



Making a difference...together

MEETING NOTES

TO: Island View Beach Regional Park – Mosquito Control Program File

DATE: April 18, 2023

FILE: 6130-30

SUBJECT Island View Beach Mosquito Control Program; flipchart notes and evaluation form

EVENT

Capital Regional District (CRD) Island View Beach (IVB) Mosquito Control Program Community Meeting

LOCATION

Tsawout First Nation offices, 7728 Tetayut Rd, Saanichton, BC V8M 2E4; April 12, 2023, 6-9 p.m. Auditorium

PARTICIPANTS

FACILITATORS:

Erin Prelypchan, Facilitator, Two Worlds Consulting
 Jessica Lansfield, Notetaker, Two Worlds Consulting

CRD: Ted Robbins, CAO
 Larisa Hutcheson, GM P&ES
 Jeff Leahy, Senior Manager
 Lynn Wilson, Park Planner
 Larissa Rathwell, Administrative Assistant
 Erin Bildfell, FNRD First Nations Advisor

CRD BOARD:

Colin Plant, Board Chair (Saanich Councillor)
 Cliff McNeil-Smith, Chair RPC (Sidney Mayor)
 Ryan Windsor, Director (Central Saanich Mayor)

CENTRAL SAANICH:

Dale Puskas, Director of Engineering

TSAWOUT:

Mavis Underwood, Elder
 Harvey Underwood, Chief
 Abraham Pelkey, Councillor
 Stan Sam, Councillor
 Micah Claxton, Public Works Manager
 Wayne Helgason, Operations Manager
 Chrissy Chen, Fisheries Manager and Principal Negotiator

FOIVB/PARK NEIGHBORS:

Brian Draper, Park Neighbor
 Wayne Cox, FOIVB
 Dr. George Kruzynski, FOIVB
 Dr. Tawni Silver, FOIVB
 Karen Harris, FOIVB
 Jamie VanDenbossche, FOIVB
 Tom Michell, Park Neighbor

PRESENTERS:

Curtis Fediuk, Duke Environmental
Patrick Lucey, Aqua-Tex
Brandon Powers, GreatPacific
Jason Clarke, GreatPacific
Jason Austin, Friends of Island View Beach (FOIVB)

MEETING OBJECTIVES

1. To respond to the Capital Regional District (CRD) Regional Parks Committee Board motion of early 2023 directing staff to bring together Tsawout First Nation, Central Saanich, and FOIVB to present findings and facilitate discussions about the mosquito control program
2. To introduce in person various groups interested in the mosquito control program in the Island View Beach area
3. To share information and establish a common basis of knowledge among the interested groups regarding the mosquito question in the Island View Beach area
4. To understand interested groups' values related to the land and land uses, and how these interact with the mosquito question
5. To understand common needs and interests that we can build on, that could lead toward options for improvement or collaboration

MEETING AGENDA

Welcoming prayer (Tsawout Elder); CRD welcome (Board Chair); housekeeping (Tsawout); introductions (facilitator); presentations (FOIVB, GreatPacific, Duka, Aqua-Tex); discussion (all); closing and evaluation form (all)

FLIPCHART NOTES

Two Worlds Consulting has prepared a separate meeting summary report from notes taken during the meeting. These meeting notes are limited to ideas that were written down on flip charts and IVB maps and are not included in the Two Worlds Consulting summary report. They are for CRD background information.

1. The following questions were written on flipchart paper affixed to three similar IVB maps located outside of the meeting room. Participants were invited to respond using small post-it notes during the meeting. Responses are deemed to be out of scope for this meeting but are included FYI.

Question 1: *What do you want most for the future of IVB area?*
Responses: -Keep dogs off leash, penalize if they are chasing birds
-Get serious about dog owners who let dogs chase birds and spoil it for the rest of dog owners

Question 2: *What matters most to you about the IVB area?*
Responses: -Maintain horse access
-Maintain mosquito control
-Replenish wild bird prey food source with rabbits

Question 3: *What do you most value about the IVB area?*
Response: -Running our dogs off-leash

2. The following **VALUES** were captured by the facilitator on a flipchart in the meeting room during the discussion following the presentations:
 - The sustainability of the Tsawout's lands (as a receiving environment)
 - Thinking long-term
 - Being good neighbors
 - Collaborating
 - Capital intensity (\$)
 - Avoiding sensitive times for wildlife (birds + fish)
 - Ecological value
 - Essential community infrastructure (e.g., sewers)
 - Addressing legacy issues
 - Integrity of the land
 - Ecological balance
 - Sustainable supply of goods
 - Health of volunteers
 - Sustainable food donations from Lamott Road farms
 - Saving money on ditch mowing
 - Environmental health
 - Climate resilience
 - Park visits
 - Western science
 - Data accuracy
 - Engineering feasibility

3. The following **IDEAS** were captured by the facilitator on a flipchart in the meeting room during the discussion following the presentations:
 - Block the flapper gate March – August
 - Create a short ditch between Tsawout salt marsh and CRD land at IVB
 - Put protective grills on the flapper gates
 - Report on ditch overflows
 - Machine mow one side of ditches
 - Central Saanich and CRD cooperation
 - Remediate tidal gates (i.e., new configuration or style?)
 - Improve ditching system
 - Improve grade (slope) of ditches
 - Maintain a “checkerboard” approach to vegetation management
 - Selective removal of vegetation
 - Shade ditches from the top with vegetation
 - Survey the ditch system (holistic view) – with the CRD, Central Saanich, and Tsawout
 - Dam the north flapper gate
 - Put in an experimental flapper gate at the wooden pedestrian bridge (i.e., install an additional flapper gate in this location)

MEETING EVALUATION FORMS

Participants were asked to complete a Community Meeting Feedback Form at the end of the meeting. There were 31 registered persons for the meeting, but 24 were eligible to complete the feedback form (i.e., the two facilitators and two CRD support staff did not complete the form, n = 4; and some participants had to leave before the end of the meeting n = 3). The total number of completed forms was 21, for a response rate of 87.5%. The results of the feedback forms are presented below.

Q1. How satisfied were you with how *informative* this community meeting was, on a scale from 1 (very satisfied) to 5 (very unsatisfied)? Please check one and explain your responses below.

Very Satisfied: n = 8
Satisfied: n = 10
Okay: n = 2
Unsatisfied: n = 0
Very Unsatisfied: n = 0

Comments:

- Excellent opportunity for sharing diverse opinions
- Good information from all participants in maintaining IVB mosquito control
- Most information was already known – more time to discuss would have been productive
- Lots of good information
- Lots of expertise; an important aspect regarding the issue
- Loved having the experts from different areas presenting along with feedback from attendees
- Good exchange of information
- Some new information and perspectives
- I was pretty familiar with the work that was done
- All comments = some kind of solution. Combination of solutions mentioned
- Lots of information and good ideas, but need dollars to fix the problems
- Transparent on how complex the situation is

Q2: How satisfied are you about this meeting as an opportunity to *share your thoughts, feelings, and experiences*? Please check one and explain your response below.

Very Satisfied: n = 9
Satisfied: n = 9
Okay: n = 3
Unsatisfied: n = 0
Very Unsatisfied: n = 0

Comments:

- Great to keep presentations on time and limit questions/comments until “discussion time.” Excellent!
- It was very productive in bringing the parties together
- Yes, good opportunity to speak
- Although I didn’t participate opinion-wise, it was interesting to hear others’ thoughts
- Everyone who had something to say had an opportunity to share their opinions/expertise
- Good
- Expertise is always interesting
- I was given a fair opportunity to speak
- Friendly environment
- Try to bring in more information to help move on a better meeting
- Felt safe
- Well facilitated meeting

Q3: What did you like most about the community meeting? What could we do better to improve future community meetings? Please briefly explain your response below.

- Respectful and moderated discussion – well facilitated!
- There was a good amount of time for dialogue
- Great format. Moderator kept things on track. Uncertain if or when the ideas and questions that were brought out will be dealt with. No future meetings set
- Opportunity for presentations to understand technical issues and to hear different interests and perspectives
- Broad range of ideas; great room for size of group
- Liked the open and facilitated dialogue. Kept to schedule. Could have been longer
- Need the facilitator to be more forceful
- Great, lots of interaction
- Well done, great organization. Thank you
- More opportunity to discuss and exchange information
- Calibre of participants
- Less control and more discussion to allow ideas and solutions
- Everyone who wanted to speak had a chance
- Tsawout was clear on challenges they have with mitigations
- I really appreciated how respectful the meeting was

Q4. Please feel free to share any comments or questions that you may have.

- First of an ongoing series of meetings. For every complex problem there is a solution that is simple, neat, and wrong. This is a wicked problem
- I think it would have been beneficial to have a representative explain an overview of the intended function of the drainage system. Fifteen minutes per presenter is too tight to explain both an overview and details of technical disciplines
- Using a working microphone that people have to use and be told how to use, it would help a lot. Put the mike to your lips, not by your chest
- The shutting down the discussion at 9 p.m. is pointless and arbitrary. A waste of opportunity to pursue ideas
- Well done in keeping speakers to the limit of talking time
- Health in the future, example is West Nile virus

Prepared by:	Lynn Wilson, Park Planner, Regional Parks 4/18/23
--------------	---