







Mount Geoffrey 2015 Survey Responses

1.a) Park Vision - Mount Geoffrey Regional Nature Park

Response	Chart	Percentage	Count
Yes		81.7%	49
No		0.0%	0
Agree with some components		18.3%	11
Total Responses			60

The 19 further comments to this question can be found in the appendix.

1. b) Park vision - Mount Geoffrey Escarpment Provincial Park

Response	Chart	Percentage	Count
Yes		69.5%	41
No		8.5%	5
Agree with some		22.0%	13
Total Responses			59

The 16 further comments to this question can be found in the appendix.

2 . Mount Geoffrey Key Values

The 16 further comments to this question can be found in the appendix.

3. Trail Network

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Don't know	Total Responses
1. Focus on maintaining existing trail system rather than expansion.	48 (80.0%)	7 (11.7%)	4 (6.7%)	1 (1.7%)	60
2. If new trails are needed, use environmental, safety and connectivity criteria to evaluate options.	54 (88.5%)	5 (8.2%)	2 (3.3%)	0 (0.0%)	61

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Don't know	Total Responses
3. Decommission and sign user created trails that require closure.	26 (43.3%)	9 (15.0%)	20 (33.3%)	5 (8.3%)	60
4. If a suitable route can be found, consider building a trail between Shingle Spit Trail and the upper trails.	47 (77.0%)	9 (14.8%)	3 (4.9%)	2 (3.3%)	61

The 26 further comments to this question can be found in the appendix.

4. Maps and Signs

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Don't know	Total Responses
1. Update trail map.	42 (71.2%)	11 (18.6%)	4 (6.8%)	2 (3.4%)	59
2. Improve orientation within the trail system by providing suggested routes of varying distances, maps at key entrances and junctions, signs and/or symbols marking trail routes.	33 (56.9%)	15 (25.9%)	8 (13.8%)	2 (3.4%)	58
3. Maintain natural and local character (e.g. local names, non-obtrusive signage, etc.)	54 (91.5%)	3 (5.1%)	2 (3.4%)	0 (0.0%)	59

The 20 further comments to this question can be found in the appendix.

5. Trail Map

	Response
1. Do you have comments or additional suggestions for the trail map?	The 18 responses to this question can be found in the appendix.
2. Are there other trails that should be mapped and become part of the formal trail network? Please explain.	The 10 responses to this question can be found in the appendix.
3. Are there any trails that should not be mapped? Please explain.	The 9 responses to this question can be found in the appendix.

The 11 further comments to this question can be found in the appendix.

6. Recreational Experience

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Don't know	Total Responses
1. Confirm trail designations on updated trail map (hiking only, hiking and biking, multi-use).	50 (83.3%)	6 (10.0%)	4 (6.7%)	0 (0.0%)	60
2. Reinforce existing culture of respect with park information materials.	49 (81.7%)	11 (18.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	60
3. Maintain restrictions on motorized use.	55 (90.2%)	3 (4.9%)	3 (4.9%)	0 (0.0%)	61
4. Continue dogs on-leash in the provincial park and off-leash in the regional parks and on Crown lands except where trails approach the provincial park.	34 (56.7%)	8 (13.3%)	16 (26.7%)	2 (3.3%)	60

The 23 further comments to this question can be found in the appendix.

7. Park Improvements

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Don't know	Total Responses
1. Priorities for park improvements are: maintain/upgrade existing trails and improve signage and maps.	50 (83.3%)	7 (11.7%)	3 (5.0%)	0 (0.0%)	60
2. Minimize picnic tables and benches.	47 (77.0%)	7 (11.5%)	6 (9.8%)	1 (1.6%)	61
3. Monitor park use and the need for outhouses and additional parking. If they are required, work with local park committees to identify appropriate locations.	46 (75.4%)	8 (13.1%)	7 (11.5%)	0 (0.0%)	61

The 21 further comments to this question can be found in the appendix.

8. Natural Environment

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Don't know	Total Responses
1. Use local, scientific and cultural knowledge to fill information gaps.	44 (75.9%)	11 (19.0%)	3 (5.2%)	0 (0.0%)	58
2. Include information on ecological values, sensitive ecosystems and ecological processes in park information materials.	48 (81.4%)	6 (10.2%)	5 (8.5%)	0 (0.0%)	59
3. Work with local park committees and other partners to develop interpretive/educational materials.	46 (78.0%)	10 (16.9%)	3 (5.1%)	0 (0.0%)	59
4. If interpretive signs are developed for the park, maintain Mount Geoffrey's natural character.	49 (83.1%)	8 (13.6%)	2 (3.4%)	0 (0.0%)	59
5. Identify, monitor and remove invasive species.	46 (78.0%)	10 (16.9%)	3 (5.1%)	0 (0.0%)	59
6. Provide information on the ecological impact of various activities such as removing downed trees and other natural resources.	38 (64.4%)	16 (27.1%)	5 (8.5%)	0 (0.0%)	59
7. Consider possible effects of climate change and manage parks to facilitate adaptation of vulnerable species.	39 (68.4%)	15 (26.3%)	3 (5.3%)	0 (0.0%)	57
8. Evaluate the pros and cons of adding foreshore adjacent to the provincial park (excluding existing tenures and accesses).	40 (69.0%)	13 (22.4%)	2 (3.4%)	3 (5.2%)	58
9. Ensure best practices in trail construction and maintenance.	53 (89.8%)	3 (5.1%)	2 (3.4%)	1 (1.7%)	59
10. Encourage continuation of the common visitor practice to stay on trails.	48 (81.4%)	9 (15.3%)	2 (3.4%)	0 (0.0%)	59

The 11 further comments to this question can be found in the appendix.

9. Wildfire Risk Management

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Don't know	Total Responses
1. Continue existing practices to reduce risks (helicopter landing sites and ponds for fire fighting, wide trails as breaks for ground fires, public education, monitor ladder fuels, etc.)	59 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	59
2. Maintain park regulations prohibiting camping and campfires.	59 (98.3%)	1 (1.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	60
3. Identify other measures for fire prevention in cooperation with the Hornby Island fire department and provincial wildfire prevention authorities.	57 (96.6%)	1 (1.7%)	1 (1.7%)	0 (0.0%)	59

The 10 further comments to this question can be found in the appendix.

10. First Nation Cultural Values

The 14 further comments to this question can be found in the appendix.

11. Orchard and Leaf House

	Response
1. What are your thoughts on a vision for this part of the provincial park?	The 25 responses to this question can be found in the appendix.
2. Please leave us your contact information if you are interested in volunteering to develop and implement a vision for the Leaf House and orchard.	The 7 responses to this question can be found in the appendix.
3. Please leave us your contact information if you are interested in volunteering to assist with maintenance in this part of the park.	The 9 responses to this question can be found in the appendix.

12. Regional Park Addition: Conservation Covenant Area

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Don't know	Total Responses
1. Retain field/forest edge habitat and control Canada thistle and other invasive plants by mowing the field once or twice a year.	45 (78.9%)	7 (12.3%)	2 (3.5%)	3 (5.3%)	57

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Don't know	Total Responses
2. Inventory native plants and animal species found within the conservation covenant area.	36 (63.2%)	16 (28.1%)	3 (5.3%)	2 (3.5%)	57
3. Prepare a site management plan to protect native species and to control invasive species.	43 (75.4%)	11 (19.3%)	2 (3.5%)	1 (1.8%)	57
4. Manage recreational use to minimize impact on the natural environment.	39 (69.6%)	9 (16.1%)	6 (10.7%)	2 (3.6%)	56

The 8 further comments to this question can be found in the appendix.

13. Crown Land Management

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Don't know	Total Responses
1. The CVRD, through the Regional Parks Committee, will continue to manage the Crown lands for recreation and the natural environment.	43 (74.1%)	10 (17.2%)	3 (5.2%)	2 (3.4%)	58

The 16 further comments to this question can be found in the appendix.

14. Future of the Crown Lands




	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Don't know	Total Responses
1. In the short term, seek legal designation of the Crown lands and enter into a partnership agreement with the Province.	36 (61.0%)	12 (20.3%)	7 (11.9%)	4 (6.8%)	59
2. Explore other options to secure long-term protection of the Crown lands.	46 (79.3%)	8 (13.8%)	2 (3.4%)	2 (3.4%)	58

15. Please provide any other comments you may have.





The 11 responses to this question can be found in the appendix.

16. Demographic Information

Residence

Response	Chart	Percentage	Count
Year-round Hornby resident		45.9%	28
Seasonal/part-time resident		37.7%	23
Visitor		16.4%	10
		Total Responses	61

Age group

Response	Chart	Percentage	Count
12 years or older		0.0%	0
13 - 20 years		0.0%	0
21 - 35 years		11.5%	7
36 - 50 years		23.0%	14
51 - 65 years		44.3%	27
66 years and older		21.3%	13
		Total Responses	61

Appendix – Written Comments

Note: Not everyone who responded to the questions above also left comments.

1. a Park Vision - Mount Geoffrey Regional Nature Park	
1.	Too much of a static approach and not enough openness to economic opportunities. What if we wanted to install some wind turbines, or create a community water reservoir? This vision makes it sound like we are sitting on precious High Conservation Value habitat, when most of the system is post-logged and could anchor sizeable opportunities for sustainable infrastructure.
2.	We need to haul out the blow-down. We need to clear the areas near homes.
3.	Natural, no cell phone towers or other EMF producing structures
4.	The mountain biking is excellent and I look forward to preserving the fun hiking and biking trails.
5.	Do not wish it to be integrated with the crown lands
6.	First Nations? That makes me a little uneasy...will they be given special endowments?
7.	What is meant by "low impact cycling"? I am skeptical about how low impact cycling is in sensitive ecosystem areas. I feel like the qualifier "low impact" is not based on anything real and is just misleading. Will there be signs restricting people to walk/bike "low impact"? How are these "low impact" trails going to be any different than trails for regular walking/biking?
8.	Point 4 has a typo. Should be "...to protect or restore...".
9.	It will be important acquire the Crownland Trails area as an addition to the existing park areas in order to provide certainty that these valuable areas will be protected into the future. Otherwise, they will become vulnerable to commercial predation.
10.	I feel the recreation aspect is equal in value to the ecosystem as what this ecosystem description describes is most of the forested areas of Vancouver Island and is not a unique ecosystem.
11.	Trail network for walking and dog walking
12.	Concerned about the lack of clarity and implications of the First Nations reference.
13.	The adjacent crown lands should be brought into either regional or provincial park.
14.	What is the definition of "low impact" in #2 and why limited to only "mountain" biking? Does low impact mean no structures, except to facilitate a crossing or to protect/restore an area, can be constructed in the park for these listed users? Also, dogs not in control can cause impacts to the wildlife and habitat.
15.	More signs are needed for hikers. For example, at the Euston road entrance there is no signage to differentiate the summit trail from the bench trail etc.
16.	More signs are needed for hikers. For example, at the Euston road entrance there is no signage to differentiate the summit trail from the bench trail etc.
17.	Looks to be a well considered vision, with open access and opportunities for all types of users.

- | |
|---|
| 18. Existing trail network is suitable. |
| 19. Mountain biking is a big part of the popularity of this park and this must be recognized in any plan. |

1.b Park vision - Mount Geoffrey Escarpment Provincial Park	
1.	Too much of a static approach and not enough openness to economic opportunities. What if we wanted to install some wind turbines, or create a community water reservoir? This vision makes it sound like we are sitting on precious High Conservation Value habitat, when most of the system is post-logged and could anchor sizeable opportunities for sustainable infrastructure.
2.	It seems like we need to create a plan to keep our island green. This means we need to deal with underbrush close to homes. And blow down.
3.	I am not entirely sure what is meant by "low impact cycling". The escarpment has been known for its challenging mountain biking trails and it is important to me as a property owner that the trails stay open for mountain biking.
4.	Do not wish that integration of management take place as this may create an obvious conflict of interest at some point in time.
5.	I do not like any group to have special privileges within a public park. This First Nation business makes me nervous. My parents have a cabin on the Nahatlatch. The First nations won the bid to provide wood to the campsites. The next year they blockaded the road. There were literally guns. I think special rights for any group is asking for trouble.
6.	What is meant by "low impact cycling"? I am skeptical about how low impact cycling is in sensitive ecosystem areas. I feel like the qualifier "low impact" is not based on anything real and is just misleading. Will there be signs restricting people to walk/bike "low impact"? How are these "low impact" trails going to be any different than trails for regular walking/biking?
7.	Points 1 - 6 should be the same wording as for Mount Geoffrey Regional Nature Park.
8.	Again, I put a higher value on recreation and don't agree with the low impact cycling and walking aspect. I find this very annoying that this is even be considered for low impact. It is highly valued for Cycling, walking, running and horse back riding.
9.	Concerned about the lack of clarity and implications of the First Nations, Leaf House and Ford family references.
10.	#2 is a change and I don't agree with the "small" number, and the omission of biking. I'd also like to see some selective clearing of downed trees for use for locals as firewood, which would also help minimize potential fire hazards.
11.	A First Nations values incorporation seems a bit unnecessary as the tribe likely focused on coastal areas, not inland.
12.	The crown lands mentioned should be brought into either regional or provincial park.
13.	Maintain Leaf House

14.	As above - well considered and participative.
15.	Trail maintenance volunteers seem to be important partners.
16.	Should include an enhanced active transportation (walking and cycling) corridor between Ford Cove and Shingle Spit to make this connection relatively quick and easy and to replace automobile trips on the island.

2. Mount Geoffrey Key Values	
1.	I think the committee is not taking into consideration comments from the first round. Much of Mount Geoffrey holds tremendous timber and non-timber forest product values; economic potential for biomass, energy, and water security (as in "used", not "un-accessible". An ecosystem-based management plan could be prepared that leaves more room for humans to be part of the ecosystem's maintenance in an active manner rather than being mere observers of it.
2.	Humans who live near or in the midst of the park. We need firewood. We need to be warm and it makes no sense to TRUCK wood in from Vancouver island. We need to consider the humans.
3.	Can't think of anything more. Looks like you've "covered all the bases".
4.	We locals use the mountain year round. Many people walk the trail with their dogs. It is a meet-and-greet kind of trail. In the off season it is rare to see a bike up there. I have heard rumor that there will be a leash law. Really? Not a good idea to state laws that can't be enforced.
5.	Community access to firewood on crown land in designated areas or by permit
6.	Recreation value includes dog walking, for many of us that is all our recreation!
7.	Promotion and provision of natural spaces supporting wildlife, insects and birds. Natural interpretation and education should be promoted. Support to Hornby Island Tourism and economic development and independence. Preservation of natural spaces that restrict development.
8.	The Calypso Orchids seem to flower right next to the trail. There was no sign of them on the Outer Ridge where I had seen them the previous year - probably wiped out by bike or feet. I did see them on the Middle Bench. Perhaps these areas could be identified and roped off.
9.	A non-gasoline dependent way of connecting the island. ie. walking, biking as a transportation route.
10.	Cooperation among user groups
11.	Spiritual values: communion with nature. What about food harvesting? Berries & mushrooms.
12.	Family oriented activities
13.	Low key, efficient active transportation along more direct routes that can replace auto trips, the primary example of which is the Ford Cove - Shingle Spit connection.

14.	Rainfall capture is a critical one based on the prediction for climate change.
15.	Nature Appreciation, including mainting a peaceful, (not noisy) natural setting.
16.	motorized recreational vehicle use on crown land

3. Trail Network	
1.	We need to make the trails a priority. There is money out there. Lets get some, and lets make the trails workable. We need them.
2.	Engage community volunteerism around park maintenance. I would certainly do some work parties in the spring / fall as I actively use the park and trail system.
3.	Allow volunteers to clean trails as needed. Many already do at risk of breaking laws
4.	I often take a bag with me to pick up gargage...I wonder how this could be encouraged.
5.	Focus on fostering community engagement. Involve and educate new community members. Have a park/trails event? Recognize community members for contributions/volunteering effort. Maybe have a sponsored trail type of system similar to the adopt a highway mile program?
6.	There are no user created trails requiring closure.
7.	<p>There should be a space to accommodate new user built trails within the park management strategy. User built trails are created in response to evolving user base and user needs within the park, and should be reviewed on a case by case basis. Relying on the CVRD to anticipate evolving park user needs on Hornby Island is a lagging strategy and not a best practice.</p> <p>If user created trails continue to become a problem, a more clear and streamlined process to permit communicate members to create new trails in a safe and environmentally friendly way should be explored.</p>
8.	Involve local community volunteers. Try an "adopt-a-trail" approach that would see different local individuals/groups of trail users responsible for minor upkeep and monitoring. Significant upkeep requirements could be referred to the Parks Committee for contractor attention. This would also provide a large network of people monitoring the appropriate use of the trails and able to report problems & problem users.
9.	These trails have been around along time, why is there concern over sustainability when they have been developed and maintained by
10.	The well trodden trails will remain, marginal ones will grow back into bush
11.	Strongly agree with #4
12.	Organized Volunteer trail maintenance crews
13.	Education signage, at park entrances, to stay on existing trails.
14.	Some of our best trail builders do it "off the cuff", in fact that is the origin of the trail network. I would not like to see these people reprimanded. They should be thanked.
15.	Keep it simple and work on reducing erosion.

16.	partnerships with user groups ie. Comox District Mountaineering Club, horse and bike riders, local hikers
17.	Educational boards at entrances to inform users. Is enforcement an option for both education and enforcing activities?
18.	Some existing trails (Test Tube being a key example) have very loose sections that should probably be re-routed to provide lower-maintenance options, to reduce the long-term maintenance requirements that the current fall-line-into-unbanked-corner sections have.
19.	have volunteer train maintenance days. The mountain bike community is know for this and if they were organized in the summer, visitors could be involved as well.
20.	Limit number of people using trails
21.	Closure of "unofficial" trails may be difficult to "enforce" generally; perhaps ecological and safety education could be used to discourage new trails in sensitive areas and promote safety. Yes, there is a limit to the number of trails (consider "crop" rotation?)
22.	Have park staff meet with volunteers (HIMBA?) to plan work to be done, provide guidance on ecological and safety factors.
23.	Enlist volunteer trail users to help with maintenance, e.g. removing dead-falls, clipping back intruding salal, etc.
24.	Volunteers
25.	There are many HIMBA volunteers who do a very good job of maintaining the trails. We built most of the single track trails and love to maintain them as we are locals and use them year round for mountain biking. At this point we don't need to rely on the limited monies of the park system to ensure sustainability because we have lots of local volunteer energy. If tourism gets out of control, it may be a problem in the future and perhaps some trails may need to be unmapped and maybe even unsigned for the busy summer, so that the bulk of tourists stay on the sustainable trails . I don't necessarily think it's a good idea to map and sign all the trails for tourists. They may need to be directed more towards the more safe and sustainable trails. Further to my multiple choice answers above - I think it's important to maintain existing trails but not 'rather than' expansion. A few new trails might be nice, especially some more advanced trails for mountain biking. I would not like to see trails decommissioned, but they don't need to be signed well if we don't want them overused. Deer make trails. Humans walk on trails which deer make. Humans walk in places where there are no trails. It's a natural setting and it is one of the joys of the mountain that we can access such a peaceful place. Sometimes it's nice to be able to be alone in a place that still has some 'wildness' to it. I would not want it to turn into a Helliwell where protecting bits of moss overrides the wonder and beauty of being able to walk off track in the bush. It is the rare person that likes to do this. So just allow it. I don't see it as necessary to decommission trails. Just don't mark them well. The tourists generally like to keep to the wide and well-marked trails. The locals who use the trails are relatively few, so let's not 'tame' the park and expect to keep it perfectly 'safe' at all times. It's unrealistic. We don't want it to become like so many others where it just becomes a tourist attraction without much sense of being a refuge away from the masses, and a natural haven.
26.	Keep crown land open to all

4. Maps and Signs	
1.	It's a trail system. Put the signs up already. The place gains nothing by being difficult to get around in.
2.	No more signs!
3.	They should not be developed further - current enhancements have gone far enough
4.	It's a small mountain on a small island. Every year tourists ask me how to get down to the beach. I recommend to them to use the force of gravity to propel themselves downwards which is guaranteed to bring you to a road somewhere. From that road you are no longer lost. Enjoy the trails as they are, have an adventure and get temporarily lost. It's in most cases not likely to kill you.
5.	I love the signs and the trail names. Would hate to see them changed to look like 'everywhere else'. Hornby is not so fond of generic signage.
6.	The new draft updated trail map has several errors and omissions that I have noted and sent in a previous email. Steve Mulhall
7.	better signage will lead to less user conflicts, better safety, and greater enjoyment for users new to the park. Think of a ski hill , signage makes the experience better.
8.	In spite of stated caution about "over-signage", the present signage needs improvement. Trails should be properly and thoroughly signed (with unobtrusive, rustic signs) at all key points - junctions, entry points. Otherwise, it's just confusing and misleading, especially for visitors.
9.	There are currently two primary maps, which provide conflicting information. They should be amalgamated and corrected along with aligning the trail signage with the revised map.
10.	Perhaps cyclists could be warned to watch out for pedestrians.
11.	The existing trail maps don't have a "you are here", and thus are confusing to newcomers. I personally added a red dot and "you are here" on the sign at the intersection of Summit trail and Beaver Slide trail.
12.	More signage at Euston is absolutely necessary.
13.	Some of the current signs have the 'you are here' in the wrong place, which could easily confuse new visitors
14.	More signage at Euston is absolutely necessary.
15.	I think the present maps that are posted, available at the bike shop, and on google maps are sufficient to navigate the trails. You are never really going to get lost on mount Geoffrey, as it is a small contained area. Part of the enjoyment is finding your way and linking trails that you like.
16.	Good maps at key locations - and recommendation of "photograph this map for reference"?
17.	Current style of trail name signs at intersections is good.

- | | |
|-----|--|
| 18. | The suggested Beulah creek loop should go up Slade connector, up coltsfoot, down Beulah. It's a shame that the newly worked logging railroad can't be included in this loop as they are all geared toward beginners and young families. |
| 19. | Visitors need adequate signs so they will feel comfortable hiking in the area. |
| 20. | I travel extensively and have hiked and camped all over the world. The parks in New Zealand for example are fabulous in part because they have well marked key hiking trails and huts. One goes off trail at one's own risk. The main focus is on enhancing the experience, with some focus on 'enhancing visitor safety' without allowing it to take precedence over maintaining the natural environment in a sustainable way. I think it's important for us to focus primarily on the visions statements; they don't say anything about 'safety'. I think this is good, because people can be encouraged to take responsibility for their own safety when they go out in nature. There will always be accidents; we can never stop them all. |

5. Trail Map.	
1) Do you have comments or additional suggestions for the trail map?	
1.	No -looks great!
2.	No. The trail map is good.
3.	Have apps available for mobile phones which can provide suggested routes while using a GPS.
4.	nope
5.	<p>The draft map has made changes to some trail names. Not sure why this has been done.</p> <p>e.g. Barney French Trail has become French Connection.</p> <p>Logging Railway has become Logging Railroad.</p> <p>Heli - 1 has become Pad Thai.</p> <p>The Way name should be added to Devil's Kitchen, Purgatory, Bitchin' Camero and Milo's Meadow.</p> <p>Rain Forest Loop is no longer a loop, so name should be changed accordingly.</p> <p>Katimavik is currently signed as Northwind at the Cliff Trail junction. This should be corrected.</p> <p>The trail joining Washing Machine and Chris and Brad's is No Horses.</p> <p>Genuine Draft is not yet connected to Strachan Trail, but it should be connected as shown on the draft map.</p> <p>It is the Shingle Spit to Ford Cove Trail according to the current signage, not the Ford Cove to Shingle Spit Trail.</p> <p>The trail from the end of Strachan Road to Bikefest Dual trail should be Strachan Trail.</p> <p>Bench Connector is actually on private land at the south end.</p>
6.	This map seems pretty comprehensive.

7.	Make difference between larger and smaller trails clearer - symbols too similar.
8.	There are currently two primary maps, which provide conflicting information. They should be amalgamated and corrected along with aligning the trail signage with the revised map.
9.	It is very detailed, but I find the satellite image (HI Mountain Bike Association) to be more attractive (topographical colour features)
10.	Trail length & difficulty should be noted on the map.
11.	Some elevation contours would help folks understand which trails will require significant uphill walking.
12.	No
13.	No
14.	I think the current map is sufficient.
15.	Placement of 1 Km scale between small and large scale maps could be confusing.
16.	Maybe indicate trail grade/direction on hills.
17.	Develop a connection between Shingle Spit and Middle Bench trails. Look at enhancing a very few key trails for active transportation (bike and walk). In addition to the obvious Ford Cove to Shingle Spit, also look at Strachan Rd area and Sandpiper area to recycling depot and community centre.
18.	I don't like the colored dot system. It is much easier just to see a coloured line to indicate usage. For example: Green for bike and hike; Yellow for the smaller portion which is bike, hike and equestrian; Red for the tiny bit which is bike only; and Black for the tiny bit which is hike only. Most of the trails would then be green...so easy to see and understand that way. I've seen many maps done with coloured lines. I find the dots very difficult to see at a glance and it takes much longer to find the route that way. Also, could the trail names please be in black? I don't take my glasses mountain biking with me, and before I knew the trails well I used to carry a map but it was SO hard to read the names in white.

5. Trail Map	
2) Are there other trails that should be mapped and become part of the formal trail network. Please explain.	
1.	No
2.	No, none that I am aware of.
3.	The west loop of Summit Trail around the old gravel pit should be added. The north branch of Hidden Valley Trail should be added. The two trails between Beulah Creek Trail and Coltsfoot Trail should be added.
4.	I love the teddy bear picnic trail between foot of slick Rock and Beulah. It is a ghost trail.
5.	I agree that a route from Shingle Spit trail to the upper trails should be investigated.
6.	No

7.	No
8.	no
9.	not aware
10.	No, I think it's fine to leave some unsigned and unmapped, but ONLY if all the trails on the map are well signed at junctions. If this is not the case then all trails must be mapped, even if not named on the map, so that people can find the trail they're looking for by referencing other trails.

5. Trail Map
3) Are there any trails that should not be mapped? Please explain.

1.	No
2.	Trails to peoples homes.
3.	Most trails that should not be mapped are difficult to find anyway and usually lead you to marijuana which is not something that should be found by the wrong people.
4.	No. It is unsafe to omit existing trails from the map.
5.	No
6.	No
7.	No
8.	Not aware
9.	Not sure, but I do think there are a small number of steep and frequently used single track trails (two examples are 'Devil's Kitchen' and 'No Horses'), which could perhaps be designated as 'bike only' trails. Having them be multi-use is more or less the same as allowing snow-shoe-ers to use already existing downhill ski and boarding areas of an alpine resort. It doesn't happen. Skiers and mountain bikers move very quickly on the downhill so it doesn't mix well with hiking. There are plenty of hiking/biking/multi-use trails which are much more pleasant to use for hiking than the very few steep ones I mention above. It's a controversial topic and certainly there are many times more bikers on the trails than hikers, and hardly any equestrians, so it hasn't been a problem at all really. Perhaps just having a few cautionary signs at the entrances to these trails would suffice, such as 'High-speed downhill bikes on this trail, use caution'.

5. Trail Map - Other comments

1.	Signage. More signage. It feels elitist and snobby to me that only "certain" people have an easy time up there.
2.	The trail map is excellent!
3.	Sorry I don't have time right now to give this proper attention.

4.	A few planned out routes with signage (symbols/colours) would help newcomers, it's a very confusing system at the moment with lots of little connector trails.
5.	Helpful and clear
6.	Signs on the trails should correspond with the names on the trail map
7.	Signs on the trails should correspond with the names on the trail map
8.	Have noticed improvements this year in designating levels, etc. Well done.
9.	HIMBA trail map is a fund raiser...can this purpose be preserved?
10.	What is the 2 year old ride around built on coltsfoot just past the slickrock exit called?
11.	One interesting thing which could be done is to designate one or two of the very popular downhill biking routes (such as 'The Way' (Devil's Kitchen, Purgatory, BC) as downhill only. That way there would never be a hiker or biker coming up. They might still be multi-use going down, but it would cut down on the uphill traffic. Perhaps the map could encourage use of the wider trails for uphill use.

6. Recreational Experience	
1.	How are you currently enforcing dog policies?
2.	We need signs to tell us where we are going. Not so many signs to tell us what to do.
3.	When walking about, it is very difficult to ascertain whether you are on or off Provincial park limits. This makes having a leashed dog problematic when crossing from off leash boundary to leash required boundary without any actual physical reference to indicate this. How about a report system for people encountering dogs that are behaving poorly. A good dog is never a problem leashed or otherwise. A timid or aggressive dog should remain leashed at all times. My .02
4.	I walk almost daily and year round with my neighbor and her dog. There have been only a couple of run-in's that were promptly settled by the dogs. It is my feeling that the bikes on the trail in the summer are more of a menace than the dogs! They go really fast and think they have total right of way. Why not have a bike bell law? I am serious! Institute a law that every bike have a bell to announce it's approach. See how that goes over.
5.	There is no need to have dogs on leash in the provincial park.
6.	I would like to see dogs on leashes in all areas.
7.	Dogs should be on-leash in all park and trail areas. The safety and enjoyment of the areas by people is the purpose of our recreation areas and there should be no risk (however slight) to people by dogs off-leash. There should be NO motorized use of any of these recreation areas, and this is another important reason to bring the crown land trails area into park status. il
8.	I believe these areas have been used primarily as off leash and am happy for them to continue this way. I don't see a need for leashes. I am a regular user and have not had any problems while on the trails.
9.	Dogs should be allowed off leash in the whole area, provincial park section also

10.	All areas in question should be designated off leash as is the 'real' current practice. Without enforcement, dogs will continue to be off-leash.
11.	Most of the year there's no body on the trails, dogs/dog owners should be allowed some freedom.
12.	The dog walkers are the main users for 10 months of the year
13.	dogs always on leash
14.	Dogs should be on-leash in both parks to protect habitat & wildlife and reduce interactions walkers.
15.	The mix of on- and off-leash isn't clear - either settling on all-leashed or updating signs would help.
16.	Trail designation should only be when it is too dangerous for one of the user groups and there is an alternate trail nearby.
17.	Have had some issues with dogs off leash on trails (dogs with bikers or hikers). Difficult to dodge a snapping dog when descending!
18.	On-leash restriction in provincial park is result of a short-sighted provincial policy that is not context sensitive. Let's just live with it, but not bend over to accommodate it by imposing leash requirements "approaching" provincial park.
19.	Dogs off leash do far less damage to habitat than mountain bikes. Most dogs trot along the trail, they're not running through the forest.
20.	Don't rebuild Dylan's drop because of safety concerns. The chance of a collision is less that getting hit by lightening during a full moon in a month that starts with the letter A.
21.	Unfortunately some dog owners seldom have their dogs on a lease & that has caused problems when my wife & I (year residents) have been on the trails.
22.	I really don't like to hear and smell motorized traffic on the beautiful mountain trails. They do extensive damage to the trails; more in one run sometimes, than 20 years of mountain biking usage. Re: dog usage - I'm rather shy of off-leash big dogs jumping around and barking at me and chasing my bike, while the owner could be 25 meters away. Perhaps it could be a policy that the owner must ensure that the dog remains in sight of the owner, and under control. If not, it must be leashed.
23.	as a representative of a small group of off road motorcyclests on hornby. Having been accosted and physically assulted numerous times on our crown land trails. its imperative we have a safe place to recreate. some of us have mobility issues that would otherwise limit our ability to get out and enjoy our crown lands.

7.	Park Improvements
1.	Of course we need benches. Old people and people who struggle deserve to have sit-down places.This should be obvious.
2.	I agree that maintaining existing trails is necessary, and also basic upgrades in places. A better map ok - but once again no more signs.

3.	Don't monitor park use, no need for more outhouses or parking
4.	Small parking lots keep down the amount of people on the trails. In the summer months there are so many people up there anyway. A big parking lot makes for unmanagable use and confrontation...ie speeding bikes and kids. Crash!
5.	There should be some outhouses, probably at the entrances.
6.	there is a need for more public outhouses.
7.	These are natural, ecological recreation areas. Benches are fine, but picnic tables are completely unnecessary and an artificial encroachment on the ambience of the Island.
8.	I have liked the fact that we have a history of users building and maintaining trails and not having to pay someone to do all the work. Lets get back to volunteers helping! Reduce the tax burden don't increase it.
9.	We don't have the volume of users to warrant outhouses or picnic tables, this is Hornby's wild heart. Leave the picnic tables/outhouses for more 'tame 'areas.
10.	More outhouses at park entrances would be good. Parking is fine as is
11.	An outhouse at each of the main entrances would be appreciated.
12.	Outhouses should be provided at the most popular entrances. With the current absence of toilets, people are using 'nature' for all needs.
13.	I agree with minimal change and want to keep the park natural.
14.	an outhouse at the trailhead by Joe King would help a lot.
15.	The natural log benches are nice. Picnic tables will create garbage in park. Outhouses will entice overnight campers.
16.	Keep it natural, please.
17.	Benches should be located sensitively, but not "minimized". Many potential users haven't the physical ability to walk long distances without periodic rests and this should be accommodated with strategically placed benches. Outhouses should be included in the plan unless you are happy with users peeing and pooping in the woods. Suggest locating outhouses sparingly and strategically AWAY from trailheads accessibly be car where they will be of most use to active users and far enough away from car access to discourage vandalism (in my observation vandalism and littering increases exponentially with proximity to car access).
18.	Put all energies into maintaining and improving trails, not on picnic sites. Folks will go to the beaches for their picnics and I've never seen parking problems.
19.	The trails are for EVERYONE so a few benches would be nice for some individuals who would like to do a hike but need to rest periodically due to health or other problems.
20.	Occasional benches for enjoying a view would be welcome.
21.	Improving signage and maps isn't necessarily a priority for me.

8. Natural Environment	
1.	Management of downed trees to minimize wildfire risk is important. As well, there should be a strict no smoking or camping or campfires rule that is promoted and enforced.
2.	Stop trying to tell us we should not be removing the blow-down. It is obvious by now that it is a fire ladder. So is dry brush. A good clear out is a GOOD idea. Stop already with the artificial conservation.
3.	Total fire ban within park lands year round.
4.	I would strongly support adding foreshore (and offshore) marine habitat to the park.
5.	I have found some of your questions to not allow the answer that I would have chosen. If I disagree is it because I don't agree with the answers or the questions. Some of this is poorly worded.
6.	Part of the joy of a hike is to leave the trails. Bikers should stay on the trails.
7.	I don,t see many bush whackers. The user developed trails all meet hiker needs. They are excellent additions.
8.	I like the plan to include evaluating adding foreshore as the coastal processes shape the shoreline at the base of the park
9.	Surely this should say "natural environment" rather than "wildfire risk"? My comments: don't over-sign and/or over-regulate. Some of my "agrees" above are qualified - I don't support over-bearing actions and actions which substantially conflict with the historical community use of this wonderful resource.
10.	I notice #10 says 'visitor'. Does that mean non-local? If so, that's nice to see. Locals like to go off trail and since there are not many locals who do this, it's environmentally fine. But since there are starting to be many, many non-resident users of the park, (visitors), I think it's best to just encourage them to stay on the trails.
11.	the existing forest on hornby is by no means pristine the island has been clear cut twice since the late 1800's and early 1900's most of our trail are old logging roads, safe for all trail users. lets not discriminate against those users with motors participating in a healthy family sport.

9. Wildfire Risk	
1.	Haul out the fry brush.Haul out the blow-down. Clear critical areas near homes. Create buffer zones. It's time to be practical.
2.	This need to be a higher propriety, The access for fire fighting is growing in and needs to be kept open. Middle bench, and access to ponds
3.	There is a build up of wood fuel (fallen branches, downed trees) in this forest because there have been no recent natural fires. This fuel should be removed.
4.	Hornby island Fire Department and the Ministry of Forests should make the Wildfire plan public.

5.	Provide signage that explains prohibition on smoking and campfires in the recreation areas, and provide a phone number for trail users to report any unsafe conditions.
6.	Add a fourth strategy: 4. Reduce fuel load adjacent to trails.
7.	Ban smoking in all 'parkland' areas during July and August citing high fire hazard risk.
8.	Very important to discourage illegal camping if those users may light fires.
9.	Agreement to 3 qualified to measures which don't unreasonably disrupt normal use. It can certainly be argued that the suppression of naturally occurring wildfires had led to significant changes in our ecosystem and favoured some native and invasive species over other native species.
10.	A policy of 'no-smoking' on the mountain and trails during high fire-risk times could be enstated.

10. First Nation Cultural Values	
1.	Helliwell was not a permanent site. There is no freshwater there. The K'omoks would not set up permanent living without a water supply nearby.
2.	Important to have Native input re the stewardship of the lands.
3.	I have stated my opinion on indulging special interest groups.
4.	All of Helliwell Park and substantial parts of the Mt Geoffrey parks were formerly privately owned land. This should be kept in mind regarding First Nation claims. The status of First Nations claims to lands that have not been continuously held as Crown land has not yet been judicially determined.
5.	Explore the possibility of using a dual naming system (English/traditional K'omoks) in areas of cultural significance in and outside the park.
6.	It seems reasonable and respectful to incorporate the draft strategies above, but we should in no way accept or facilitate any potential First Nations claim to the area - it is for the use of all.
7.	It would be good to identify where the village at Helliwell was located. Perhaps a sign with information about the how the land was burned to increase camas and berry production , could be provided.
8.	It is not common knowledge that there was a permanent settlement in Helliwell Park. The common understanding is that Hornby was a seasonal stop, where is this "new" information coming from? The First Nation cultural values are as important as those of every other citizen, not more so.
9.	They are important~!
10.	None
11.	None
12.	Endorse research in this area and preservation of cultural sites.

13. Good to have involvement and cooperative management.
14. The above makes sense to me. I concur with the 4 points listed.

11. Orchard and Leaf House
1) What are your thoughts on a vision for this part of the provincial park?
1. The leaf house could be renovated and turned into a visitor info center
2. The orchard is a useful food source. The Leaf house was built to bio-degrade.
3. if feasible would be good to maintain the Leaf Houe
4. find a corporate sponsor that may help fund the costs of maintaining the orchard and leaf house
5. Continue to nurture the orchard for local gleaning purposes
6. Spend money on the park before the leaf house
7. This part of the park has significant values worth preserving.
8. It would be good to have a vision for these cultural items and to provide for their maintenance.
9. Sorry, no vision. It's ok if the leaf house rots, that's what happens here. i do appreciate that the orchard is mowed.
10. Would love to be able to visit the orchard and cemetery
11. Would love to be able to visit the orchard and cemetery
12. If there is not active community interest (ie a group willing to assume management on an on-going basis, let this area just return to nature.
13. Would like to see the orchard pruned and brought back to life. The Leaf House is so beautiful and it would be a shame to leave it to rot.
14. Good idea, difficult to sustain
15. I personally, do not have much interest in this area, and have only walked through once. I was not even aware of the Leaf House.
16. Not so impotant
17. contact user groups for help
18. If the house cannot be saved (and cost is an issue) then perhaps a sign/plaque with photos could be erected that provides its history.
19. Leaf House should be maintained
20. I don't often use this part of the park.
21. Agree it would be very had to preserve the Leaf House architecture; Basically it would need to be constructed anew
22. First I have heard of it in 25+ yrs of summer visits.

- | |
|--|
| 23. "No vision" pretty well sums up current myopic and budgetarily deficient BC Parks policies. These are important cultural and historical artifacts and should be preserved. |
| 24. Let it go. |
| 25. Yes, partner up with a community group to maintain Leaf House and Orchard. |

11. Orchard and Leaf House
2) Please leave us your contact information if you are interested in volunteering to develop and implement a vision for the Leaf House and orchard.
Seven people expressed an interest in volunteering. The contact information was deleted in this compilation of responses to protect individuals' privacy.

11. Orchard and Leaf House
3) Please leave us your contact information if you are interested in volunteering to assist with maintenance in this part of the park.
Nine people expressed an interest in volunteering. The contact information was deleted in this compilation of responses to protect individuals' privacy.

12. Conservation Covenant Area
1. Mow it a few times, then leave it alone. Maybe rip out the seedling trees that are threatening to take over the meadow.
2. Way too much stinging nettle in the area - needs to be removed.
3. Having paths, and allowing the public to see special areas, is the way to help educate and ensure people develop an appreciation for nature, and protecting it.
4. Quit regulating everything as a goal.
5. Plan for removal of invasive plants in the forested areas as well (blackberry, holly etc.)
6. Strong support for continued trail use
7. Recreational use - hiking and biking and what we use the park for. I would not like to see that 'managed' any more than it has been.
8. I think recreation would be fine if it is minimal impact. For example, a multi-use trail would be great through this area if possible.

13. Crown land management	
1.	Humans are part of nature and our needs (water, energy, wood, forest food) can enhance ecosystems - embrace it - we are no longer in a Descartian world!
2.	It is important that downed trees and standing dead trees be removed to lower fire hazard. Please reopen silviculture issue to identify options and process.
3.	I think we need to allow blow-down harvest.
4.	Hornby should become a member of BCCFA.CA and have community control and management of the crown lands for silviculture purposes
5.	Something should be done to remove excess fuel from downed trees and branches.
6.	There definitely should be no cutting of standing trees in the Crown forest. It might be advisable though to find some provision for supervised (possibly by a contractor or trained volunteer) removal of downed trees as long as there is no ecological value to their remaining as nurse logs, etc. Downed trees can present a fire hazard if left to accumulate.
7.	Pursue measures to address firewood removal and incursion of motorized vehicles.
8.	Do not support silviculture or any kind of logging for personal use or profit on these lands
9.	I have no problem with a managed forestry plan that allows local people to get firewood. Perhaps it could be done on certain days of the year, with people helping each other.
10.	I am concerned about too much meddling by non users.
11.	Adjacent crown lands should be added to either the provincial or regional park.
12.	Education at entrance signage and have the public observe, record and report.
13.	Tree cutting in the park should remain prohibited - unclear if that is actually being questioned here...
14.	Strongly advocate against firewood cutting being permitted on Mt. Geoffrey.
15.	No cutting or firewood should be allowed.
16.	please keep crown land accessible to ALL not everyone fits into the park user model, crown lands offer those of us who dont a place to recreate. right now we have a healty mix of crown and park land,for all groups to utilize.

14. Future of the Crown Lands / Please provide any other comments you may have.	
1.	We need to consider people as well as trees.
2.	This is extremely important, and I support it without reservation. In fact, ideally, the entire Crown land trail area should be made part the Parks.
3.	The Crown land should be protected with the same vision and objectives as the two parks, in consultation with First Nations.
4.	I don't want forest service rules to take over. I would like common courtesy rules to be spelled out. There is some conflict among user categories e.g. Mountainbikers and hikers. While I find it easy and natural to step off the trail for bikers. My hiking companion is a real

pain and thinks walkers get first consideration. It is ridiculous. The bikers built the trails. Mountain bikers are a good source of tourism. My walking partner thinks she is more important. I would like to wring her neck. Mostly everything works so well. No to leashing dogs please and yesto people stepping off the trail for bikes and horses.

5. Formal legal protection of adjacent crown lands and removal of invasive species are top priorities.

6. I have some doubts about any partnership with the current provincial government, as they have shown that they do not see park preservation as a priority.

7. Providing these do not result in restricted access.

8. Regarding item 14, above: preamble is hard to understand and possibly contains typos. More information on this is needed to warrant agreement with 1. My distrust of provincial parks policies is well-founded, and I would not support anything that gave them greater control over the regional park areas.

9. I think that we need more trails for family use, like coltsfoot, Beulah, logging railroad. Put them lower down on the hill, easy for young riders. I would like to see a trail along side coltsfoot and upper washing machine as well as below new section just below slick rock that includes large hills that you can easily roll over or bunny hop into a nice transition if you want. We need more beginner and intermediate jumps and ladders and interesting features like this to learn on before stepping up to yer mom and trails with bigger implications. Having trails like this lower on the hill ensures that beginner, and intermediate jumpers (whole families of tourists and locals alike) could all enjoy the same trails.

I also worry about going into partnership with the province will be adding a layer of bureaucracy to adding or maintaining the trail system.

10. I really appreciate that you have given us all the opportunity to give feedback and that you will consider such in your decision making process.

11. please keep crown land as crown land. Their are many on the island that would be left with no where to recreate if these lands are taken out of of crown distinction. unfortunately we are few in numbers and the least vocal. Please consider all users,not just the most vocal special interest groups who want nothing more than to turn the whole island into a park for the few restricting many.