

Appendix III: Summary of Public Consultation

The following is an overview of the results of the online and in-park surveys completed between 2015 and 2017, the 2016 open house survey, and the 2018 open house survey. The results of the surveys were used to support the drafting and refinement of this management plan.

This summary document, the questionnaires and the complete results are available for public review via: [WEBSITE URL](#)

Reminders for Interpreting Results

- The surveys were not intended to be statistically significant. The surveys were meant to provide the CVRD with a general sense of visitor use patterns, emerging issues and community values.
- Not all respondents provided a response to every survey question. In other instances, questions allowed respondents to select more than one response. This is important context when interpreting the results in percentages.
- Open-ended questions were analyzed using keyword analysis.

General Background

- The initial in-park survey was conducted between May 26, 2015 and August 15, 2015 on eleven separate days. In total, 149 in-park surveys were gathered.
- The initial online survey was available to the general public from July 2015 to March of 2017. In total, 141 online surveys were submitted.
- The first open house was held at the Huband Park Elementary School on January 20, 2016. A total of 70 surveys were gathered at this open house event. During this open house, small focus groups discussions were held to further explore public opinions related to park amenities, trail use, wayfinding and the natural environment.
- The second open house was held at the Huband Park Elementary School on May 16, 2018. A total of 64 participants attended this open house. During this open house a survey was presented to get feedback on the draft management plan and trail concept plan. This survey was also made available online from May 16th to July 3rd, 2018. A total of 182 paper and online surveys were received.

Initial In-Park and Online Survey (2015 – 2017) Background

- Approximately 90% of the in-park and online survey respondents indicated they were residents of the Comox Valley. Specifically, approximately 31% of respondents indicated they were residents of Electoral Area B (Lazo North), approximately 27% indicated they reside in the City of Courtenay, approximately 14% indicated they reside in the Town of Comox and approximately 10% indicated they are residents of Electoral Area C (Puntledge - Black Creek).
- Few respondents to the in-park and online surveys indicated they under the age of 35 (approximately 11%); the majority of respondents indicated they were over the age of

50 (approximately 72%) with the bulk of respondents indicating they were between the ages of 50 to 65 (approximately 56%).

In-Park and Online Survey (2015 – 2017) Results Summary

- When asked why they visit the park, most users indicated exercise (approximately 77%) while a majority also indicated that the park offers a place to de-stress and get away from it all (approximately 54%). Additionally, approximately 39% of respondents indicated they use the park to exercise their pet (dog or horse), approximately 31% use the park to observe wildlife, and approximately 29% use the park to meet up and spend time with family and friends.
- Reported uses for the park include walking, jogging, cycling and horseback riding. Specifically, the in-park and online surveys indicate approximately 51% of users walk the trails without a dog and approximately 40% walk the trails with their dogs. This is followed by approximately 24% of the visitors using the trails for jogging, approximately 18% for cycling and approximately 16% for equestrian use.
- In terms of frequency of use, the survey indicated that during the summer months half of all the respondents visited the park *at least* once a week (approximately 53% of respondents). Specifically, a quarter (approximately 25%) of survey respondents indicated they visited the park almost daily during the summer, while approximately 28% indicated they used the park once or twice a week and approximately 24% indicated they used the park once or twice a month. Frequency of use during the off-season are very similar.
- The majority of in-park and online survey respondents (approximately 70%) indicated they never experienced conflict with other users on the trails. Those users that did indicate some level of conflict indicated that it did not happen that often. Of those that provided additional comments on conflicts, approximately a third (32%) indicated concern with dogs (off leash, jumping up or not being under control); approximately 13% indicated conflict with cyclists (riding too fast, not announcing themselves and riding on non-cycling trails); and approximately 6% indicated conflict with horses.
- When asked what trails are used, approximately 41% of respondents indicated they used the trails on the water side of Bates Road and approximately 26% indicated they used most of the trails on the inland side of Bates Road. Specifically, the trails to the beach (approximately 38%), the swamp loop trail (approximately 35%) and the horse-bike loop (approximately 31%) appear to be the most popular park trails. Interestingly, approximately 20% of respondents indicated their trail use varies and approximately 13% indicated they used all the trails.
- In terms of park access, approximately 81% of survey respondents indicated they access the park by vehicle with approximately 63% indicating they came by single occupancy vehicle. That being said, approximately 31% of respondents indicated they access the park by means of active transportation (either by bike (approximately 20%) or by foot (approximately 11%)).
- The majority of respondents (approximately 69%) indicated that finding parking at the park can be difficult. This appears to be most problematic during weekends and during events at the Bates Road parking area. Some difficulties with horse trailer parking at Hardy Road was also mentioned.

- In terms of overall park satisfaction, most respondents (approximately 53%) rated the park a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being the highest rating. Approximately 75% of respondents rated the park at least 4.5 and approximately 96% rated the park at least a 4 out of 5. The mean of the responses was 4.6 with a standard deviation of 0.6.
- When asked what users like most about the park, many respondents referenced the trail network (approximately 18%), the beautiful of the natural environment and the vistas (approximately 17%) and peaceful and quiet setting (approximately 15%). Other park values that were considered important include: the forest (approximately 8%), the proximity of the park (approximately 7%), and the beach and ocean (approximately 6%). To a lesser degree the following park values were mentioned: diversity (approximately 4%), large size (approximately 4%), accessibility (approximately 3%) and the wildlife (approximately 3%). Some representative comments from the 242 responses received include:
 - Quiet, scenic, feels remote
 - Variety, ocean, wetland, dragonflies, flora, restorative
 - Calm, the ocean, good trails and it's close
 - Flat, easy walking, wide trails
 - It's a beautiful park for everyone to enjoy. I love riding my horse through the natural forest trails and always feel so relaxed and happy after our ride
 - A nice place to walk your dog and ride horses
 - Nice trails for walking, jogging or biking
 - Lots of opportunities for linking trails in different ways to get different perspectives. Remarkably quiet in the forest section of the park considering how close to town it is. The Barbara Way boardwalk and the new Grieve Trail have been great additions for accessibility.
 - Size, good trails, wildlife, relaxation, beach space
 - Beauty of huge ferns, tranquility of forest, refuge of beach
 - Variety of trails...easy to hard, dog friendly
 - Serenity
 - Proximity to home, "wild"
 - We are lucky to have such a beautiful natural area so close to town where we can recreate and enjoy nature
 - That there are still some places wild enough and not used too often that the bears can live in peace
- When asked about desired improvements they would like to see if the park, a range of responses were provided. Approximately 11% of respondents indicated they were completely satisfied with the park as-is and felt that no improvements were necessary. Of those respondents seeking improvements, the most desired improvement was for better directional signage (approximately 20% of respondents wanted to see better signage and wayfinding in the park). Other improvements mentioned include: more horse trails (approximately 9%), improvements to trail drainage (approximately 6%), better trail surfacing (approximately 5%), improved horse loop trail off Bates Road (approximately 4%), more bike trails (approximately 4%), improved parking (approximately 4%), need to address vehicular speeds on Bates Road (approximately 4%), better enforcement of park rules (approximately 3%) and additional park amenities such as more garbage cans (approximately 3%), more trails maps

(approximately 3%) and improvements to washroom facilities (approximately 4%). Some representative comments from the 199 responses received:

- More signs for people who are new to the park. It took us a long time to get to know how to get around.
- Better directional signage for new people. Traffic is too fast on Bates Road.
- Maybe some designated horse trailer parking?
- Quality of trails and signage
- I would like to see horse/bike trails expanded. There are many trails that are appropriate and could be used for horse/bike use.
- Make sure pedestrian trails are pedestrian only. No horses.
- Wheelchairs and strollers can't access inland side of Bates rd
- More trails opened for horses so we can do a loop without riding on Bates rd. Not asking for the Beach side or swamp loop.
- More parking at Hardy Road entrance and the main entrance. Also a crosswalk at the Bates road entrance to the swamp loop. As a driver, sometimes people seem to appear out of nowhere.
- Ensure the natural habitat continues to be a priority over human needs. Limit the development or improvement to the lesser used trails.
- I would like to see a couple more trash bins and dog poop bag dispensers
- Perhaps some of the low areas on some of the trails could be raised and fixed somehow so they won't flood when it rains
- Better parking strategy
- Keep it as natural as possible
- When asked what could be done to better protect the parks natural environment, respondents suggested more interpretive education materials (approximately 19%), signage indicating to stay on trails (approximately 10%), better drainage control (approximately 6%), more garbage cans (approximately 6%), reduction in the number of unmarked trails (approximately 5%), keeping dogs on leash (approximately 5%), keeping cyclists and horses off sensitive trails (approximately 5%), providing interpretive park stewards (approximately 5%), removal of invasive species (approximately 4%) and protecting Seal Bay Forest in perpetuity (approximately 3%). Some representative comments from the 134 received:
 - Efforts to identify invasive plants and signage to help people identify them. From there continually work to remove invasive plants.
 - Continue to keep motorized vehicles out, and insist that dogs be under control and confined to trails
 - Educate people that it is a natural habitat first then a park for people second
 - Have areas that are inaccessible. Regular presence to educate and maintain park.
 - I think nothing needs to be done – all is fine as is. There are enough rules in place currently.
 - Keep it a park forever and stop development around edges
 - Maintenance of good trail system will protect the rest of the park. I would like to see better signage.
 - Park interpretive stewards – guided tours
 - Signs that provide information about native plants and animals, reminders not to pick plants

- Reduce unmarked trails
- Continue reforestation, remove non-native species (e.g. Ivy), reintroduce native species of plants that are losing ground, discourage unplanned trail creation
- Keep everyone on designated trails and maintain trails
- Erosion control

Some comments provided from the 81 responses received when respondents were asked an open-ended question inviting additional comments or questions:

- This Park is absolutely wonderful, and should be a priority for protection and ensurance it's values for nature and wildlife observation are maintained. Consider creation of a strong volunteer stewardship program to encourage participation for the Comox Valley community to become stewards and work with park or regional staff to help maintain and preserve the experiences and facilities. Provide more educational signage regarding what can be seen in the park, wildlife safety and opportunities to volunteer. Maintain the dogs off leash rules the way they are, but in no way allow more freedom for this to occur. Encourage more use of the western side of the Park, by possibly putting parking on both sides of Bates road. Consider planning for longer terms rather than the 5 year models, (don't know what terms you are considering however) consider 10, 30, 50 years, and how it can be preserved and managed, think LONG term; we tend to think in too short a time frame when planning. Would be willing to participate in any opportunity to get involved with this park. I am so proud to have this so close to our urban community.
- Upgrade trail surfaces and drainage. Otherwise a very good park.
- It was on trip advisor but had trouble finding the park
- I would like to see all people share our park. It's huge with plenty of room for everyone. Horse people are running out of places to ride as logging roads are gated off and other areas are developed. I like that I can ride my horse without using my truck and trailer. I am very respectful of other park users and safety.
- Beautiful park that everyone should/can enjoy
- I want Seal Bay Park to be around for many future generations
- Great park and encouragingly good stewardship by the CVRD...my concern is simply to make it even better
- Speed zone (reduced speed limit) at parking area on Bates Road
- All parks need nice bathrooms. Thanks.
- A beautiful park that is getting busier every year. I think the time has come to ban horses.
- This is one of my favourite places to run and walk.
- I feel strongly that this park be maintained as a multiuse area that respects nature
- Keep park undeveloped and free of motorized vehicles

First Open House Survey (2016) Results Summary

- When asked what you usually do when you visit Seal Bay Park, most respondents indicated they walked (approximately 54%) either with or without a dog. To further break that down, approximately 30% indicated they walked their dog and approximately 24% walked without a dog. Others indicated they jogged (approximately 14%), biked (approximately 20%) or rode horses (approximately 12%). Many respondents indicated more than one activity. These results are very similar to results obtained through the user survey.
- When asked about park values and a proposed vision for the park, approximately 93% of respondents indicated they agreed with the key values that were identified in the information panels and approximately 79% indicated they agreed with the components of the proposed vision that was presented.
- When asked about the inclusion of a wilderness conservation zone in the park, approximately 82% of participants supported the idea. Approximately 32% of those respondents indicated the conservation zone should correspond to the area of the ecological map reserve, approximately 17% indicated it should encompass a much larger area as suggested in the original 1998 masterplan and approximately 13% indicated they were not sure of the extent it should encompass. Those participants that indicated they were opposed to the inclusion of a conservation zone preferred more recreational use and did not see the value of a dedicated conservation zone either because they felt the park was too small to provide conservation value or they were unsure what the conservation zone would be protecting.
- When asked what activities should be restricted within a wilderness conservation zone, approximately 59% of participants did not want any new trails, approximately 23% did not want any trails through low-lying wet areas (even if it meant closing trail connections), approximately 20% did not want multi-use trails within a wilderness conservation zone and approximately 27% wanted dogs and other pets restricted from this zone.
- When asked what could be done to better explain seasonal leashing rules for dogs to protect nesting birds and fawns, approximately 40% of respondents indicated more signage was required with some indicating temporary signage would be sufficient, approximately 25% indicated more education was needed, approximately 29% indicated more enforcement was needed and approximately 8% indicated they favoured year round leashing. Some representative comments of the 51 responses include:
 - Clear signage and reason for leashing
 - Educational signage to explain the reasons. Enforcement with an educational component.
 - Closer monitoring. Enforcement of seasonal leashing rule.
 - Better explanation of reason for leashing rule. Better explanation of areas where dogs are allowed off leash and on leash.
 - More temporary signage to support rules during April – June months. Then remove signs for the rest of the year.
 - Some interpretive signs explaining why
 - A few more signs in key areas
- When asked what kinds of interpretive signage they would like to see in the park, approximately 37% indicated they would like to see plant identification signage,

- approximately 27% indicated ecosystem signage, approximately 24% indicated signage on the history of the park and 8% indicated they would not like to see any additional interpretive signage.
- When asked what could be done to protect wildlife and the natural ecosystems of Seal Bay Park into the future, approximately 31% of participants indicated more education was required. Specific means of education mentioned included signage (approximately 11%), interpretive walks (approximately 11%) and coordinated efforts with schools (approximately 6%). Other ways indicated by participants to help protect the natural environment include: no more new trails (approximately 11%), keeping people out of sensitive areas (approximately 17%), removal of trails and restoration of habitat in sensitive areas (approximately 8%), better dog management (approximately 11%) and invasive species removal (approximately 8%). Some representative comments from the 36 responses received include:
 - Educate the children in schools about the ecosystems and let them teach the parents. Natural looking barriers – log fences – to bar people from areas where necessary. Encourage the act of stewardship among us all. We look out for the park and remind each other.
 - Don't add to the trail system. Education, nature walks, interpretive signs.
 - Discourage or block unofficial trails or re-vegetate them.
 - Education, teach users respect for our parks. Habitat protection.
 - Enforce leashed dog season. We are dog owners and do not want people that do not follow the restrictions to ruin our present privilege.
 - Explanations of what and why. Identification of species and ecosystems.
 - When asked if they would like to see more multi-use trails in the park, approximately 51% indicated they would like to see more multi-use trails and approximately 49% indicated they would not. Of those that indicated they wanted to see additional trails or trails re-designated as multi-use trails, the most popular included the Mitchell Grade (approximately 55%), the Catch-up Loop (approximately 29%) and an additional trail along the west side of Bates Road (approximately 19%). Of those that indicated they did not want to see additional multi-use trails, approximately 55% indicated there are enough existing trails and approximately 35% mentioned impacts on the trail surface from horse and bike use.
 - When asked about the potential construction of a new trail adjacent to Bates Road to increase horse safety, the following preferences were indicated by respondents:
 - Relocate section of the horse-bike loop trail further inland:
 - Agree: 27%, Neutral: 28%, Disagree 30%, Need more information: 15%
 - Construct new trail on inland side of Bates Road:
 - Agree: 62%, Neutral: 16%, Disagree 11%, Need more information: 11%
 - Re-designate trails multi-use that are close to Mitchell and Elmo Roads where this is horse trailer parking:
 - Agree: 59%, Neutral: 14%, Disagree 16%, Need more information: 11%
 - Re-designate the east arm of Catch-up loop multi-use:
 - Agree: 37%, Neutral: 16%, Disagree 37%, Need more information: 10%

- Re-designate the entire catch-up loop multi-use:
 - Agree: 47%, Neutral: 12%, Disagree 35%, Need more information: 6%
- Re-designate the Mitchell Grade multi-use:
 - Agree: 52%, Neutral: 5%, Disagree 31%, Need more information: 12%
- When asked to rank a list of priorities to improve wayfinding in the park from 1 to 5 with 1 being the highest priority and 5 being the lowest priority, approximately 79% of respondents ranked new directional signage as 1 or 2 priority with approximately 44% ranking it as the highest priority. Approximately 56% of respondents indicated trail maps at intersections in the park as a 1 or 2 priority with approximately 26% ranking it as the highest priority. Finally, approximately 55% of respondents indicated a desire to replace old maps in the park as a 1 or 2 priority with 23% indicating it as the highest priority.
- When asked what other signage is desirable in the park, approximately 40% of respondents indicated that signage should be kept to a minimum, left as-is or should be reduced. Approximately 12% of respondents indicated that natural history interpretive signage would be desirable.
- When asked to prioritize a list of potential park improvements on a scale from high priority (next 1 to 4 years) to medium priority (5 to 8 years) to low priority (9 to 15 years), 41 of the 70 respondents (approximately 59%) indicated applying to the province to lower the speed limit on Bates Road as a high priority. This was the highest priority item. Other items indicated by participants as high priority included: accessible gate for wheelchairs and strollers at Swamp Loop trail entrance at Bates Road (24 of 70 respondents indicated it as a high priority and 22 indicated it as a medium priority), improve drainage at muddy sections of trail (21 of 70 respondents indicated it as a high priority and 18 indicated it as a medium priority), make a safer connection of the horse-bike loop near Bates Road (23 of 70 respondents indicated it as a high priority and 13 indicated it as a medium priority), explore crosswalks on Bates Road (21 of 70 respondents indicated it as a high priority and 14 indicated it as a medium priority), and resurfacing of the wheelchair loop to make it more accessible (24 of 70 respondents indicated it as a high priority and 22 indicated it as a medium priority).
- When asked what percentage of each dollar spent on Seal Bay Park should be allocated to a various improvements or activities, participants indicated that maintaining the condition of the existing trails was important (46 of the 70 respondents indicated 10 to 60% allocation, 5 of the 70 respondents indicated over 60%, and 1 respondent indicated less than 10%). Other improvements or activities considered important for funding allocation included: habitat protection and restoration was relatively important (32 of the 70 respondents indicated 10 to 40% allocation, 6 of the 70 respondents indicated over 40%, and 6 respondents indicated less than 10%); park entrance improvements (31 of the 70 respondents indicated 10 to 40% allocation, 1 of the 70 respondents indicated 40 to 60%, and 9 respondents indicated less than 10%); education and interpretation (32 of the 70 respondents indicated 10 to 40% allocation, and 7 respondents indicated less than 10%); directional signage (27 of the 70 respondents indicated 10 to 40% allocation, 1 of the 70 respondents indicated 60 to 80%, and 12 respondents indicated less than 10%);

- and new trail construction (23 of the 70 respondents indicated 10 to 40% allocation, 2 of the 70 respondents indicated 40 to 60%, and 7 respondents indicated less than 10%).
- When asked to provide additional comments with respect to improvements in the park, participants generally indicated they like the natural setting and would like to keep it pristine. Some representative comments provided include:
 - Haul out the abandoned cars located near the multi-use trail west of SB30 (between SB30 & Clark Rd entrance)
 - This is a great park. Thank you for being pro-active in keeping it this way, and to improve it for both the people using it and the animals who call it home!
 - Park is becoming less “natural” over the years, improvements are nice, but there is a fine line.
 - Please do not make drastic changes to Seal Bay Park. The reason for its high volume use is its natural beauty. The less change the better!

Second Open House Survey (2018) Background

- During this open house a presentation on the trail concept plan was made.
- Most of the respondents reside in relatively close proximity to the park. Approximately 44% of the respondents reside in Electoral Area B of the CVRD; approximately 30% were from the City of Courtenay; approximately 12% from the Town of Comox; and approximately 9% from the Electoral Area C of the CVRD.
- Most of the respondents indicated they were over the age of 36 (approximately 91%). Approximately 45% of respondents were between 51 and 65 years of age; approximately 18% were between the ages of 36 and 50; and approximately 25% were between the ages of 66 and 75.

Second Open House Survey (2018) Results Summary

- When asked whether they agree or disagree with the proposed Vision Statement, the majority of respondents (approximately 87%) indicated they agreed with the Vision Statement. Specifically, approximately 45% indicated they strongly agreed and approximately 42% indicated they agreed. A further 5% of the respondents indicated they were neutral about the statement, while approximately 7% indicated they either disagreed or strongly disagreed.
- When asked how much you agree or disagree with proposed facility improvements, the most supported facility improvement was constructing a viewpoint at Melda’s Marsh near the dam to replace the aging viewpoint tower (approximately 67% agreed or strongly agreed). The least supported proposed facility improvement was adding horse trailer parking to the Huband Road area (approximately 34% were not in favour and specifically 20% of respondents indicated they strongly disagreed). The following summarizes the responses:
 - Upgrade Bates Road parking Area – approximately 53% were in favour of upgrades and specifically approximately 24% indicating they strongly agreed. Approximately 29% were neutral; approximately 14% were not in favour; and approximately 5% had no opinion.
 - Move Hardy Road parking area slightly north away from the road curve – approximately 49% were in favour; approximately 32% were neutral;

- approximately 11% were not supportive; and approximately 8% had no opinion.
- New Huband Road parking area – approximately 41% were in favour; approximately 34% were neutral; approximately 16% were not in favour; and approximately 8% had no opinion.
 - Add horse trailer parking to Huband Road area - approximately 23% were in favour; approximately 34% were neutral; approximately 34% were not in favour; and approximately 10% had no opinion. Approximately 20% of respondents strongly disagreed with the proposed improvement.
 - Move washroom from Seal Flipper Loop Trail to Seabank parking area - approximately 22% were in favour; approximately 45% were neutral; approximately 21% were not in favour; and approximately 12% had no opinion.
 - Construct small Nature Discovery Shelter at Melda's Marsh as a place to learn about the natural environment - approximately 57% were in favour; approximately 21% were neutral; approximately 19% were not in favour; and approximately 3% had no opinion.
 - Construct viewpoint at Melda's Marsh near dam to replace aging viewpoint tower - approximately 67% were in favour; approximately 20% were neutral; approximately 10% were not supportive; and approximately 3% had no opinion.
- When asked how much you agree or disagree with proposed trail use zones, most respondents indicated they would like to have the Oceanside of Bates Road remain pedestrian only and dogs on leash year round (approximately 81% were in favour and specifically 64% indicating they strongly agreed). Most respondents indicated they also wanted to see the Swamp Loop Trail and Melda's Marsh to remain pedestrian only and dogs on leash year round (approximately 77% were supportive and specifically 58% strongly agreed). Outside of the areas indicated above (oceanside of Bates Road and Swamp Loop), approximately 58% agreed dogs should be leashed seasonally, while 24% indicated they were not supportive and 16% were neutral.
 - When asked how much you agree or disagree with upgrading a few trails to accessible standards, most respondents indicated they were in favour of upgrading the Coupland Loop trail and the Swamp Loop trail with Coupland Loop trail upgrades having slightly more support. Specifically respondents indicated:
 - Coupland Loop trail - approximately 65% were in favour with 32% indicating they strongly agree; approximately 22% were neutral; approximately 10% were not in favour; and approximately 3% had no opinion.
 - Swamp Loop trail - approximately 63% were in favour with 32% indicating they strongly agree; approximately 20% were neutral; approximately 15% were not in favour; and approximately 3% had no opinion.
 - When asked how much you agree or disagree with specific proposed trail improvements, the most supported improvement was to close horse access into the park from Bates Road (approximately 47% supported this with 29% in strong agreement). Trail improvements proposed to allow more equestrian and bike use on some existing trails were fairly evenly divided. The following summarizes the responses:

- Re-route part of the Horse-Bike Loop trail away from Bates Road to a new location that crosses Swamp Loop trail - approximately 40% were in favour; approximately 33% were neutral; approximately 21% were not in favour; and approximately 7% had no opinion.
- Close horse access into the park from Bates Road - approximately 47% were in favour with 29% indicating they strongly agree; approximately 34% were neutral; approximately 12% were not in favour; and approximately 8% had no opinion.
- Upgrade existing southern portion of the Mitchel Grade to allow equestrian and bike use - approximately 41% were in favour; approximately 23% were neutral; approximately 28% were not in favour; and approximately 8% had no opinion.
- Upgrade part of Catch Up Loop to allow equestrian and bike use - approximately 39% were in favour; approximately 24% were neutral; approximately 32% were not in favour with 20% in strong disagreement; and approximately 6% had no opinion.
- Upgrade existing unnamed trail from Fitzel entrance trail to Catch Up Loop to allow equestrian and bike use - approximately 36% were in favour; approximately 26% were neutral; approximately 30% were not in favour; and approximately 7% had no opinion.
- Re-route existing eroded section of the Horse-Bike Loop trail near Happy Face trail - approximately 43% were in favour; approximately 34% were neutral; approximately 16% were not in favour; and approximately 7% had no opinion.
- Re-route existing section of the Horse-Bike Loop trail near Langlois Road away from the property line - approximately 37% were in favour; approximately 37% were neutral; approximately 19% were not in favour; and approximately 6% had no opinion.
- When asked how much you agree or disagree with a few specific new trails, respondents were most supportive of a commuter trail along Bates Road (approximately 65% were in favour with 34% in strong agreement; approximately 23% were neutral; and approximately 9% were not in favour). A proposed new trail near Elmo Road was also mostly supported with approximately 64% in favour with 31% in strong agreement; approximately 23% neutral; and approximately 12% not in favour. Finally, a new proposed trail near the Hardy Road entrance was mostly supported with 55% in favour with 23% in strong agreement; approximately 24% neutral; and approximately 17% not in favour with 12% in strong disagreement.
- When asked how much you agree or disagree with specific trail closures, respondents were generally fairly evenly divided highlighting the delicate balance between those wanting recreational trails and those wanting more conservation. The trail closure with the most opposition was the proposed closure of Seabank trail with approximately 51% not in favour with 45% being strongly opposed. The following summarizes the responses for each proposed trail closure:
 - Proposed closure of southern portion of Twinflower Lane which is low-lying - approximately 34% were in favour; approximately 33% were neutral; approximately 29% were not in favour; and approximately 5% had no opinion.

- Proposed closure of unnamed trail from Loxley road to Horse-Bike Loop trail which is low-lying - approximately 35% were in favour; approximately 32% were neutral; approximately 28% were not in favour; and approximately 5% had no opinion.
- Proposed closure of short connector trail between Mitchel Grade and Catch-Up Loop which is low-lying - approximately 33% were in favour; approximately 32% were neutral; approximately 29% were not in favour; and approximately 5% had no opinion.
- Proposed closure of connector trail from Bates Road which is redundant - approximately 34% were in favour; approximately 38% were neutral; approximately 25% were not in favour; and approximately 4% had no opinion.
- Proposed closure of northern portion of Mitchel Grade through the Map Reserve - approximately 24% were in favour; approximately 39% were neutral; approximately 31% were not in favour; and approximately 6% had no opinion.
- Proposed closure of Seabank trail - approximately 34% were in favour; approximately 13% were neutral; approximately 51% were not in favour with approximately 45% in strong disagreement; and approximately 3% had no opinion.
- When asked how much you agree or disagree with trail closures to facilitate expansion of conservation zones, slightly more respondents were in agreement with approximately 44% in favour; approximately 18% neutral; approximately 36% not in favour; and approximately 2% had no opinion.
- When asked what you like about the trail concept plan, 104 of 182 respondents provided comments. Of the responses provided, respondents generally favored the addition of accessible trails (approximately 18%); the focus on conservation (approximately 17%); and the enhanced parking (approximately 12%). The separation of pedestrian trails was liked by approximately 11% of the respondents and approximately 14% of respondents liked the additional multi-use trails.
- When asked what you dislike about the trail concept plan, 105 of 182 respondents provided comments. Of the responses provided, respondents disliked the proposed closure of the Seabank trail (approximately 46%); the increased focus on horse use (approximately 26%); the closing of unmaintained trails (approximately 18%); and the impacts of additional parking (approximately 8%).
- When asked what are your top three trail and facility improvements, 109 of 182 respondents provided comments. Of the responses provided, respondents indicated their top item would be better signage (approximately 21%). This was followed by parking upgrades (approximately 17%); maintaining existing beach accesses (approximately 17%); creation of accessible trails (approximately 15%); additional washrooms (approximately 15%); reducing speeds on Bates Road (approximately 8%); trail surfacing (approximately 6%); re-routing Horse-Bike Loop trail near Bates Road (approximately 5%); and adding viewing area at Melda's Marsh (approximately 5%).
- When asked are you an equestrian rider, the vast majority of respondents indicated no (approximately 95%).

- Of the ten respondents who indicated they were equestrian riders, re-routing the Horse-Bike Loop trail off Bates Road further inland was ranked as the top priority, followed by re-routing the Horse-Bike Loop trail near the Langlois Road properties; followed by upgrading portion of Mitchel Grade and re-surfacing existing horse use trails.
- When asked how much you agree or disagree with the proposed management zones plan, most of respondents indicated they agreed with the plan (approximately 44%); approximately 24% indicated they were neutral; approximately 29% indicated they disagreed; and 4% indicated they had no opinion. Comments on the plan tended to focus on general concern regarding intensive recreation zones and the lack of clarity of the intention of this management zone.
- When asked to indicate the level of support for each of the proposed management goals, respondents strongly supported the goals to: Protect the park's rare and sensitive ecological communities (approximately 92% were in support with 65% in strong agreement); Manage the park's natural assets with a focus on the preservation of natural ecosystems (approximately 92% were in support with 64% in strong agreement); Maintain the park's current sense of place (approximately 90% were in support with 66% in strong agreement); and Provide a trail network that is environmentally sustainable and supports low impact recreation activities (approximately 86% were in support with 54% in strong agreement). The least supported goals included: Provide sufficient visitor services amenities to meet users' needs (approximately 45% were in support, approximately 36% were neutral and approximately 17% were not in support); and Improve access to the park for the surrounding communities (approximately 49% were in support, approximately 30% were neutral and approximately 19% were not in support). Comments on the management goals tended to focus on the need to ensure impacts to the park are minimized.
- When asked to provide additional comments, 71 respondents provided feedback. The feedback was wide ranging but generally users are appreciative of the park and would like changes to the park to be minimized. There is also a general concern about the increase in multi-use trails.

Highlighted results from 2018 survey questions related to the prioritization of proposed action items (66 respondent participated)

- Goal 1 – Protect the park's rare and sensitive ecological communities
 - Highest priority item - 'Ensure continued protection of the wetland ecosystems and biodiversity present in the Map Reserve' with 48% of respondents indicating this as essential and 30% indicating this as a high priority;
 - Second highest priority item - 'Inventory and map the park's rare and sensitive ecological communities as well as species and ecosystems at risk' with 39% of respondents considering this essential and 30% indicating this as a high priority.
- Goal 2 – Manage the park's natural assets with a focus on the preservation of natural ecosystems

- Highest priority item – ‘Preserve wetland habitat for waterfowl, birds, and aquatic wildlife’ with 50% of respondents indicating this as essential and 38% indicating this as a high priority;
- Second highest priority item – ‘Preserve forage and denning opportunities for wildlife’ with 49% of respondents indicating this as essential and 40% indicating this as a high priority.
- Goal 3 – Maintain the park’s current sense of place
 - Highest priority item – ‘Ensure future park improvements respect the community’s desire to experience nature in a quiet, peaceful setting’ with 76% of respondents indicating this as essential and 14% indicating this as a high priority;
 - Second highest priority item – ‘Ensure future park improvements are aesthetically pleasing, unobtrusive and blend with the natural environment’ with 68% of respondents indicating this as essential and 18% indicating this as a high priority.
- Goal 4 – Provide educational opportunities to learn about the park’s diverse natural environment
 - Highest priority item – ‘Educate users about the impacts on the park’s natural resources from use of the unmarked trails through discreet signage and interpretive materials’ with 27% of respondents indicating this as essential and 32% indicating this as a high priority;
 - Second highest priority item – ‘Provide opportunities for self-guided natural history interpretive programming including opportunities to identify flora and fauna and natural system processes’ with 23% of respondents indicating this as essential and 33% indicating this as a high priority.
- Goal 5 – Recognize and protect cultural values within the park
 - Highest priority item – ‘Work with the K’ómoks First Nation to inventory cultural values and ensure protection of these values into the future’ with 35% of respondents indicating this as essential and 14% indicating this as a high priority;
 - Second highest priority item – ‘Identify First Nation place names and work in collaboration with the K’ómoks First Nation on signage policy within the park’ with 29% of respondents indicating this as essential and 18% indicating this as a high priority.
- Goal 6 – Improve wayfinding in the park
 - Highest priority item – ‘Develop a clear and simple signage plan for the park’ with 42% of respondents indicating this as essential and 30% indicating this as a high priority;
 - Second highest priority item – ‘Install park trail maps at key intersections and replace old trail maps to ensure consistent messaging’ with 35% of respondents indicating this as essential and 23% indicating this as a high priority.
- Goal 7 – Improve access to the park for surrounding communities
 - Highest priority item – ‘Maintain the current park entrance connections’ with 26% of respondents indicating this as essential and 37% indicating this as a high priority;

- Second highest priority item – ‘Continue to support a BC Transit stop at the Bates Road parking area’ with 20% of respondents indicating this as essential and 29% indicating this as a high priority.
- Goal 8 – Provide sufficient visitor services amenities to meet park users needs
 - Highest priority item – ‘Monitor park use and explore options for additional or improved park amenities (such as washrooms and garbage cans) at key locations in the park’ with 32% of respondents indicating this as essential and 24% indicating this as a high priority;
 - Second highest priority item – ‘Ensure vehicular parking is sufficient to meet the needs of day users’ with 23% of respondents indicating this as essential and 20% indicating this as a high priority.
- Goal 9 – Provide a trail network that is environmentally sustainable and supports low impact recreation activities
 - Highest priority item – ‘Continue to keep motorized vehicles off the trail network with the exception of motorized wheelchairs, ebikes or scooters used by individuals with mobility challenges. Service and emergency response vehicles are to be allowed on designated trails’ with 62% of respondents indicating this as essential and 23% indicating this as a high priority;
 - Second highest priority item – ‘Continue to restrict equestrian and bike use to multi-use paths’ with 62% of respondents indicating this as essential and 21% indicating this as a high priority.
- Goal 10 – Ensure the trail system is inclusive for a range of users
 - Highest priority item – ‘Maintain current off-leash dog rules and monitor restrictions. Educate users as to why these restrictions are in place and enforce as required’ with 52% of respondents indicating this as essential and 15% indicating this as a high priority;
 - Second highest priority item – ‘Trail use conflicts and trail impacts to be monitored. Persistent conflicts or maintenance issues may be addressed through separation or restriction of users as required’ with 32% of respondents indicating this as essential and 33% indicating this as a high priority.
- Goal 11 – Work with government agencies, local municipalities, stakeholders and the K’ómoks First Nation to protect and enhance the park’s natural, social, cultural and recreational values
 - Highest priority item – ‘Continue to work with the Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development to acquire Seal Bay Forest to ensure protection of the forest in perpetuity’ with 71% of respondents indicating this as essential and 14% indicating this as a high priority;
 - Second highest priority item – ‘Work with the City of Courtenay to ensure future development adjacent to the park is compatible with park objectives of environmental stewardship and connectivity’ with 52% of respondents indicating this as essential and 24% indicating this as a high priority.
- Goal 12 – Be responsive to community needs by working with the local community to facilitate conservation, restoration and recreation goals within the park

- Highest priority item – ‘Continue to work with the local community on new initiatives or significant park changes’ with 55% of respondents indicating this as essential and 18% indicating this as a high priority;
- Second highest priority item – ‘Work with the equestrian community to find a solution to the issue of horse manure within the park’ with 48% of respondents indicating this as essential and 11% indicating this as a high priority.
- Goal 13 – Ensure public safety in the park
 - Highest priority item – ‘Continue to impose a no smoking policy within the park during extreme dry weather’ with 85% of respondents indicating this as essential and 5% indicating this as a high priority;
 - The second highest priority item – ‘Engage with the provincial Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure to explore ways to increase public safety on the section of Bates Road that passes through the park. This may be accomplished through vehicular speed reduction, traffic-calming measures, installation of signage, fewer crossing points or installation of crosswalks’ with 48% of respondents indicating this as essential and 12% indicating this as a high priority.
- Goal 14 – Coordinate emergency response planning
 - Highest priority item – ‘Work with the provincial North Island Mid Coast Fire Centre to identify areas of wildfire risk vulnerabilities in the park’ with 58% of respondents indicating this as essential and 20% indicating this as a high priority;
 - Second highest priority item – ‘Work with the provincial North Island Mid Coast Fire Centre, local emergency first responders and the local Search and Rescue organization to ensure adequate access to the park is maintained to meet emergency response needs while not negatively impacting the park’s sense of place’ with 55% of respondents indicating this as essential and 17% indicating this as a high priority.
- When asked about their top three action items, respondent’s feedback was varied. The most referenced items included maintaining the beach accesses, continuing to provide separated trail uses, exploring ways to improve public safety along Bates Road and focusing on park conservation.