has goodly amount of upland but needs more ocean frontage... plan makes no reference to fact the TCT is missing a link over/around the Malahat to connect north to Shawnigan.. This should be a priority!!
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	Trail networks on southern Gulf Islands should be more extensive, including back country hiking and multi-use trails over public and private lands, safe walking paths along public roads, and safe bikeways between ferry terminals and major destinations. Specifically on Galiano Island, we need a bikeway along the east side of the island from Sturdies Bay to Coon Bay in Dionisio Point Park, plus parallel hiking paths up each side of the island along the ridges. The east side bikeway plus the west side hiking trail could be designated as the regional trail in a loop configuration.
	Yes	
	Yes	
	Yes	
Other Comments		The connectivity of the trails and parks most important

	<p>Plan seems largely on track</p> <p>I am in favour of a series of connecting parks with trails. Keep a focus on a variety of parks; some challenging paths, some accessible for wheel chair or walker users. Prevent developing for housing any area with trees. As an example: develop the gravel pits in Colwood first. Do not allow non-motorized vehicles in parks. Keep dogs on leash and have signs to pick up dog feces. Put effort into removing invasive plant species so to allow native plants to thrive. Plan for a CRD park in Colwood at the waterfront so not to allow all the land for commercial development. Thank you for making the draft strategic plan available on line</p> <p>I appreciate the work of the CAP, and support its draft strategic plan, particularly where it draws attention to the increasing population and the need to set aside more green space for these larger numbers of park & trail users. Already, swimming beaches are very crowded. I used to hike in East Sooke Park without encountering another soul, and now I'm guaranteed to meet someone else on the trail. Not that I object, but these places are definitely seeing increased use. Oh, and with respect to trail maintenance (which is generally awesome) - I use CRD parks an awful lot during the winter, and while I'm not afraid to get muddy, it would be wonderful if some of the worst bits (I'm talking about you, McKenzie Creek Trail!) saw some attention. Just some cross-cut logs with that grated-wire for grip, so one could hop-and-skip across, would be so appreciated.... It doesn't have to be bridges or anything expensive</p>
	<p>The draft plan does not seem to directly address how conflicts between activities/user groups/values in parks will be addressed. Perhaps such conflicts will be addressed on a park-by-park basis, and park user/stakeholder consultation will occur, but I did not see this actually stated in the plan. I wonder about this because there will be increasing conflict between users, and increasing stress on wildlife, as human use of parks increases. For example, I see more and more dogs (especially off-leash) in popular parks such as Thetis Lake, to the point where I feel like the main trails around Thetis Lake are dominated by off-leash dogs and their owners. Off-leash dogs</p>

	<p>are incompatible with some other park activities such as jogging, wildlife/bird watching, or walking with small children. As a regular jogger at Thetis Lake, I can say that I often have to take quick action to avoid collisions with dogs that run in front of me, and I have even had dogs attempt to bite me or chase me. I have also witnessed situations where dogs bark at or chase birds, and bark or run up to small children (and in some cases knock them over) causing fear and distress for the child and their family.</p>
	<p>I am disturbed that there are not more CRD board members legally permitted to vote on the development of lands adjoining the Juan de Fuca Trail. I hike in this area and oppose the potential development proposed by Mr. Ender Ilkay west of Jordan River</p>
	<p>CRD perhaps should broaden the approach to regional trails by looking at alternatives to strict land ownership of trail ROW's. UK's national Trust offers some good examples of cost effective and community supported approaches. I would be willing to help with the planning of the regional trails in North and Central Saanich.</p>
	<p>Well done on such a thorough and thoughtful plan/strategy! I am happy to see the plans for connecting regional trails</p>
	<p>In terms of the Gulf Islands and especially Salt Spring Island where I live, you have done a fine job of acquiring pieces of land for park purposes. However, you have done nothing with these pieces of land, especially on Salt Spring. The Mill Farm Park Reserve includes beautiful pieces of land that are unknown to most islanders because there has been no publicity about this area and nothing has been done to improve the land. We don't need picnic tables or toilets or garbage cans. We do need signage and trail maintenance, the latter something that local volunteers could do. We once had a good system of volunteer park monitors who at least visited the park on a regular basis to ensure that the land was not being abused. CRD staff have discouraged the existing volunteers (VIPs) and not appointed new ones on the basis that a park reserve does not require VIPs. This is unfortunate, to say the least. Very few islanders know about CRD Parks or about our Mill Farm Park Reserve because the CRD has done nothing in the almost-20 years since</p>

	<p>the park reserve was acquired. My guess is that most islanders wouldn't be able to tell you the difference between CRD Parks and our local PARC, which is also part of the CRD and is doing a fine job of signing and developing our parks. Perhaps the Mill Farm Park Reserve should be turned over to the local park commission if the CRD is not prepared to do anything with the land. The time has come to do something with this magnificent asset. There is nothing in the strategic plan about the Gulf Islands. Your proposed regional parks and trails system is admirable, but in actuality we are now seemingly much less important to CRD Parks than Vancouver Island. I would hope that this can be rectified in the final draft of the plan and in its execution in the future. We need a strong CRD Parks presence in the Gulf Islands, and speaking for Salt Spring, we are not getting that. I would be pleased to discuss any of this further with CRD staff.</p>
	<p>Willis Point's Partridge Hills should be included in the lands of interest, and especially the lands on the east side of the road. The two parcels at the south end would be a prime protected natural area. They contain many listed species and endangered ecosystems and could be an excellent way of providing a protected walking path from Mount Work Regional Park over the Hills to Todd Inlet. The paths in the Partridge Hills connect with Gowland Todd Provincial Park and provide a contiguous route from the Butchart Gardens Cement factory trails, up through arbutus woodlands to Durrance Lake, up the Partridge Hills and down, through community cut and maintained trails, to the entrance of Todd Inlet. If these parcels are lost to development, this extended hiking route will no longer be available. Please help save the Partridge Hills</p> <p>One of my main concerns as a resident of Pender Island is that we have a lot of different parks, both federal and regional. However, there is only one park that allows for disc golf. The CRD disc golf park on Pender Island is without a doubt the busiest and most used park on the island, if not one of the busiest parks in the entire CRD parks system. During the summer, every weekend there are dozens of visitors from off island who travel to Pender specifically for the disc golf course - I am sure disc parks would be used and appreciated in other</p>

	<p>areas of the CRD. It would be really nice to see more parks lands allocated to disc golf - clearly there is a large diverse demographic of people who enjoy playing a round of disc golf. Furthermore, the costs and maintenance fees of running a disc park are fairly minimal - especially considering the enjoyment and exercise they provide the people. Please address the need for more disc golf courses in CRD parks system. Thank you for your consideration, B Bauer, Pender Island resident of 8 years and avid disc golfer</p>
	<p>I believe that managed OHV use in the capital region is a necessary part of a plan to address the wide range of needs of the community. Since about 1998 the Off Road groups have been systematically pushed out of the area with development, closing of private forest lands, and CRD parks purchases. CRD parks initiated meetings to resolve these issues at that time and have never made good on their commitment to help. Page 9 of the draft plan uses strong words that leave no room for the off road groups. Perhaps some surplus lands that the CRD owns would be a good start, or an agreement with Timber west on a piece of their private lands (BOYS Pit) After all, the tax payer has purchased a lot of land from them thru the CRD. Again words that don't completely rule out managed OHV use in the CRD would be a good start to a mutually satisfactory resolution to the concerns of both sides. Enforcement is costly, and shows a systemic problem rather than an increase in criminal activity. Thanks for your time.</p>
	<p>There are responsible motorized groups out there who would be happy to help guide the CRD on reasonable rules for motorized access (ex. Victoria motorcycle club, VMC). Please consider asking for the advice and contributions of the local motorized recreational groups</p>
	<p>In the mission statement, the first three points are about connectivity. Keep this front and centre. While all of the goals are laudable (and would be more so, if presented more concisely), the draft strategic plan is too broad and unfocussed, a wonderful bunch of motherhood statements and wishes that go well beyond the 20-year scope of the undertaking.</p>
	<p>Haro Woods meets all the criteria and ToR of your draft Strategic Plan. CRD already owns a parcel of the natural, wild woodlands.</p>

	Entire forest is currently protected by Covenants - UVic, Saanich, CRD Places for events on QA/VIHA property adjacent to forest - educational buildings, playing fields, camp site, picnic area, playground Park area is perfectly positioned for partnership between CRD, Saanich, UVic, QA/VIHA, HAT and TLC Haro Woods has established trails that have been used by the community for over 43 years
	Thanks for coming to Galiano Island to present the draft strategic plan. Our discussion spoke of the problems encountered in creating trails on private land, as experienced by the local Parks Commission and the creation of the Galiano Trails Society as an alternate model more agreeable to property owners. (See KOOTENAY COLUMBIA TRAILS SOCIETY WEB site for how it works). It was suggested that the CRD should play a facilitating role that incorporates local Parks Commissions as well as local non-governmental groups (Moving Around Pender, Galiano Trails...) to work together to find collaborations best suited to implement the strategic plan on the Southern Gulf Islands. A joint meeting of all such groups was suggested--- in the style of the periodic Commonality meetings now taking place, but including non-CRD groups as well. Good idea!
	The entire plan reflects a bias against recreation use and by inference seems to presume all cycling only occurs on trails not in parks...
	This is an excellent vision and plan
	I am very impressed with the CRD's willingness to include members of the community in the planning of the strategic plan. You are to be congratulated.
	Overall a pretty good plan but given that CRD parks/trails are leading the way at present with alternative transportation connections it would be nice to see that as a more explicit target.
	CRD does well in having these meetings and this literature and staffs is to be commended for their attitude and professionalism.

Youth Engagement – Focus Groups

UVic Focus Group

May 26, 2011

Experiences	Seeking skunk cabbage
	Running around Thetis
	Being near the water at East Sooke
	Goose – cycled Victoria to Sooke; being away from development
	Elk/Beaver; green space in developed area; easily accessible; water and green space
Overall Impression	Happy with the plan, agree with information
	Appropriate to youth generation; getting to root of problem; addresses environmental issues
	Little optimistic
	Positive values it puts forward; great goals
	How do you put into action
	Challenge of use and conservation
	How will environmental education goals be met
	Steps in implementing “the how to”
	Little broad – need specific implementation actions
	Need money
Mission, Vision	Need definition of conserving or provide example
	Made sense, liked what it says
	Being clear on what a park is
Words that best describe document	Necessary, need to implement
	Ambitious
	Comprehensive “covers all necessary bases”
	A lot to implement
	Collaboration, community, integration
	Working with First Nations
	Education focus

	Community-based
	Good awareness piece
Words that best describe proposal system	Too fragmented for species protection
	Too thin areas
	Need larger areas
	Trails look great
	Not enough highlighted to meet 50% goal
	Proposed areas should be bigger
Anything Missing	Making goals "smart goals"; measureable statements

Intergovernmental Working Group

RESULTS OF MAY 26, 2011 CONSULTATIONS WITH THE INTER-GOVERNMENTAL WORKING GROUP ON THE DRAFT CRD REGIONAL PARKS STRATEGIC PLAN

Prepared by:
James L. Barlow
Barlow Management Services

June 1, 2011

1. INTRODUCTION

The Inter-Governmental Working Group (IGWG) comprises representatives from the municipalities within the Capital Regional District (CRD), Parks Canada (Environment Canada), the Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations, the Ministry of Community, Sport and Cultural Development and the Ministry of the Environment. The membership list is attached in Appendix I.

The IGWG members all have a professional role in park or outdoor recreation management and as such, have valuable experience and knowledge to contribute to the CRD Regional Parks Strategic Planning process. The members are closely connected with park users in the region and are aware of user concerns, needs and issues. They are also in contact with elected officials in their respective jurisdictions and are able to share the concerns and issues related to parks that may have been expressed by the public to their elected officials. Taken all together, the IGWG provided valued insight into the development of a credible CRD Regional Parks Strategic Plan.

The IGWG has met on three occasions as part of the process to provide advice and input to the Strategic Plan. The final and third meeting was held on May 26th, 2011. The members who attended provided feedback and advice on the draft CRD Regional Parks Strategic Plan with focus on the following topics:

- Overall Impressions of the draft Strategic Plan
- Vision Statement
- Mission Statements
- Management Goals
- Strategic Priorities.

The content developed at the third workshop is the subject of this report and has been analyzed and summarized below into key themes for each of the topics.

2. ANALYSIS AND SUMMARY OF RESULTS FROM THE IGWG WORKSHOP HELD ON MAY 26, 2011

2.1 Overall Impressions of the draft Strategic Plan

Kudos:

- Looks good; robust, clear vision and strategic directives; good focus/content;
- Good background – core to understanding the plan;
- Good discussion around regional trails;
- Very strategic, comprehensive, well written, good graphics/photographs;

- Compelling, bold ideas, futuristic, good branding, will encourage people to stay in Victoria and the region;
- Nice to see focus on potential regional parks west of Sooke River;
- Good recognition of need for off-road motorized recreational opportunities outside of regional parks;
- Good description of the need for a financial plan to compliment the Plan goals and the acquisition, land development and management needs which will flow from implementing the Plan.

Suggested Improvements/Concerns:

- Need better background discussion of the concept “nature needs half” (NNH) with references to related topics such as substantive completion, achievement of biodiversity given types of land involved (e.g. land trusts, types of protected areas, green spaces, hedgerows, etc.), the role of CRD in NNH, time frames, need to avoid public confusion with this initiative;
- Reference to an action plan for monitoring ecosystems is missing;
- Discussion of camping (front and back country) is weak;
- Suggest that a complimentary regional trail strategy and land acquisition strategy also be prepared;
- Concern that the proposed future establishment of regional parks/trails west of the Sooke River may conflict with current zoning, existing club programs and other types of long-established recreation;
- Concern about the growing shift of regional trail use from recreation to commuting resulting in the perceived loss of recreational use opportunities due to conflicting needs of the two user groups; highlights the need to specify improved education programs in the Strategic Plan about how trails should be used and the need for trail etiquette, mutual consideration and respect among user groups;
- Trail connectivity and trail standards (between municipalities) need more attention in the Plan;
- The potential development of Light Rail Transit (LRT) and its impact on the parks in the LRT corridor is a strategic issue that needs to be addressed in the Plan;
- The Plan needs larger maps with more informative bullets;
- There seemed to be redundancy in several areas which can distract from focusing on the information and strategies – consider a professional editor for the final edition.

- Regional Parks may wish to add more active, yet compatible, recreation opportunities in the mix of visitor uses currently proposed (e.g. more mountain biking, technical climbing, similar activities);
- Blue spaces (waterways) and urban forests are not address in the Plan.

2.2 Vision Statement

Kudos:

- Clear and comprehensive, good focus on ecological integrity, structure, function and restoration actions;
- Setting aside lands to protect key species and ecosystems is an important first step;
- Hits the mark, the content of the Plan follows the vision; suitably ambitious.

Suggested Improvements/Concerns:

- Given the Vision, the Plan needs to elaborate on how biodiversity, ecological integrity and related natural processes will be monitored and maintained;
- To achieve the Vision, Regional Parks will need good science, especially in the Coastal Douglas Fir Zone;
- The Vision may be perceived by some as weighted in favor of preservation versus recreation – there will be a need to balance this dynamic to ensure public and political support for the Plan;

2.3 Mission Statements

Suggested Improvements/Concerns:

- There is a need to provide context in the Plan for the unexpected reference to Metro Vancouver Regional Parks in the Mission (Stat. 2);
- Statements 3 and 12 need better definition in terms of what other agencies may be involved, funding and acquisition expectations, the role of maintenance and signage in achieving the Mission;
- Caution that achieving Ecological Integrity (Stt 4) may be beyond the fiscal and human resources that will be available to Regional Parks. The statement as written will establish public expectations that ultimately may not be possible to meet;

- Statement 5 – the reality is that there may be more of a focus on transportation (commuting) on some trails rather than a recreational and nature appreciation experience;
- Take care to maintain a balance in the use/preservation dynamic (e.g. soften statement 8);
- Statement 9 needs more clarity of intent regarding leadership and advocacy by Regional Parks;
- Provide more clarity in what the mutual expectations may be for collaboration with First Nations in park management (Stt 10).

2.4 Management Goals

Kudos:

- Goal 2 effectively links and supports cooperation between other protected areas agencies and managers;
- Interpretative signs lauded with advice to concentrate at trail heads and visitor centres to avoid visual disturbance of the natural landscape experience;
- Support for Goal 7 to remove invasive plants (caution - invasive animals will be much more challenging to deal with effectively);
- Praise for the involvement of youth/university students in the Strategic Plan process as it helps achieve educational experience (Goal 10).

Suggested Improvements/Concerns:

Protecting the Natural Environment Goals (Thirteen Goals)

- The Management Goals section seems to emphasize natural environment preservation over compatible visitor use with almost three times as many natural environment goals as visitor use/facility goals;
- Goal 1 could be understood to capture Goals 5, 6, and 7 - check for redundancy;
- Goal 3 – note that Coastal Douglas Fir ecosystems are rare and poorly represented in various regional protected areas while the proposed expansion of Regional Parks in the area west of Sooke will mainly protect Western Hemlock ecosystems that are already well represented in protected areas, therefore, focus is needed on ecosystems that are most at risk of disappearing;

- Need to rationalize Goals 4 and 5 with ongoing wildfire suppression programs;
- Goal 5- add “where feasible” so that the goal can ultimately be achieved;
- Goal 8 – clarify whether Regional Parks will be supporting research by others (e.g. universities) or establishing research as a Regional Parks function – there is a large cost difference;
- Management Goals 12 and 13 could be combined as currently written – differentiate more carefully.

Cultural Features (One Goal)

- Clarify the type of cultural resources being considered (Archaeological, First Nations sites, built heritage, historical landscapes?).

Visitor Use Activities (Two Goals)

- Camping mentioned, but, there is also a need for water access facilities (kayaks etc.) and goals for trails;
- Assess the supply of camping opportunities on a regional basis then fill the gaps with camping facilities that most closely meet the mission of Regional Parks;
- Goals are needed on managing mixed use trails, balancing transportation with recreation on the Galloping Goose and Lochside Regional Trails – clarification on the purpose of trails would be appropriate in a Strategic Plan.

Facilities Goals (Three Goals)

- More emphasis needed on accessibility needs;
- Goal 3 - Don’t foreclose your options for permanent commercial facilities as they are often provided most effectively by the private sector which needs certainty of time frames to recoup capital expenditures (e.g. national parks allow 10 year licenses or 42 year leases for commercial facilities depending on zoning).

2.5 Strategic Priorities

Suggested Improvements/Concerns:

- The six Strategic Priorities seem unrelated to the previous full page of natural environment management goals;
- Add a priority that recognizes environmental protection;

- Statement 4 needs to be more specific.

3. SUMMARY COMMENTS

The Intergovernmental Working Group was generally very impressed with the scope and the forward looking, robust vision that the draft Strategic Plan presents for the future of Regional Parks. It is deemed to be the logical and necessary progression from the 2000 - 2010 Master Plan given the environmental issues, visitor use opportunities and evolving demographics of the Capital Region.

Several areas for improvement and clarification were also identified for consideration by the Citizens Advisory Panel and the staff of CRD Regional Parks.

Some members of the IGWG have already or will provide editorial comments or corrections for the text of the draft Strategic Plan. These have been or will be submitted to the CRD Regional Park planners under separate cover.

APPENDIX I - MEMBERS OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL WORKING GROUP

Andy Katschor, Township of Esquimalt

Frank Ullmann, Min. of Community, Sport and Cultural Development

Rae Roer, District of Saanich

Brian Robinson (Jane Waters), District of North Saanich

Sheila Mackay, District of Metchosin

Katherine Lesyshen, District of Sooke

Ron Hamilton, Juan de Fuca Electoral Area

Kees Ruurs, Salt Spring Island

Kate Emmings, Islands Trust

John Cunningham, Town of Sidney

Mike Leskiw, City of Langford

David Speed, City of Victoria

Dan Biggs (Calvin Ross) (By Telephone), Min. of Forest, Lands and Natural Resource Operations

Christopher Coates, District of Highlands

Bonnie McKenzie (Bruce Greig), District of Central Saanich

Lorne Middleton, District of Oak Bay

Dave Podmoroff, Town of View Royal

Jaime Hilbert (Brett Hudson), Ministry of Environment

Wayne Bourque, Parks Canada

Larry Hutchings, Sooke Parks and Recreation

Note: not all members or their alternates (Name) were able to attend each workshop.

Salt Spring Island Electoral Area Director Garth Hendren's Comments

I would like to see section(s) on trails punched- up with respect to Salt Spring and the Southern Gulf Islands. In particular Salt Spring Island is working on upgrading its plan now. So, looking at the document I would like to make the following suggestions:

Section 5: The Proposed Regional Parks and Trails System

CRD Parks will have a number of roles in bringing the proposed trail system into being, including:

1. It will advocate that the system be established.
2. CRD Parks will coordinate the establishment of the system.
3. It will seek cooperative agreements or other partnership arrangements with public agencies, municipalities or private organizations for the planning, funding and operation of the system. This will include the major regional trail route on Salt Spring and the southern Gulf islands.

Section 6: Managing Regional Parks and Trails

Refers to the Galloping Goose Regional Trail as being "a key link in the entire cycling network." Add "Connections with this trail are proposed for Salt Spring and the Outer Gulf Islands."

Section 7: Implementation Strategy

1. Strategic Direction2: Acquire additional land for regional parks and trails...some priorities are Ford Lake/Cusheon Lake/Fulford Creek on Salt Spring Island.
2. Under the same heading with a separate bullet:
 - a. initiate planning and consultation process to establish the following areas as regional parks and trails:
 - i. Salt Spring Island Regional Trail
 - ii. A few other Salt Spring land references