

Off-Leash Dog Management Options Analysis (Governor General Area)

	Option 1: Maintain Existing Conditions (Status Quo): monitor & maintain split-rail fence & vegetation buffer	Option 2: Partial Roadway Fencing: construct a 4' high chain-link roadside fence (~250 m length)	Option 3: Fully Fenced Dog Enclosure: construct a 4' high chain-link fence ~13,720 m² (~590 m perimeter)
Alignment with Watershed Management Plan	Yes – Current management practices support watershed function and planned restoration initiatives.	No – Not a standard approach for restoration or enhancement activities.	No – Impacts management activities required to restore watershed function.
Alignment with Management Plan	Yes – Accommodates a broad range of outdoor recreational activities while maintaining natural character. Management Plan identifies split rail fence along west side of Elk Lake Drive.	No – Chain-link fencing on the boundary of regional parks is not a standard management approach. Added infrastructure begins to shift the character of the area.	No – Does not preserve natural character and introduces special interest group facilities.
Alignment with CRD Parks Regulation Bylaw	Yes – The Bylaw supports off-leash use in suitable areas provided dogs remain under effective control.	Somewhat – Shifts management from owner responsibility (effective control) to infrastructure, reducing reliance on effective control	No – Replaces owner responsibility with infrastructure. Dogs may be less actively monitored.
Site Suitability	Yes – Well suited to continue functioning as a low-intensity, flexible off-leash area. Existing conditions and infrastructure support dispersed use without introducing additional physical constraints or intensification of activity.	Yes – Would remain suitable for dispersed off-leash use and continue to function as a flexible and multi-use space. Does not fundamentally alter the scale or intensity of use. Introduces some site constraints.	No – Scale, intensity, and exclusive nature of this option are not well matched to the site's broader function, capacity, and setting.
Impacts on Park Use	Low – Continues to allow for a range of uses.	Low to Medium – Continues to allow for a range of uses. Dogs may be less actively monitored.	High – Limits use of space for other park users, including large event overflow parking. Could result in the need for additional parking.
Environmental Considerations	Low – Older forest ecosystem is healthy and functioning as indicated by the diverse range of wildlife.	Low to medium – Added infrastructure could impact watershed function improvement and restrict wildlife movement.	High – May result in habitat fragmentation, restricts wildlife movement and potential degradation of the grassland foraging habitat.

Community Input Required	No – In alignment with Management Plan.	Yes – Engagement process recommended (moderate shift from Management Plan).	Yes – Planning and engagement process required (significant shift from Management Plan).
Estimated Costs	Within existing operational budget.	\$45,000 capital cost (materials and installation). First Nations and community engagement: \$20,000 – \$40,000.	\$95,000 capital cost (materials and installation). Management planning process, including First Nations and community engagement: \$100,000 – \$150,000.