

IMAGINE SLOCAN LAKE

*Community Values Study for RDCK Area H North
Residents and Property Owners*



November 22nd, 2012

A Study by the Slocan Lake Stewardship Society

Contact Email: slocanlss@gmail.com

Mailing Address: Box 322, New Denver, BC, V0G 1S0

Report prepared by Michelle Laurie, consultant

1. Acknowledgements

The Slocan Lake Stewardship Society sponsored the study to ensure the region-wide values concerning the lake were available along with science for future decision makers. The following people and organizations contributed in different ways:

The community values study was made possible with Columbia Basin Trust's *Community Initiatives* grants from:

Regional District of Central Kootenay Area H North

Village of New Denver

Village of Silverton

Village of Slocan

and by BC Hydro's Community Outreach Program



Thank you to the 14 member advisory committee who provided local knowledge and guidance from start to finish.

Lawrence Schiavon, Hills

Gary Wright, New Denver

Casey Law, New Denver

Peter Roulston, New Denver

Peggy Chatburn, Out of town property owner (rural New Denver)

Decker Butzner, Out of town property owner (New Denver)

Deborah Sword, Out of town property owner (New Denver)

Clarence denBok, Red Mountain

Bob Fuhrer, Red Mountain

Sally Hammond, Red Mountain

Kim Roshinski, Rosebery (property owner in Slocan)

Jody Cliff, Silverton

Jim Hicks, Silverton

Linda Bjerg, Slocan

Thank you to all participants of the Focus Group Workshop (September 11, 2012) who ensured the survey met the needs of a wide range of people.

Walter Popoff	Area H North	Jan McMurray	New Denver
Helen Davis	Hills	Ken Smith	New Denver
Lawrence Schiavon	Hills	Peter Roulston	New Denver
Richard Allin	Hills	Therese DesCamp	New Denver
Bill Richards	New Denver	Nadine Raynolds	New Denver
Colin Moss	New Denver	Barb Yeomans	
Hennig von Krogh	New Denver	New Denver/Rosebery	

Kevin Murphy		Ross Johnson	Silverton
New Denver/Silverton		Stuart Nelson	Silverton
Peggy Chatburn	Out of town	Ty Capelle	Silverton
property owner (rural New Denver)		Jack Kelly	Silverton
Clarence denBok	Red Mountain	Deb Corbett	Slocan
Sally Hammond	Red Mountain	Linda Bjerg	Slocan
Kim Roshinski	Rosebery	Patricia McGreal	Slocan
Richard Johnson	Rosebery	Rory Lindsay	Slocan
Jim Hicks Jr.	Silverton		

Thank you to the planners and consultants for sharing their knowledge on Lake Management Planning/Official Community Planning and more generally working with lake-based communities:

Karen McLeod, MCIP, RPP – Planner, Regional District of East Kootenay

Heather Leschied, Program Manager, Living Lakes Canada / Wildsight

Susan Ashmore – Wasa Lake volunteer

Dan Wallace, MCIP – Planner, Thompson-Nicola Regional District

Catherine Berris, MCIP, FCSLA – Landscape Architect & Planner, Catherine Berris Associates Inc.

Thank you to external reviewers of the draft survey for your comments and outside perspectives:

Catherine Berris, Catherine Berris Associates Inc.

Jennifer Ellis

Michael Harstone

Terri MacDonald, Regional Innovation Chair in Rural Economic Development, Selkirk College

Kate Mahoney

Heather Mitchell

Gary Ockenden

Lastly, thank you to Rachael Roussin for assisting in project logistics and communications; Lisa Theissen for the beautiful graphics that branded the project; and Jennifer Ellis for her exceptional skill and support on data analysis.

2. Table of Contents

- 1. Acknowledgements.....ii
- 2. Table of Contents.....iv
- 3. Executive Summary..... 1
- 4. Introduction and Background 3
- 5. Methodology..... 4
- 6. Survey Analysis Approach 7
 - a. Data Cleaning 7
 - b. Confidence Calculations..... 8
- 7. Demographics 9
- 8. Survey Findings 11
 - a. Values and Vision 11
 - b. Recreation 21
 - c. Built Structures..... 26
 - d. Boating and Marinas 31
 - e. Planning, Land Use and Our Environment 34
- 9. Issues Not Addressed..... 42
- 10. Conclusions 43

- Appendix 1: Slocan Lake Survey: Your Values and Vision
- Appendix 2: Survey Reports by Village and Rural Areas
- Appendix 3: Qualitative Analysis Summary
 - Question 17:
 - Question 18:

3. Executive Summary

The community values study, “Imagine Slocan Lake”, surveyed residents and property owners aged 16 and over on their values and vision for the future of Slocan Lake. The study area was limited to Regional District of Central Kootenay (RDCK) Area H North including the Villages of Slocan, Silvertown and New Denver.

Survey analysis was based on the broad groupings of values and vision, recreation, built structures, boating and marinas, and planning, land use and our environment. More detailed analysis was undertaken to compare the responses of permanent residents versus those of part-time/seasonal residents and absentee land/home-owners as well as each village and the combined rural area. Overall, the views of residents and property owners in the Slocan Lake study area were generally in alignment. 665 surveys were collected, which is more than double the number needed to be 95% confident the answers represent the views of the overall population (with +/- 5% confidence interval).

Values and Vision

With respect to values and visions, Slocan Lake residents and property owners place a very high value on clean water and healthy ecosystems. Consistent with the highest ranked values, the ideal vision for 2032 and beyond for the majority of respondents included clean water and healthy aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems. Undeveloped Crown land and quiet were also high-ranking visions.

The vast majority of residents and property owners were concerned about the future of Slocan Lake (77.4%) with the top concerns being the inverse of what is most important to them (for example, reduced water quality and loss of biodiversity). Additional concerns that ranked high in respondents’ top choices included crowding on the lake, selling Crown land, and noise pollution.

High and low ranking choices should be taken in the context that participants were only allowed to select up to five choices in total. The desire for some limited growth/development emerged as a vision for some respondents in the open-ended responses. Perhaps respondents felt they could more clearly qualify their statements to specify they only wanted sustainable, limited development that was ‘done right’.

Recreation

With respect to recreational activities, the majority of respondents felt that the current situation is satisfactory with regard to swimming, fishing, canoeing/kayaking/rowing, sailing, and small electric or 4-stroke motor boating.

On the other hand, the majority of respondents (over 64%) felt that with respect to houseboating and sea-dooing/jet skiing, there should be either none or less than the current situation. A large number of respondents (more than 43%), although not the

majority, also felt that for ski boating and wake boating, there should be none or less than the current situation.

Camping and hiking were the only two activities that a small majority of respondents indicated there could be more of on or around Slocan Lake.

Built Structures

Overall, the results suggest that for the majority of respondents, there is substantial to total support for the maintenance of existing public wharves/docks/boat ramps. With respect to the development of additional public wharves/docks/boat ramps, the results are mixed, with the largest percentage of respondents indicating no support, the second largest percentage of respondents indicating only modest support and a small percentage of respondents (less than 20%) indicating substantial to total support.

With respect to location of new public wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters, if they were to be developed, a strong majority of respondents (71.9%) expressed no support for locations outside of existing communities. A small majority (57.6%) expressed substantial or total support for locations within and around the villages of Slocan, Silverton, New Denver and the unincorporated communities of Rosebery and Hills.

In terms of private structures, the majority of respondents expressed no support for unlimited private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore. Support for limited new private development on the foreshore ranged between respondents that expressed no support (49.6%), those that expressed modest support (29.6%) and those that expressed substantial or total support (19.6%).

Boating and Marinas

The greatest percentage of respondents indicated modest support (40.9%) for moorage expansions at existing docks, while 27.8% indicated substantial to total support and 28.1% indicated no support for moorage expansions at existing docks. With respect to the development of dock and moorage facilities at additional locations, a slight majority of respondents indicated no support. The bulk of respondents who indicated some support indicated only modest support.

Support for the proposed regulations and restrictions relating to boating and marinas was very strong with the majority of respondents indicating substantial to total support.

Planning, Land Use and Our Environment

Overall, the majority of respondents indicated support for a wide range of regulations associated with lake and land management and no support for the development of vacant Crown Land bordering the shores of Slocan Lake or development on the lakeshore. A sizable percentage of respondents (47%) indicated that more regulation is needed to ensure that the lake and foreshore is properly managed.

4. Introduction and Background

The community values study, “Imagine Slocan Lake”, surveyed residents and property owners around Slocan Lake on their values and vision for the future of the Lake. The main component of the study was a survey that asked about peoples’ values, concerns, and desires for the way they imagine the lake in 2032 and beyond. The data gathered is useful for the community at large, as well as decision makers, to proactively plan for the future.

Slocan Lake is located in the unique Inland Temperate Rainforest area of south-eastern British Columbia in the Selkirk Mountains. Ninety-three percent of Slocan Lake’s 83 kilometres of shoreline remains unaltered by human impact and its clean and healthy waters are the pride of residents and property owners. Valhalla Provincial Park borders much of the west side of Slocan Lake. Highway 6 parallels the eastern shore, connecting the unincorporated communities of Summit Lake, Hills and Rosebery and the three villages of New Denver, Silverton and Slocan from the north to the south of the lake. Slocan Lake is the focal point of valley history and culture and in many ways anchors the local economy, as it attracts visitors, recreationalist and prospective residents.

Development pressures have not yet had a great impact on Slocan Lake. Water quality is unequalled and watershed health remains exceptional. Concerned residents are anticipating potential demographic and land-use changes in the future and are working to ensure guidelines are in place to maintain and enhance the land, water and ecosystems related to the lake. The survey information is aimed to inform decision makers of peoples’ values and vision with respect to the balance of development pressures on the foreshore, ecosystems, and water quality with cultural, social, environmental and economic interests.

A Lake Management Planning process for Slocan Lake is anticipated for 2013. Lake Management Plans (LMP) are a tool to guide the long-term management of lakes by directing local government planning of lakes and associated shorelines and also provide advice to other levels of government. The lake-wide community values survey highlighted that the majority of full time and part-time residents in all villages and rural areas are concerned about the future of the lake. Furthermore, with respect to values and visions, everyone places a very high value on clean water and healthy ecosystems.

The report to follow provides a detailed analysis of the survey results as well as key messages for each of the sections surveyed. This information along with scientific studies will be useful inputs for any future planning process that involves Slocan Lake and its surrounding communities.

5. Methodology

The main focus of the project was the community values survey. Several methods were utilized to make sure the survey was technically sound and communicated to the public effectively.

In order to ensure the survey met the needs of local people, an advisory committee (AC) was formed with 14 residents and out-of-town property owners representing a variety of interests and geographies around the lake (see section 1. Acknowledgements). The advisory committee met face-to-face five times between July-November 2012. In addition, a review process with a 28 member focus group took place September 11, 2012 where participants provided direct input into the content of the survey (see section 1. Acknowledgements).

Research was conducted on Lake Management Plans undertaken in other parts of the Province as well as Official Community Planning in lake-based communities. Several interviews with planners and consultants working on these plans were held to understand the opportunities and challenges in a study such as *'Imagine Slocan Lake'* as well as to understand where community values information can be used by decision makers. A few different scales are used throughout the survey depending on the nature of the question. Generally speaking, participants were asked for top choices in order to filter out the highest priorities from the many important issues. In some cases, a four-point scale was used to determine level of support. The four-point scale forces participants to choose an answer rather than be neutral. The option of 'Don't Know' was always provided. Lastly, the survey was reviewed externally by eight professionals from the fields of water, community planning, and survey methods and assessment.

The final survey was nine pages in total, with 18 questions taking approximately 20 minutes to complete (see Appendix 1).

The following methods were used to ensure the survey was visible to the public and encourage participation:

- Project Fact Sheet distributed at community meetings and placed around the region by AC members.
- Project Posters (25 laminated posters posted in study area)
- Garlic Fest Booth, information post cards and sign-up for direct email receipt of survey
- New and updated webpages describing the project on www.SlocanLakeSS.com
- Direct mail post cards sent and received by 685 mailboxes in RDCK Area H North (those that don't receive unaddressed mail did not get the post card) as well as to every out-of-town property owner (533) explaining the survey


- Full page spreads (including article and ½ page advertisement) in two issues of the Valley Voice which is received by every mailing address and newsstand in the Slocan Valley (Sept 19th and October 3rd)
- Information summaries in the Village of Slocan newsletter and 358-Exchange
- Direct emails to networks and groups of AC and focus group participants
- Emails forwarded and passed on to individual networks by the AC, SLSS and focus group participants
- Outreach to school teachers and principal
- Reminder phone calls to identified people who do not use the Internet
- Survey availability online and in paper formats (pick-ups at 3 Village Offices plus SLSS members)
- Cash prize incentive of \$100.00

An unanticipated two-page insert in the Valley Voice on September 19th, on the impact of Lake Management Planning, produced by the Valhalla Wilderness Society may also have contributed to spreading awareness and interest in the survey.

The study area was limited to Regional District of Central Kootenay (RDCK) Area H North which is the same area as the RDCK Area H North Official Community Plan (OCP). The southern border is the confluence of the Slocan River and Slocan Lake and extends north of Summit Lake (see Map 1 to follow). The Villages of Slocan, Silverton and New Denver were also all included.

All members of a household aged 16 and over were invited to take the survey via the methods described above.

Map 1: Regional District of Central Kootenay Area H North Official Community Plan (OCP) boundaries



6. Survey Analysis Approach

Survey analysis was conducted based on the broad groupings for which data was collected in the survey including values and vision, recreation, built structures, boating and marinas, and planning, land use and our environment. In addition, more detailed analysis was undertaken to compare the responses of permanent residents versus those of part-time/seasonal residents and absentee land/home-owners. More detailed analysis was also undertaken for each village and the combined rural area (RDCK Area H North) so each electoral area could see their unique results (as well as their results in relation to neighbouring electoral areas).

Key messages and areas of convergence and divergence were identified for all respondents, and the groups for which more detailed analysis was undertaken. Content analysis was also undertaken for the comments provided in the two open-ended questions at the end of the survey. The results of the content analysis are summarized in the values and vision section of this report.

a. Data Cleaning

In total, 859 surveys were returned. As a result of the validation and verification process, only 665 surveys were deemed valid. Disqualified surveys were deleted.

Surveys were disqualified based on the following criteria (as outlined in Table 1):

- Initial disqualification based on stating they were not a property owner or resident (4)
- Incomplete surveys (both paper and electronic) (109)
- Surveys returned by people from out of town or just outside the boundaries of the study area who were not property owners on file with RDCK (7+4+49=60) (Determined by cross-checking the addresses given with an out of town property owner list from RDCK and a map of Area H North OCP and then Google Maps to see where the address falls. If the address provided was south of the village boundaries it technically would be Area H South.) For example surveys from Winlaw, and south of the Village of Slocan were deleted, unless they were property owners on the RDCK list.
- Surveys for which no personal information was submitted (2+18=20) (Determined by cross-checking all IP addresses and time stamps)

Table 1: Total number of surveys disqualified

Total Values Surveys Started or Returned	859
Disqualifications	4
Incomplete Surveys	109
Non-residents or property owners	61
Failure to complete personal info	20
Total	665

- Three survey choke points where people stopped answering questions and did not complete the survey were identified. These included the question regarding public built structures (question 7) the question regarding government regulation (question 10) and the question regarding permanent versus part time residency (question 15). The survey can be found in Appendix 1.

b. Confidence Calculations

Confidence interval and level were calculated for both the permanent residents and part-time seasonal residents/absentee property/homeowners. Two calculations were done for each group to correct for population under sixteen and estimated population rather than number of households.

The **confidence interval** is also called margin of error. It is the plus or minus figure that is attached to individual survey results. For example, if your confidence interval is 4% and 47% percent of your sample picks a certain answer you can be "sure" that if the entire population had responded, between 43% (47-4) and 51% (47+4) would have picked that answer.

The **confidence level** tells you how sure you can be regarding the accuracy of the confidence interval, or in other words how sure you can be about the percentage of the entire population that would answer within the confidence interval. The 95% confidence level means you can be 95% certain. Most researchers use the 95% confidence level.

Confidence calculations were done using software found on a survey website:
<http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm>

Permanent Residents

First Calculation:

Total Completing Survey: 431

Total Estimated Population (including children under 16): 1651

Confidence Level: 95%

Confidence Interval: 4.01%

Second Calculation:

Total Completing Survey: 431

Total Population Including Children under 16 in Central Kootenay Area H (the Census Division in which the Study Area falls): = 1651

Children under 16 Estimate = 21%

Total Number of Children under 16: $1651 * 0.21 = 347$

Estimated Number of People 16 and Over $1651 - 347 = 1304$

Confidence Level: 95%
Confidence Interval: 3.86%

In this case, for the permanent residents, with a confidence level of 95% and a confidence interval of about 4%, if the answer to a particular question was 47%, we can be 95% sure that the true percentage of the entire population, for that answer, is between 43% and 51%.

Part-time/Seasonal Residents and Absentee Land/Home-Owners

First Calculation:

Total Completing Survey: 234
Total Number of Households (excluding government properties, utilities, and churches):
517

Confidence Level: 95%
Confidence Interval: 4.74%

Second Calculation:

Total Completing Survey: 234
Total Number of Households = 517
Estimated Size of Households = 2.5 persons (based on Census Canada average Household size of 2.5 including children and assumption that part-time/seasonal residents and absentee land/home-owner households contain a similar number of children under 16 as permanent resident households):

Estimated Population: $517 * 2.5 = 1293$
Children under 16 Estimate = 21%
Total Number of Children under 16 = $1293 * 21\% = 271$
Estimated part-time/seasonal residents and absentee land/home-owner aged 16 and over: $1293 - 271 = 1022$

Confidence Level: 95%
Confidence Interval: 5.63%

In this case, for the permanent residents, with a confidence level of 95% and a confidence interval of about 6%, if the answer to a particular question was 47%, we can be 95% sure that the true percentage of the entire population, for that answer, is between 41% and 53%.

7. Demographics

In total, 665 individuals completed the survey. This included:

- 431 permanent residents;
- 175 part-time/seasonal residents; and
- 59 absentee land/home-owners.

For the purposes of the analysis, the 234 part-time/seasonal residents and absentee land/home-owners will be considered together and referred to as the *part-time/absentee group*.

It is worth noting that the breakdown of the permanent versus part-time/absentee groups matches the actual demographics of the area fairly closely. Using the corrected estimates of the total populations of individuals 16 and over for each group, and a total study population of $1304 + 1022 = 2326$, we find that:

- the permanent group constitutes $1304/2326 = 56\%$ of the total study population
- the part-time/absentee group constitutes $1022/2326 = 44\%$ of the total study population

Accordingly, 65% of survey respondents were in the permanent group (431/665) and 35% of survey respondents were in the part-time/absentee group (234/665).

Individuals responding to the survey live or own property in the following study area locations:

- Village of Slocan 71 respondents (10.7%)
- Enterprise Creek 13 respondents (2.0%)
- Village of Silverton 94 respondents (14.1%)
- Rural Silverton 55 respondents (8.3%)
- Village of New Denver 214 respondents (32.2%)
- Rural New Denver 192 respondents (28.9%)
- Summit Lake 9 respondents (1.4%)
- Other study area 17 respondents (2.6%)

Other study area locations included Rural Slocan and the West side of the lake.

For the purposes of the analysis, the three villages will be separated out and the rural area (RDCK Area H North) comprised of Enterprise Creek, Rural Silverton, Rural New Denver, Summit Lake and Other study area, making up 286 respondents, will be treated as one analysis area. Results for the three villages and rural area will be considered for each area of analysis. Areas of convergence and divergence between the villages and rural area will be noted. The full results for each village and the rural area can be found in Appendix 2.

Out of the participants who entered recognizable street addresses (street addresses were not required if they provided other address information) – there were 232 surveys where two people in the household responded, 16 surveys where 3 people in the household responded and 8 surveys in which 4 people in the household responded. This gives an idea of the number of households that had more than one person complete the survey.

Lastly, for a total estimated population of 2326, 330 surveys would have needed to be collected to ensure a confidence level of 95% (with 5% confidence interval). The study collected 665 surveys, which is more than double that number.

8. Survey Findings

a. Values and Vision

This section reviews the qualitative and quantitative results for six survey questions pertaining to important values for Slocan Lake, concerns about the future of Slocan Lake, and ideal visions for the future of Slocan Lake.

Important Values

Survey respondents were asked to identify what is most important to them for the future of Slocan Lake. They were given a list of answer options and permitted to select up to five choices. Their responses to this question, including the breakdown in responses between the permanent group and part-time/absentee group are summarized in Table 2.

By a large margin, respondents indicated that *clean water* was the most important value for them for the future of Slocan Lake. This was followed by *healthy ecosystems and biodiversity, and wilderness parks and conservation areas*. Enforcement of regulations, economic opportunities, natural viewsapes, no over-regulation, recreational opportunities and a lake management plan with wide public support scored relatively lower. High and low ranking choices should be taken in the context that participants were only allowed to select up to five choices in total. Overall, the data suggests strong pro-environmental values on the part of the majority of Slocan Lake study area residents and property owners.

Permanent Versus Part-Time/Absentee Groups

There was limited difference in the responses of the permanent versus part-time/absentee respondents. The differences occurred more in degree of importance (in terms of the precise percentages for each group), rather than which values were deemed most important. Both groups selected clean water and healthy ecosystems and biodiversity and wilderness parks and conservation areas as their three most important values for Slocan Lake.

Permanent residents tended to place a higher value on a natural foreshore and public access, while part-time residents/absentee owners placed a higher value on wilderness parks and conservation areas and recreational opportunities. However the differences were small and recreational opportunities still remained low on the list of important values for part-time residents/absentee owners.

Table 2: What is most important to you for the future of Slocan Lake? (Overall and by residency)

Answer Options	All Respondents	Permanent	Part-Time Absentee	Difference
Clean water	83.5%	84.6%	81.6%	3.0%
Clean beaches	39.1%	39.3%	38.9%	0.4%
Healthy fish stocks	36.4%	38.1%	33.3%	4.8%
Healthy ecosystems & biodiversity	58.9%	60.7%	55.6%	5.1%
Natural foreshore	32.8%	37.9%	23.5%	14.4%
Economic opportunities	16.6%	17.3%	15.4%	1.9%
Lake management plan with wide public support	24.6%	23.4%	26.9%	3.5%
Enforcement of regulations	15.6%	15.7%	15.4%	0.3%
No over-regulation	21.9%	21.0%	23.5%	2.5%
Natural viewscapes	20.7%	19.9%	22.2%	2.3%
Quiet	34.1%	32.7%	36.8%	4.1%
Wilderness parks and conservation areas	43.8%	40.4%	50.0%	9.6%
Public access	31.3%	34.3%	25.6%	8.7%
Recreational opportunities	24.2%	21.5%	29.1%	7.6%


Villages and Rural Areas

There was some difference in the responses among the three villages and rural areas in terms of most important values. Again, the difference lay in degree of importance rather than which values were deemed most important. Respondents from all three areas identified clean water, healthy ecosystems and biodiversity and wilderness parks and conservation areas as their most important values. However there were somewhat wider variations among the villages and rural areas with respect to the degree of importance of the various values than between the permanent and part-time/absentee groups. This is illustrated in Table 3 and Chart 1.

As a group, Silverton residents and property owners appeared to place slightly less value on clean water and healthy ecosystems and biodiversity than the other villages and rural areas, and slightly more value on clean beaches and a natural foreshore. Village of Slocan residents and property owners placed slightly higher value on healthy fish stocks, and New Denver and rural residents and property owners placed slightly lower value on wilderness parks and conservation areas.

Table 3: What is most important to you for the future of Slocan Lake? (by area)

Answer Options	New Denver	Silverton	Slocan	Rural
Clean water	84.4%	76.6%	87.3%	84.2%
Clean beaches	39.6%	43.6%	40.8%	36.8%
Healthy fish stocks	32.1%	33.0%	50.7%	37.2%
Healthy ecosystems & biodiversity	58.5%	51.1%	57.7%	62.1%
Natural foreshore	32.1%	38.3%	26.8%	33.0%
Economic opportunities	16.0%	19.1%	19.7%	15.4%
Lake management plan with wide public support	30.7%	21.3%	25.4%	21.1%
Enforcement of regulations	16.5%	9.6%	18.3%	16.1%
No over-regulation	19.3%	24.5%	9.9%	26.0%
Natural viewscapes	19.8%	20.2%	18.3%	22.1%
Quiet	28.3%	38.3%	22.5%	40.0%
Wilderness parks and conservation areas	40.1%	48.9%	53.5%	42.5%
Public access	36.3%	30.9%	29.6%	28.1%
Recreational opportunities	25.9%	31.9%	26.8%	19.6%



Concern about Future of Slocan Lake

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they are concerned about the future of Slocan Lake. The majority of respondents (77.4%) indicated that they were concerned about the future of Slocan Lake. When the respondents who indicated that they are “sort of” concerned about the future of Slocan Lake were added to the respondents that are concerned about the future of Slocan Lake, it is evident that 90.6% of respondents have at least some concerns about the future of Slocan Lake. Their responses to this question, including the breakdown in responses between the permanent group and part-time/absentee group are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4: Are you concerned about the future of Slocan Lake? (All and by residency)

Answer Options	All Respondents	Permanent	Part-Time Absentee	Difference
Yes	77.4%	79.6%	73.5%	6.1%
Sort of	13.2%	12.1%	15.4%	3.3%
No	8.0%	7.0%	9.8%	2.8%
Don't know	1.4%	1.4%	1.3%	0.1%

Permanent Versus Part-Time/Absentee Groups

There was limited difference between the permanent versus part-time/absentee groups. Part-time residents/absentee owners were slightly *more likely* to indicate that they are not concerned or only sort of concerned about the future of Slocan Lake than permanent residents.

Villages and Rural Areas

Overall, there was little differentiation among the villages and rural areas with regard to concern about the future of Slocan Lake. Village of Slocan residents and property owners however appear to be the most concerned regarding the future of Slocan Lake as highlighted in Table 5.

Table 5: Are you concerned about the future of Slocan Lake? (by Area)

Answer Options	New Denver	Silverton	Slocan	Rural
Yes	77.1%	75.5%	80.3%	77.6%
Sort of	13.1%	12.8%	16.9%	12.6%
No	7.5%	11.7%	1.4%	8.7%
Don't know	2.3%	0.0%	1.4%	1.0%
TOTAL Respondents	214	94	71	286

Types of Concerns regarding the future of Slocan Lake

Respondents were asked to identify what concerns them the most regarding the future of Slocan Lake and were given the opportunity to identify up to five choices. If they were not concerned about the future of Slocan Lake, they were permitted to skip this question. The top six most frequently selected concerns in order regarding the future of Slocan Lake included:


- reduced water quality;
- fuel stations and related lake contamination;
- loss of biodiversity/reduced fish and wildlife;
- crowding and traffic on the lake;
- selling Crown land; and
- noise pollution.

Concerns that were chosen by a minority of respondents and therefore ranked low overall in the list of concerns included inability to develop on lakefront, exclusion of user-groups, lack of economic development and too much regulation. Given that respondents were required to choose their top five areas of concern a low rank for a concern does not mean it was not an issue of concern.

Responses to this question, including the breakdown in responses between the permanent group and part-time/absentee group are summarized in Table 6 and shown graphically in chart 2 for all respondents.

Table 6: What most concerns you when you think of the future of Slocan Lake? (All and by Residency)

Answer Options	All Respondents	Permanent	Part-Time Absentee	Difference
Crowding, traffic on the lake	46.4%	44.6%	49.8%	5.2%
Noise pollution	44.5%	44.1%	45.1%	1.0%
Fuel stations and related lake contamination	53.0%	58.3%	42.8%	15.5%
Reduced water quality	62.0%	60.0%	65.6%	5.6%
Passing point of no return (cum. neg. impacts)	29.4%	30.9%	26.5%	4.4%
Invasive species	26.6%	25.2%	29.3%	4.1%
Loss of biodiversity/reduced fish and wildlife	47.7%	48.8%	45.6%	3.2%
Too much regulation	19.1%	17.9%	21.4%	3.5%
Lack of enforcement of regulations	20.9%	21.8%	19.1%	2.7%
Lack of economic development	13.8%	13.7%	14.0%	0.3%
Inability to develop on lake front	9.5%	9.1%	10.2%	1.1%
Loss of public access to lake front	36.6%	35.3%	39.1%	3.8%
Exclusion of user-groups	10.8%	10.3%	11.6%	1.3%
Selling Crown land	45.6%	47.5%	41.9%	5.6%



Permanent Versus Part-Time/Absentee Groups

There was no difference between the permanent versus part-time/absentee groups in terms of the issues selected as the top five most important areas of concern. However there were some slight differences with regard to the degree of concern for each of those issues. In particular, the part-time/absentee group expressed *less concern* regarding fuel stations and related lake contamination and the selling of Crown land, and *greater concern* regarding crowding/traffic on the lake and reduced water quality.

Villages and Rural Areas

As with the previous question, there is somewhat wider variation in the concerns among the villages and rural areas than among the permanent and part-time/absentee groups. As highlighted in Table 7, although the villages were generally in line with each other in terms of most important areas of concern, there were some differences in the rankings of the most important concerns. Reduced water quality was the only issue that all three villages and rural property owners ranked in their top three. Fuels stations and related lake contamination was also in the top three for all but the Village of Slocan. Silverton identified noise and traffic on the lake as a major concern, the Village of Slocan was more concerned about loss of biodiversity and public access to the lakefront and rural property owners were more concerned about the selling of Crown land.

Table 7: What most concerns you when you think of the future of Slocan Lake? (by Area)

Answer Options	New Denver	Silverton	Slocan	Rural
Crowding, traffic on the lake	40.1%	51.8%	45.7%	49.6%
Noise pollution	45.0%	43.4%	37.1%	46.3%
Fuel stations and related lake contamination	53.5%	61.4%	42.9%	52.6%
Reduced water quality	60.4%	55.4%	61.4%	65.3%
Passing point of no return (cum. negative impacts)	37.6%	27.7%	22.9%	25.4%
Invasive species	21.8%	30.1%	30.0%	28.4%
Loss of biodiversity/reduced fish and wildlife	43.6%	41.0%	57.1%	50.4%
Too much regulation	21.3%	19.3%	14.3%	18.7%
Lack of enforcement of regulations	20.8%	18.1%	18.6%	22.4%
Lack of economic development	16.3%	10.8%	17.1%	11.9%
Inability to develop on lake front	8.9%	7.2%	14.3%	9.3%
Loss of public access to lake front	39.1%	37.3%	48.6%	31.3%
Exclusion of user-groups	12.9%	12.0%	12.9%	8.2%
Selling Crown land	39.1%	45.8%	44.3%	50.7%
TOTAL Respondents	214	94	71	286


Ideal Vision for Slocan Lake 2032 and Beyond

Respondents were asked to indicate their ideal vision for Slocan Lake for 2032 and beyond based on a list of potential options from which they were permitted to select up to five choices. Responses to this question, including the breakdown in responses between the permanent group and part-time/absentee group are summarized in Table 8 and graphed in Chart 3.

The most frequently identified visions for Slocan Lake for 2032 and beyond were clean water, healthy aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems, undeveloped Crown land and quiet. Lake front development opportunities, preservation of archeological history, enforcement of regulations and business/economic opportunities were chosen by a minority of respondents as their top five choices and thus ranked lower in the ideal visions of respondents.

Table 8: What words come closest to describing your ideal vision for Slocan Lake for 2032 and beyond? (All and by Residency)

Answer Options	All Respondents	Permanent	Part-Time Absentee	Difference
Recreational opportunities	27.0%	23.9%	32.9%	9.0%
Business/economic opportunities	17.4%	19.3%	13.9%	5.4%
Year-round residents (more than current)	23.7%	27.8%	16.0%	11.8%
Respect for different lake uses/types of recreation	25.2%	23.4%	28.6%	5.2%
Healthy aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems	59.5%	59.2%	60.2%	1.0%
Clean water	79.5%	80.7%	77.1%	3.6%
Quiet	42.4%	41.3%	44.6%	3.3%
Natural viewscapes	33.7%	34.6%	32.0%	2.6%
Preservation of archaeological history	13.9%	12.8%	16.0%	3.2%
Enforcement of regulations	14.0%	14.6%	13.0%	1.6%
Current level of public access to lakeshore maintained	38.5%	37.8%	39.8%	2.0%
Crown land remains undeveloped	49.2%	51.0%	45.9%	5.1%
Lakefront development opportunities	10.6%	11.6%	8.7%	2.9%
Park-like wilderness area with development clustered in existing development areas	39.3%	36.4%	44.6%	8.2%



Permanent Versus Part-Time/Absentee Groups

There is a slightly greater difference among the permanent and part-time/absentee groups with respect to ideal vision for 2032 and beyond than for the other questions. However the differences remain minimal. Permanent residents were more likely to place greater emphasis

on increasing the number of year-round residents, undeveloped Crown Land and business/economic opportunities. Part-time/absentee residents placed more emphasis on recreation opportunities, respect for different lake uses/types of recreation and a park-like wilderness area with development clustered in existing development areas.

Villages and Rural Areas

Again there is slightly greater variation among the villages and rural areas in terms of ideal vision than among the permanent and part-time/absentee groups. As highlighted in Table 9, although the villages were generally in line with each other in terms of their ranking of ideal visions, there were some differences in the rankings.

Clean water and healthy aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems ranked highest for all three villages and the rural areas. However undeveloped Crown Land was ranked third by Silverton, Slocan and the rural areas, whereas park-like wilderness area with development clustered in existing development areas was ranked third by New Denver. Still, these are very similar options and likely the variations reflect that people recognize the interconnections among the choices. Other variations of note include the high ranking of year-round residents (more than current) by New Denver and Silverton, the high ranking of quiet by rural areas and the low ranking of park-like wilderness areas by Silverton.

Table 9: What words come closest to describing your ideal vision for Slocan Lake for 2032 and beyond? (by Area)

Answer Options	New Denver	Silverton	Slocan	Rural
Recreational opportunities	29.0%	31.2%	32.4%	22.9%
Business/economic opportunities	21.5%	18.3%	21.1%	13.0%
Year-round residents (more than current)	30.8%	32.3%	15.5%	17.6%
Respect for different lake uses/types of recreation	26.2%	26.9%	19.7%	25.4%
Healthy aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems	57.5%	52.7%	64.8%	62.0%
Clean water	79.0%	75.3%	81.7%	80.6%
Quiet	36.9%	45.2%	32.4%	48.2%
Natural viewscapes	29.4%	34.4%	33.8%	36.6%
Preservation of archaeological history	13.1%	11.8%	16.9%	14.4%
Enforcement of regulations	14.5%	14.0%	15.5%	13.4%
Current level of public access to lakeshore maintained	39.7%	41.9%	38.0%	36.6%
Crown land remains undeveloped	41.1%	48.4%	47.9%	56.0%
Lakefront development opportunities	8.4%	12.9%	12.7%	10.9%
Park-like wilderness area with development clustered in existing development areas	41.6%	25.8%	39.4%	41.9%

Values and Vision from Qualitative Responses

In survey question 17, respondents were requested to briefly describe their vision for Slocan Lake in an optional comment box at the end of the survey. 557 respondents answered this question and their responses were content analyzed to identify themes, patterns and common responses. The most frequently recurring vision themes related to:

- keeping the lake pristine/natural/beautiful/healthy – 237 respondents;

- keeping the lake and water clean and unpolluted – 160 respondents;
- establishing some form of motorized boating restrictions – 115 respondents;
- keeping the lake quiet and peaceful – 107 respondents;
- promoting some limited development/growth – 90 respondents;
- leaving the lake as it is – 84 respondents;
- promoting various forms of non-motorized recreation – 76 respondents; and
- protecting ecosystems other than just the lake – 75 respondents.

These themes must be interpreted very carefully. Qualitative questions allow respondents to put responses into their own words and categories, which sometimes do not match those established for quantitative responses by the survey designer. Qualitative data also has to be considered differently than quantitative data because it takes more effort to describe a vision and think of all the components of it than to tick boxes. Thus, although there were fewer numbers of respondents speaking to certain visions than for the quantitative data, the numbers cannot just be directly compared. For every respondent who took the time to articulate their vision in writing, there may have been several more who agreed but did not complete the question as thoroughly. Thus the qualitative data must be given due consideration as both a means of corroborating the quantitative data, but also a means of identifying emergent data that did not appear as strongly in the quantitative results.

The theme of clean lake and water in the qualitative responses matches closely the leading vision of clean water identified in the quantitative responses. Keeping the lake pristine/natural/beautiful/healthy is probably very closely related to healthy aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems, the second choice in the quantitative responses, but also could be linked to keeping it like a park-like wilderness area and protecting natural viewsapes in the quantitative responses. Protecting ecosystems other than just the lake and leaving the lake as it is also probably for some people means healthy aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems and keeping it like a park-like wilderness area. For other respondents, leaving the lake as it is meant not planning and not regulating activities on the lake.

Some respondents also tend to define their vision as the inverse i.e. what they do not want instead of what they do want. Thus the desire for some form of motorized boating restrictions emerged as a strong theme for respondents who wanted quiet, peace, safety, clean water and/or the opportunity for non-motorized recreation. The type of restrictions desired varied significantly from banning certain types of motorized boating (large boats, jet skis, houseboats), to restricting boating times, or speeds or the number of boats. These details are provided in qualitative data summary in the last section of the survey results (see Appendix 3).

The emergence of a relatively strong theme of desiring some limited growth and development in the qualitative responses differed slightly from the quantitative responses. A few respondents indicated that they felt they did not have the opportunity to choose small or limited or sustainable development in the quantitative choices, as development was not defined. Thus there may be somewhat higher support for limited sustainable development as a vision for 2032 than was highlighted in the quantitative visions. Many of the respondents that

indicated this stated that there is a need for jobs to support families and full-time residents. The majority of respondents who indicated a desire for growth (75 of the 90) stressed that it should be sustainable and appropriate economic development 'done right.'

Visions that emerged less frequently in the qualitative data, but are still worth noting include:

- allowing no development/sale of crown land on lake/foreshore – 57 respondents;
- allowing only restricted development/growth – 53 respondents;
- ensuring that the foreshore/lake/water is accessible – 47 respondents;
- attracting/living with people/residents/tourists who respect the land and are stewards of nature – 39 respondents;
- allowing motor boats/water sports on the lake – 29 respondents; and
- maintaining natural viewsapes – 20 respondents.

These results highlight that maintaining public access to the lakeshore and protecting crown land on the foreshore from development, which were important quantitative values, also emerged as somewhat important visions in the qualitative responses with 47 respondents advocating for continued access and 57 respondents advocating for no development of crown land on the foreshore. When people think of their vision, however, they do not always think in great detail unless encouraged to do so, and therefore many of the vision statements provided in the qualitative responses were dominated by more general words such as 'pristine,' 'natural' and 'beautiful'. That does not mean that more detailed visions such as not developing the foreshore or ensuring public access to the lake are not important, but rather that they do not tend to emerge as strongly in open-ended questions.

It should also be noted that the vision of allowing only restricted development/growth is differentiated from the vision of promoting some limited development/growth presented above. Specifically, the first set of respondents (who wanted to promote growth) spoke of needing and wanting growth/development, while the second set of respondents spoke of accepting it and that it must be restricted.

The full results of the content analysis of question 17 can be found in Appendix 3.

Key Messages

Overall, the key messages that can be derived from the quantitative data with respect to values and visions are that all Slocan Lake Study Area property owners place a very high value on clean water and healthy ecosystems. The vast majority of Slocan Lake Study Area residents and property owners were concerned about the future of Slocan Lake. Key concerns included:

- reduced water quality;
- fuel stations and related lake contamination;
- loss of biodiversity/reduced fish and wildlife;
- crowding and traffic on the lake;

- selling Crown land;
- and noise pollution.

Consistent with the highest ranked values, the ideal vision to 2032 and beyond of the majority of Slocan Lake Study Area property owners and residents included clean water and healthy aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems. Undeveloped Crown land and quiet are also high-ranking visions. **Given that respondents were required to choose a maximum of five choices for their values, areas of concern and vision, other themes that were not listed in the top five may still be relatively important.**

The vision statements provided in open-ended questions at the end of the survey generally supported the quantitative vision data, with keeping the lake pristine/natural/beautiful/healthy and keeping the lake and water clean and unpolluted emerging as the two most frequently mentioned visions for respondents. The desire for some limited growth/development emerged more strongly as a vision in the qualitative responses than in the quantitative responses, perhaps because respondents felt they could more clearly qualify their response with statements that they wanted only sustainable, limited development that was 'done right'.

There was limited variation in the responses of permanent residents and part-time residents/absentee owners. Permanent residents and part-time residents had very similar rankings for the values, concerns and ideal visions for Slocan Lake. There were greater variations in the responses of residents and property owners in the individual villages and rural areas of the Slocan Lake Study Area, with certain individual values, concerns, or visions emerging as slightly more important in certain areas. However overall, the views of all of the residents and property owners in the Slocan Lake Study area were in alignment.

b. Recreation

This section reviews the results of question 6 in the survey pertaining to recreation on and around Slocan Lake. Respondents were asked to identify how much (none, less than current, same as current, or more) of a wide range of recreational activities should be permitted to occur on or around Slocan Lake. In indicating that more could be allowed, respondents were given the option to select more with regulations and enforcement, or more even without regulations. The results of this survey question for all respondents are provided in Table 10 and shown graphically in Chart 4.


Important results to note include that for both houseboating and sea-dooing/jet skiing, the majority of respondents (over 64%) felt that there should be either none or less than the current situation. A large number of respondents (more than 43%), although not the majority, also felt that for ski boating and wake boating, there should be none or less than the current situation.

For most recreational activities on the lake, including swimming, fishing, canoeing/kayaking/rowing, sailing, and small electric or 4-stroke motor boating, the majority of respondents felt that the current situation is satisfactory.

Camping and hiking were the only two activities that the majority of respondents (50.3% and 56.5% respectively) indicated that there could be more of on or around Slocan Lake.

Table 10: State your level of support for each recreational activity on and around Slocan Lake.

Answer Options	None should be allowed	Less than current situation	Current situation is satisfactory	We could have more, with regulations and enforcement	We could have more, even without regulations	Don't know
Hiking	0.3%	0.8%	41.5%	20.5%	36.1%	0.1%
Swimming	0.2%	0.2%	58.8%	9.6%	30.7%	0.0%
Fishing	0.0%	2.7%	63.5%	17.1%	11.9%	0.0%
Canoeing/Kayaking/Rowing	1.2%	0.3%	55.3%	11.7%	31.3%	0.0%
Sailing	1.8%	0.6%	54.7%	13.2%	25.7%	0.0%
Sea-dooing/jet-skiing	56.4%	11.7%	18.5%	5.7%	5.9%	0.0%
Small electric or 4-stroke motor boating	3.9%	6.8%	59.4%	15.0%	12.5%	0.0%
Ski Boating	27.7%	15.9%	37.7%	7.7%	8.3%	0.0%
Wake Boating	35.3%	14.1%	28.4%	6.8%	6.9%	0.0%
Houseboating	59.8%	4.7%	20.2%	7.1%	4.8%	0.0%
Camping	0.5%	0.9%	46.5%	33.1%	17.3%	0.0%



Respondents were divided with regard to whether various activities could be increased with or without regulations. With respect to hiking, more respondents (36.1% versus 20.5%) stated that hiking could be increased even without regulations. With respect to camping, more respondents (33.1% versus 17.3%) felt that increasing camping would require more regulations and enforcement. Although the majority of respondents indicated that the current situation was satisfactory with regard to fishing, more respondents felt that if fishing were to be increased then it should be done with regulations and enforcement, than without regulations. Likewise, although few respondents supported more houseboating, of those that did, more felt that it should be done with regulations and enforcement than without. A fairly large number of respondents, although not the majority, felt that there could be more swimming, canoeing/kayaking/rowing and sailing on the lake, without regulations. However, it should be noted that the majority of respondents felt that the current situation was satisfactory with respect to swimming, canoeing/kayaking/rowing and sailing on the lake.

Permanent Versus Part-Time/Absentee Groups

When the results for the permanent versus part-time/absentee groups were compared, there were few major differences to note. The results of this survey question by residency are provided in Table 11.

Table 11: State your level of support for each recreational activity on and around Slocan Lake (by Residency)

Answer Options	None should be allowed		Less than current situation		Current situation satisfactory		More with regulations		More even without regulations	
	Perm	Part	Perm	Part	Perm	Part	Perm	Part	Perm	Part
Hiking	0.2%	0.4%	1.2%	0.0%	40.6%	43.2%	20.2%	20.9%	36.7%	35.0%
Swimming	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	56.8%	62.4%	9.3%	10.3%	32.9%	26.5%
Fishing	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	2.1%	60.6%	68.8%	19.3%	13.2%	13.0%	9.8%
Canoeing/Kayaking/Rowing	1.6%	0.4%	0.5%	0.0%	52.0%	61.5%	12.3%	10.7%	33.4%	27.4%
Sailing	2.1%	1.3%	0.5%	0.9%	53.6%	56.8%	15.1%	9.8%	26.2%	24.8%
Sea-dooing/jet-skiing	59.9%	50.0%	10.2%	14.5%	15.8%	23.5%	5.3%	6.4%	7.4%	3.0%
Small electric or 4-stroke motor boating	4.4%	3.0%	7.7%	5.1%	54.8%	67.9%	14.8%	15.4%	16.0%	6.0%
Ski Boating	29.2%	24.8%	15.1%	17.5%	36.7%	39.7%	7.4%	8.1%	9.0%	6.8%
Wake Boating	37.4%	31.6%	13.0%	16.2%	26.0%	32.9%	7.4%	5.6%	7.9%	5.1%
Houseboating	63.3%	53.4%	3.2%	7.3%	17.9%	24.4%	6.7%	7.7%	6.3%	2.1%
Camping	0.7%	0.0%	1.2%	0.4%	46.9%	45.7%	32.3%	34.6%	17.9%	16.2%

Although permanent residents more frequently stated that activities such as houseboating, sea-dooing/jet-skiing, ski boating and wake boating should not be allowed, the part-time/absentee group more frequently stated that there should be less than the current situation for these activities. When the results for respondents stating that none should be allowed or there should be less than the current situation are combined, the differences between the permanent versus part-time/absentee groups with regard to these activities are minor with the part-time/absentee group emerging as only slightly more supportive of the continuation of, or more of, houseboating, sea-dooing/jet-skiing, ski boating and wake boating. Nevertheless, the majority of the part-time/absentee group, as with the permanent group, stated that there should be no or less houseboating and sea-dooing/jet-skiing on Slocan Lake.

The part-time/absentee group was more likely to say that the current situation is satisfactory with regard to hiking, swimming, fishing, canoeing/kayaking/rowing, sailing, and small electric or 4-stroke motor boating, whereas the permanent group was more likely to support more of these activities with or without regulations. In fact, the permanent group was more likely than the part-time/absentee group to support more of *all* of the recreational activities listed with or without regulations, with the exception of camping for which the two groups were nearly equal.

The part-time/absentee group was slightly more likely to support regulations if recreational activities are to be increased than the permanent group, especially with regard to camping, houseboating and small electric or 4-stroke motor boating. Permanent residents were more likely to say that recreational activities could be increased without regulations, with the exception of fishing and camping. However, it is important to keep these results in the context that the only recreational activities that the *majority* of the permanent or part-time/absentee group supported increases in were hiking and camping.

Villages and Rural Areas

Some variation was observed with respect to the responses from the villages and rural areas. The majority of respondents from all three villages and the rural areas felt that with respect to houseboating and sea-dooing/jet-skiing none or less than the current situation should be allowed. However, with respect to houseboating, respondents from the Villages of Silverton and Slocan felt less strongly that there should be none or less than the current situation. Responses among the villages and rural areas with respect to having none or less than the current situation of all other recreational activities were consistent.

With respect to satisfaction with the current situation and support for more of certain recreational activities, the Village of Silverton indicated the strongest support for the current situation, compared to the other villages and Rural Areas on all of the activities except sailing. The Village of Silverton also indicated the least support for more of any of the recreational activities, with the exception of houseboating and small electric and 4-stroke motor boating. The Village of New Denver indicated the strongest support for more of all of the recreational activities. However, as stated previously, this must be kept in the context that the majority of

all respondents supported more of only hiking and camping. However the majority of respondents from New Denver also supported more swimming and canoeing/kayaking/rowing. Support for more camping was lower in the Village of Silverton and the Rural Areas.

With respect to regulation, respondents from the Village of Slocan and the Rural Areas were slightly more likely to support regulations if recreational activities are to be increased than the Villages of New Denver and Silverton. Respondents from the Villages of New Denver and Silverton were slightly more likely to say that if recreational activities are increased, it could occur without regulation, with the exception of camping and fishing.

Key Messages

With respect to recreational activities, the majority of respondents to the survey felt that the current situation is satisfactory with regard to:

- swimming;
- fishing;
- canoeing/kayaking/rowing;
- sailing; and
- small electric or 4-stroke motor boating.

The majority of respondents felt that with respect to houseboating and sea-dooing/jet skiing, that there should be either none or less than the current situation. A large number of respondents, although not the majority, also felt that for ski boating and wake boating, there should be none or less than the current situation.

Camping and hiking were the only two activities that the majority of respondents indicated that there could be more of on or around Slocan Lake. Nevertheless these were small majorities. More respondents felt that if camping were to be increased it should be with regulations and enforcement than without, whereas more respondents felt that if hiking were to be increased it could be without regulations.

These results were fairly consistent across respondents from the permanent and part-time/absentee groups as well as the villages and rural areas. While respondents from the permanent group were more likely to want none or less of activities, such as houseboating and sea-dooing/jet skiing, respondents from the part-time/absentee group were more likely to be satisfied with the current situation. Respondents from the permanent group were more likely to support more of all recreational activities, with the exception of camping for which the two groups were equal. Respondents from the Village of New Denver indicated stronger support for more of all of the recreational activities, whereas those from the Village of Silverton indicated lower support for more of most of the recreational activities.

Overall, the results suggest that respondents are satisfied with the current level of the majority of activities on and around Slocan Lake with the exception of houseboating and sea-doing/jet

skiing which most respondents want none or less of, and camping and hiking, which the majority of respondents support increases in.

c. Built Structures

This section reviews the results of questions 7 and 8 with regard to public and private built structures on and around Slocan Lake.

Public Built Structures


Respondents were asked to indicate their level of support, ranging from no support to total support for the maintenance of and development of additional public wharves/docks/boat ramps and the location of additional public wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters in existing community areas and outside of existing community areas. The results for this survey question are presented in Table 12.

Table 12: State your level of support for each statement for PUBLIC built structures

Answer Options	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
Maintain existing public wharves/docks/boat ramps for lakeside recreational activities.	2.1%	18.3%	25.1%	54.1%	0.3%
Develop additional public wharves/docks/boat ramps.	46.5%	29.0%	7.2%	14.7%	2.6%
If new public wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters are developed, they should be limited to existing community areas in and around the villages of Slocan, Silverton, New Denver and the unincorporated communities of Rosebery and Hills.	17.9%	21.7%	22.1%	35.5%	2.9%
If new public wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters are developed, they should be in areas outside of existing communities.	71.9%	12.9%	4.1%	4.7%	6.5%

Overall, the results for all respondents suggest that for the majority of respondents, there is substantial to total support for the maintenance of existing public wharves/docks/boat ramps. Although 46.5% of respondents expressed no support for the development of additional wharves/docks/boat ramps, 29.0% expressed modest support and 21.9% expressed substantial to total support for the development of additional wharves/docks/boat ramps.

If public built structures are to be developed, with respect to location of new public wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters, a strong majority of respondents (71.9%) expressed no support for the development of new wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters outside of existing communities (as illustrated in Chart 5), whereas if public built structures are to be developed, a small majority (57.6%) expressed substantial or total support for the location of new wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters within and around the villages of Slocan, Silverton, New Denver and the unincorporated communities of Rosebery and Hills.



Permanent Versus Part-Time/Absentee Groups

When the results for the permanent versus part-time/absentee groups are compared, there are few major differences to note. The results of this survey question by residency are provided in Table 13.

Table 13: State your level of support for each statement for PUBLIC built structures (by Residency)

Answer Options	No Support		Modest Support		Substantial Support		Total Support	
	Perm	Part	Perm	Part	Perm	Part	Perm	Part
Maintain existing public wharves/docks/boat ramps for lakeside recreational activities.	2.8%	0.9%	17.4%	20.1%	25.1%	25.2%	54.5%	53.4%
Develop additional public wharves/docks/boat ramps.	48.5%	42.7%	26.9%	32.9%	7.2%	7.3%	15.3%	13.7%
If new public wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters are developed, they should be limited to existing community areas in and around the villages of Slocan, Silvertown, New Denver and the unincorporated communities of Rosebery and Hills.	20.0%	14.1%	21.6%	21.8%	22.3%	21.8%	33.4%	39.3%
If new public wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters are developed, they should be in areas outside of existing communities.	74.5%	67.1%	10.7%	17.1%	3.9%	4.3%	5.6%	3.0%

The part-time/absentee group was slightly more likely to indicate modest support and less likely to indicate no support for the *maintenance* of existing wharves/docks/boat ramps and the development of *additional* wharves/docks/boat ramps than the permanent group. The part-time/absentee group was also slightly less likely to indicate total support for the development of *additional* wharves/docks/boat ramps. The differences however were very minor.

With respect to the location of new wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters, the majority (67% or greater) of both the permanent and part-time/absentee groups indicated no support for locating them outside of existing communities and substantial to total support for locating them within existing community areas. However, the part-time/absentee group was slightly

more likely to indicate modest rather than no support for locating new wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters outside existing communities, and more likely to indicate total support for locating them within existing communities. *It is possible that some respondents misunderstood this question and that a no support choice with respect to locating structures within existing communities could mean that the respondent does not support the development of the structures at all.* Thus it is difficult to compare the responses of the permanent versus part-time/absentee groups with respect to the location of wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters.

Villages and Rural Areas

The responses of the villages and rural areas with respect to the maintenance of existing wharves/docks/boat ramps were largely similar. However there were some minor differences. Although the majority of respondents (73%) from Rural Areas expressed substantial or total support for the maintenance of existing wharves/docks/boat ramps, a larger number of Rural Area respondents expressed only modest support (24.5%) than respondents from the villages. Respondents from the villages were more likely to express substantial or total support (82% of respondents or greater) for the maintenance of existing wharves/docks/boat ramps.

With respect to the development of new wharves/docks/boat ramps, respondents from the Village of Silverton and Rural Areas were slightly more likely to indicate no support with 50 to 51% of respondents indicating no support, while only 40% of respondents in the Village of Slovan and 42% of respondents in the Village of New Denver indicated no support. Respondents from the Villages of New Denver and Slovan were slightly more likely to indicate substantial or total support for the development of new wharves/docks/boat ramps.

In terms of the location of new wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters, the majority of respondents from all three villages and the rural areas indicated substantial or total support for locating them within existing communities and no support for locating them outside of existing communities, if they were to be developed. Respondents from the rural areas were slightly more likely to express no support for locating new wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters outside of existing communities.

Private Built Structures


Respondents were asked to indicate their level of support, ranging from no support to total support for unlimited and limited private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore. The results for this survey question are presented in Table 14 and shown graphically in Chart 6.

The results suggest strongly that there is no support for unlimited private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore. With regard to limited private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore, 49.6% of respondents (the largest percentage)

indicated no support for limited private development of, while 29.6% indicated modest support and 19.6% indicated substantial or greater support.

Table 14: State your level of support for each statement for private built structures

Answer Options	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
Allow unlimited private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore.	81.5%	7.1%	4.2%	5.7%	1.5%
Allow limited new private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore.	49.6%	29.6%	10.7%	8.9%	1.2%



Permanent Versus Part-Time/Absentee Groups

When the results for the permanent versus part-time/absentee groups are compared, there are few major differences to note. The results of this survey question by residency are provided in Table 15.

Table 15: State your level of support for each statement for private built structures (by residency)

Answer Options	No Support		Modest Support		Substantial Support		Total Support	
	Perm	Part	Perm	Part	Perm	Part	Perm	Part
Allow unlimited private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore.	83.5%	77.8%	6.5%	8.1%	2.8%	6.8%	5.6%	6.0%
Allow limited new private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore.	52.2%	44.9%	27.1%	34.2%	10.7%	10.7%	8.6%	9.4%

The part-time/absentee group was slightly less likely to indicate no support for unlimited private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the


foreshore, and more likely to indicate modest or substantial support. Nevertheless, the majority of the part-time/absentee respondents (77.8%) indicated no support for unlimited private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore.

With respect to limited new private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore, the part-time/absentee group was again slightly less likely to indicate no support and slightly more likely to indicate modest support. A slight majority of the permanent group (52.2%) indicated no support for limited new private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore. Of the part-time/absentee group, 44.9% indicated no support for limited new private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore.

Villages and Rural Areas

The majority of respondents (78% or greater) in all three villages and the Rural Areas expressed no support for unlimited private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore. This was led by respondents in the Village of Slocan and Silvertown (87% or greater) who were slightly more likely to indicate no support for unlimited private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore.

A small majority of respondents in the Villages of Silvertown (56.4%) and New Denver (50.9%) expressed no support for limited new private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore. Slightly smaller percentages of respondents in the Village of Slocan (43.7%) and the Rural Areas (47.9%) expressed no support for limited new private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore. These results are highlighted in Chart 7.



Key Messages

Overall, the results for all respondents suggest that for the majority of respondents, there is substantial to total support for the maintenance of existing public wharves/docks/boat ramps. With respect to the development of additional wharves/docks/boat ramps, the results are more mixed, with the largest percentage of respondents indicating no support, the second largest percentage of respondents indicating only modest support and a small percentage of respondents (less than 20%) indicating substantial to total support.

With respect to location of new public wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters, if they were to be developed, a strong majority of respondents (71.9%) expressed no support for locations outside of existing communities. A small majority (57.6%) expressed substantial or total support for locations within and around the villages of Slocan, Silverton, New Denver and the unincorporated communities of Rosebery and Hills, if new public wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters were to be developed.

In terms of private structures, the majority of respondents expressed no support for unlimited private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore. Support for limited new private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore ranged between respondents that expressed no support (49.6%), those that expressed modest support (29.6%) and those that expressed substantial or total support (19.6%). The permanent group and the Villages of New Denver and Silverton were slightly more likely to express no support for limited new private development of structures on the foreshore.

It should be noted that the aggregation of wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters into one question forced respondents to provide an answer based on the aggregate of all structures. In reality respondents may feel differently about each structure.

d. Boating and Marinas

This section reviews the results of question 9 with regard to boating and marinas. The results for this survey question are presented in Table 16.

Table 16: State your level of support for each statement regarding boating and marinas

Answer Options	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
Moorage expansions at existing docks.	28.1%	40.9%	14.6%	13.2%	3.2%
Dock and moorage facilities developed at additional locations.	51.7%	26.0%	8.4%	11.1%	2.7%
Prohibiting fueling stations on the lake.	17.6%	7.4%	8.3%	65.1%	1.7%
Limiting engine power of boats on the lake if possible.	27.4%	11.6%	12.0%	47.8%	1.2%
Limiting power driven vessels to less-polluting types of motors if possible.	20.6%	17.0%	12.0%	49.0%	1.4%
Boating restrictions in environmentally sensitive and swimming areas.	10.7%	11.3%	11.4%	66.0%	0.6%
Guidelines for noise limits on boats.	11.7%	14.3%	12.2%	61.2%	0.6%
Guidelines for wakes by boats.	15.2%	15.0%	14.1%	52.0%	3.6%

These results highlight that the greatest number of respondents (40.9%) indicated modest support for moorage expansions at existing docks, while only 28.1% indicated no support and 27.8% indicated substantial to total support. With respect to the development of dock and moorage facilities at additional locations, respondents indicated no support by a slight majority. The bulk of those respondents who did indicate some support for the development of dock and moorage facilities at additional locations indicated only modest support.

Support for all of the proposed regulations and restrictions was very strong with a majority of respondents indicating total support for all except two, for which a majority expressed substantial or greater support. These proposed regulations and restrictions in order of level of substantial to total support are (with the combined percentage of substantial and total support):

- Boating restrictions in environmentally sensitive and swimming areas (77.4%);
- Prohibiting fueling stations on the lake (73.4%);
- Guidelines for noise limits on boats (73.4%);
- Guidelines for wakes by boats (66.2%);
- Limiting power driven vessels to less polluting types of motors if possible (61.1%); and
- Limiting engine power of boats on the lake if possible (59.8%).

Permanent Versus Part-Time/Absentee Groups

When the results for the permanent versus part-time/absentee groups are compared, there are few major differences to note. The results of this survey question by residency are provided in Table 17.

Table 17: State your level of support for each statement regarding boating and marinas (by Residency)

Answer Options	No Support		Modest Support		Substantial Support		Total Support	
	Perm	Part	Perm	Part	Perm	Part	Perm	Part
Moorage expansions at existing docks.	32.3%	20.5%	38.3%	45.7%	14.4%	15.0%	13.0%	13.7%
Dock and moorage facilities developed at additional locations.	55.2%	45.3%	23.2%	31.2%	7.0%	11.1%	12.3%	9.0%
Prohibiting fueling stations on the lake.	17.9%	17.1%	4.9%	12.0%	8.1%	8.5%	67.1%	61.5%
Limiting engine power of boats on the lake if possible.	27.4%	27.4%	11.4%	12.0%	10.2%	15.4%	50.3%	43.2%
Limiting power driven vessels to less-polluting types of motors if possible.	19.7%	22.2%	16.7%	17.5%	10.4%	15.0%	52.0%	43.6%
Boating restrictions in environmentally sensitive and swimming areas.	11.6%	9.0%	8.6%	16.2%	11.4%	11.5%	68.2%	62.0%

Guidelines for noise limits on boats.	12.3%	10.7%	13.5%	15.8%	11.4%	13.7%	61.9%	59.8%
Guidelines for wakes by boats.	16.7%	12.4%	13.2%	18.4%	12.5%	17.1%	53.1%	50.0%

The permanent group was more likely to express no support for moorage expansion than the part-time/absentee group. The part-time/absentee group, in contrast, expressed more modest support for moorage expansion. The largest percentage of both the permanent and part-time/absentee group (38% or greater) expressed modest support for the expansion of moorage at existing docks.

The part-time/absentee group was more likely to express modest and substantial support for the development of dock and moorage facilities at additional locations. The permanent group was more likely to express no support for the development of dock and moorage facilities at additional locations (55.2% of respondents) compared to the part-time/absentee group (45.3% of respondents).


With respect to the proposed regulations and restrictions, the majority of part-time/absentee group also expressed substantial to total support for all of the regulations and restrictions listed, but to a slightly lesser degree than the permanent group. Total support from the part-time/absentee was typically 6 to 10% lower than for the permanent group. However substantial and modest support from the part-time/absentee group was generally higher than for the permanent group.

Villages and Rural Areas

Respondents in all three villages and the Rural Areas were most likely to express either modest (39 to 44%) or no support (26 to 35%) for the expansion of moorage at existing docks. Respondents from the Village of Silverton were most likely to express no support for moorage expansion at existing docks than the other two villages and Rural Areas (35% versus 28% or lower in the other areas).

With regard to the development of dock and moorage facilities at additional locations, small majorities in the Village of Silverton and the Rural Areas (56.4% and 54.9% respectively) expressed no support, while respondents in the Villages of New Denver and Slocan were slightly more likely to indicate modest, substantial or total support. As stated previously, the bulk of the support for the development of dock and moorage facilities at additional locations was only modest.

With respect to the proposed regulations and restrictions, the majority of respondents from all three Villages and the Rural Areas expressed substantial to total support for all of the regulations and restrictions listed (See Chart 8). Total support was slightly lower in the Villages of Slocan and Silverton, but not substantially.



Key Messages

The majority of respondents indicated modest, substantial or total support for moorage expansions at existing docks. However the largest number of respondents indicated only modest support, so these results must be interpreted carefully. With respect to the development of dock and moorage facilities at additional locations, a slight majority of respondents indicated no support. The bulk of those respondents who did indicate some support for the development of dock and moorage facilities at additional locations indicated only modest support.

Support for all of the proposed regulations and restrictions was very strong with a majority of respondents indicating substantial to total support for all of the proposed regulations and restrictions listed.

There were few major differences among the permanent and part-time/absentee groups. The part-time/absentee group was slightly more likely to support the development of dock and moorage facilities at additional locations and slightly less likely to indicate total support for the proposed regulations and restrictions.

There were few differences in the results among the three villages and Rural Areas.

e. Planning, Land Use and Our Environment

This section reviews the results of questions 10 through 14 with regard to government regulation, land use planning and our environment.


Potential Government Regulations

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of support, ranging from no support to total support, for various types of government regulation. The results for this survey question are presented in Table 18.

Table 18: State your level of support for each potential government regulation

Answer Options	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
Regulate setbacks of buildings from lakes and streams.	8.3%	13.8%	21.2%	55.2%	1.5%
Regulate vegetation retention on foreshore & riparian areas.	12.6%	15.6%	21.2%	47.7%	2.9%
Regulate stormwater that runs into the lake.	13.4%	15.6%	20.2%	43.2%	7.7%
Regulate sewage that runs into the lake.	3.2%	2.6%	9.0%	84.7%	0.6%
Regulate for preservation of views/aesthetic landscape.	10.1%	14.1%	20.8%	53.7%	1.4%
Regulate to protect environmentally sensitive areas.	7.1%	11.0%	17.1%	63.3%	1.5%
Encourage more active measures to ensure environmental protection of riparian areas on PUBLIC lands in the Slocan Lake area.	9.9%	14.7%	16.1%	57.7%	1.5%
Encourage more active measures to ensure environmental protection of riparian areas on PRIVATE lands in the Slocan Lake area.	17.6%	16.2%	17.9%	46.5%	1.8%

Key results to note with regard to this question are that a sizable majority of respondents indicated substantial to total support for all of the potential regulations listed, particularly with regard to regulating sewage that runs into the lake (93.7% of respondents) and regulating to protect environmentally sensitive areas (80.4%). Regulating stormwater that runs into the lake received the lowest degree of support, but 63.4% of respondents still expressed substantial or total support. These results are shown graphically in Chart 9.



Permanent Versus Part-Time/Absentee Groups

When the results for the permanent versus part-time/absentee groups are compared, there are few major differences to note. The results of this survey question by residency are provided in Table 19.

Table 19: State your level of support for each potential government regulation (by Residency)

Answer Options	No Support		Modest Support		Substantial Support		Total Support	
	Perm	Part	Perm	Part	Perm	Part	Perm	Part
Regulate setbacks of buildings from lakes and streams.	7.7%	9.4%	12.3%	16.7%	20.0%	23.5%	58.2%	49.6%
Regulate vegetation retention on foreshore & riparian areas.	12.3%	13.2%	14.4%	17.9%	20.9%	21.8%	49.0%	45.3%
Regulate stormwater that runs into the lake.	13.9%	12.4%	16.9%	13.2%	17.4%	25.2%	42.5%	44.4%
Regulate sewage that runs into the lake.	3.5%	2.6%	2.3%	3.0%	8.6%	9.8%	84.7%	84.6%
Regulate for preservation of views/aesthetic landscape.	10.2%	9.8%	13.0%	16.2%	20.6%	20.9%	54.5%	52.1%
Regulate to protect environmentally sensitive areas.	7.7%	6.0%	9.5%	13.7%	15.8%	19.7%	65.2%	59.8%
Encourage more active measures to ensure environmental protection of riparian areas on PUBLIC lands in the Slocan Lake area.	11.8%	6.4%	14.2%	15.8%	13.9%	20.1%	59.2%	55.1%
Encourage more active measures to ensure environmental protection of riparian areas on PRIVATE lands in the Slocan Lake area.	16.2%	20.1%	15.5%	17.5%	16.0%	21.4%	50.6%	38.9%

The majority of both the permanent and part-time/absentee group indicated substantial or total support for all of the potential regulations listed. Total support was slightly lower among the part-time/absentee group for several potential regulations, notably encouraging more active measures to ensure environmental protection of riparian areas on private lands and regulating setbacks of buildings from lakes and streams. However total support for regulating stormwater that runs into the lake was higher for the part-time/absentee group.

Villages and Rural Areas

The majority of respondents (60% or greater) from all three villages and the rural areas indicated substantial or total support for all of the potential regulations listed. Substantial and total support tended to be 5 to 10% lower in the Village of Silverton for all regulations except for setbacks of buildings from lakes and streams. For example, substantial and total support for regulating sewage that runs into the lake was 94% or higher in the Village of Slocan, New Denver and the Rural Areas and 86% in the Village of Silverton. Substantial and total support for all of the regulations was the highest in the Village of Slocan.

Vacant Crown Land

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of support for making vacant Crown Land on the shores of Slocan Lake available for potential private ownership and development. The results for this survey question are presented in Table 20.

Table 20: State your level of support for the development of vacant Crown Land

Answer Options	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
VACANT Crown land bordering the shores of Slocan Lake should be available for potential private ownership and development.	71.3%	16.1%	5.3%	5.9%	1.5%

The survey results indicate that a strong majority of respondents do not support making vacant Crown Land bordering the shores of Slocan Lake available for potential private ownership and development.

Permanent Versus Part-Time/Absentee Groups

There are few differences to note between the permanent versus part-time/absentee groups with respect to making vacant Crown Land available for private ownership and development. A strong majority of both groups expressed no support for the development of vacant Crown Land bordering the shores of Slocan Lake. The results of this survey question by residency are provided in Table 21.

Table 21: State your level of support for the development of vacant Crown Land (by Residency)

Answer Options	No Support		Modest Support		Substantial Support		Total Support	
	Perm	Part	Perm	Part	Perm	Part	Perm	Part
VACANT Crown land bordering the shores of Slocan Lake should be available for potential private ownership and development.	71.5%	70.9%	15.3%	17.5%	5.3%	5.1%	7.0%	3.8%

Villages and Rural Areas

The results indicate that there are few differences in perspectives with regard to making vacant Crown Land available for private ownership and development. A large majority of respondents in all three villages and the Rural Areas indicated no support with respect to making vacant Crown Land available for private ownership and development. This majority was lowest in the Village of Slocan (66.2%) and highest in the Rural Areas (73.8%).


Land Management for Mountains and Tributaries

Respondents were asked to indicate whether planning for areas surrounding Slocan Lake should include land management direction for mountains and tributaries. The results for this survey question for all respondents and for the permanent and part-time/absentee groups are presented in Table 22 and shown graphically in Chart 10.

Table 22: Planning for areas surrounding Slocan Lake should include land management direction for mountains and tributaries (all respondents and by residency)

Answer Options	All Residents	Permanent	Part-Time	Difference
Yes	68.9%	69.1%	68.4%	0.7%
No	14.9%	15.8%	13.2%	2.6%
Don't know	16.2%	15.1%	18.4%	3.3%

The results indicate that a strong majority (68.9%) of all respondents believe that planning for areas surrounding Slocan Lake should include land management direction for mountains and tributaries. It is important to note that a fairly large percentage of respondents (16.2%) indicated that they 'did not know' in response to this question suggesting that people were unsure what land management direction for mountains and tributaries means and perhaps more information would be helpful.



Permanent Versus Part-Time/Absentee Groups

As highlighted in Table 22, there are no major differences to note in the responses between the permanent and part-time/absentee groups with regard to whether planning for areas surrounding Slocan Lake should include land management direction for mountains and tributaries.

Villages and Rural Areas

The majority of respondents in all three villages and the rural areas stated that planning for areas surrounding Slocan Lake should include land management direction for mountains and tributaries. However the number of respondents that indicated that planning for areas surrounding Slocan Lake should include land management direction for mountains and tributaries was lowest in the Village of Silverton (56.4%) and highest in the Village of Slocan (77.5%).


Location of and Extent of Development

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they would like to see more development in various types of locations around Slocan Lake. The results for this survey question for all respondents and for the permanent and part-time/absentee groups are presented in Table 23.

Table 23: Preferred locations and extent of development

Answer Options	I would like to see more	I am okay with more	I don't want to see more	Don't know
Development on the lakeshore.	7.2%	20.9%	68.9%	3.0%
Development located in village areas away from the lakeshore.	32.2%	54.3%	10.8%	2.7%
Development located in rural areas away from the lakeshore.	22.3%	54.7%	18.9%	4.1%

A strong majority of respondents (68.9%) indicated that they did not want to see more development on the lakeshore. However a small majority of respondents indicated that they were okay with more development in village areas away from the lakeshore or in rural areas away from the lakeshore and a substantial percentage of respondents (32.2%) indicated that they would like to see more development in village areas away from the lakeshore. These results are shown graphically in Chart 11.



Permanent Versus Part-Time/Absentee Groups

There are a few differences to note in the responses between the permanent and part-time/absentee groups with regard to the preferred locations of development as highlighted in Table 24.

Table 24: Preferred locations and extent of development (by residency)

Answer Options	I would like to see more		I am okay with more		I don't want to see more	
	Perm	Part	Perm	Part	Perm	Part
Development on the lakeshore.	8.8%	4.3%	19.7%	23.1%	68.4%	69.7%
Development located in village areas away from the lakeshore.	33.2%	30.3%	51.3%	59.8%	12.5%	7.7%
Development located in rural areas away from the lakeshore.	25.5%	16.2%	49.0%	65.4%	21.1%	15.0%

A strong majority of both the permanent group and the part-time group did not want to see more development on the lakeshore. However, with regard to development located in village or rural areas away from the lakeshore, the permanent group tended to be more split with a larger number of respondents either wanting to see more development or not wanting to see more development, whereas the part-time/absentee group had a larger number of respondents who indicated that they were okay with more development.

Villages and Rural Areas

The majority of respondents in all three villages and the rural areas stated that they did not want to see more development on the lakeshore but that they are okay with more development located in village or rural areas away from the lakeshore. Village of Slocan respondents were most strongly supportive of development in all three locations, while Village of Silverton residents were least supportive as highlighted in Table 25.

Table 25: Preferred locations and extent of development (by area)
New Denver

Answer Options	I would like to see more	I am okay with more	I don't want to see more
Development on the lakeshore.	9.3%	20.1%	67.8%
Development located in village areas away from the lakeshore.	32.2%	53.7%	11.7%
Development located in rural areas away from the lakeshore.	23.8%	53.3%	18.2%

Slocan

Answer Options	I would like to see more	I am okay with more	I don't want to see more
Development on the lakeshore.	11.3%	28.2%	59.2%
Development located in village areas away from the lakeshore.	36.6%	57.7%	4.2%
Development located in rural areas away from the lakeshore.	23.9%	57.7%	15.5%

Silverton

Answer Options	I would like to see more	I am okay with more	I don't want to see more
Development on the lakeshore.	4.3%	18.1%	74.5%
Development located in village areas away from the lakeshore.	34.0%	47.9%	16.0%
Development located in rural areas away from the lakeshore.	26.6%	48.9%	20.2%

Rural

Answer Options	I would like to see more	I am okay with more	I don't want to see more
Development on the lakeshore.	5.6%	20.6%	70.3%
Development located in village areas away from the lakeshore.	30.4%	55.9%	10.1%
Development located in rural areas away from the lakeshore.	19.2%	57.0%	19.9%

The ranges in answers between the Village of Slocan and Silverton however were small and tended to be between 10 to 15%.

Extent of Regulation

Question 14 focused on the degree to which respondents believed there is too many, sufficient or not enough regulation for the lake and the foreshore at this point in time. The results from this question are provided in Table 26 for all respondents and by residency.

Table 26: Extent of regulation for lake and foreshore (all respondents and by residency)

Answer Options	All Respondents	Permanent	Part-Time	Difference
There are too many regulations for the lake and the foreshore now	6.3%	5.6%	7.7%	2.1%
There is sufficient regulation for the lake and the foreshore now	28.3%	27.4%	29.9%	2.5%
There is not enough regulation - we need more to ensure that the lake and foreshore are properly managed	47.1%	50.6%	40.6%	10.0%
Don't know	18.3%	16.5%	21.8%	5.3%

The results highlight that of the respondents offering an opinion (excluding those that indicated that they did not know), the majority (47.1%) stated that there is not enough regulation for the lake and foreshore. A lesser, but noticeable percentage (36.6%), stated that there is sufficient or too many regulations. It is worth noting that a reasonable percentage (18.3%) stated that they don't know.

Permanent Versus Part-Time/Absentee Groups

Table 26 highlights that a slight majority (50.6%) of the permanent group stated that there is not enough regulation for the lake and foreshore. While a sizable percentage of the part-time group also stated this (40.6%), they were more likely to say there are too many regulations, sufficient regulations, or that they did not know, as compared to the permanent group.

Villages and Rural Areas

Respondents from all three villages and rural areas were most likely to indicate that there is not enough regulation for the lake and foreshore. However respondents from the Village of Slocan were slightly less likely to say that there is not enough regulation for the lake and foreshore and slightly more likely to indicate that they do not know if there is enough regulation for the lake and foreshore.

Key Messages

Overall the majority of respondents indicated support for a wide range of regulations associated with lake and land management and no support for the development of vacant Crown Land bordering the shores of Slocan Lake or development on the lakeshore. A sizable percentage of respondents indicated that more regulation is needed to ensure that the lake and foreshore is properly managed.

There were few differences among the permanent and part-time/absentee groups with respect to planning and land management. The part-time/absentee groups were slightly less supportive of regulations and the need for more regulations, but the majority of this group still indicated substantial to total support for all the regulations proposed. With regard to the development of vacant Crown Land and other land on the lakeshore, and land management of the mountains and tributaries, the permanent and part-time groups were in alignment.

There were a few differences in the responses of the three villages and rural areas with regard to planning and land management. Respondents in the Village of Slocan were the most supportive of additional development in all locations, but also the most supportive of the proposed regulations and land management of mountains and tributaries.

9. Issues Not Addressed

The issues not addressed were determined by identifying emergent themes in the open-ended questions at the end of the survey that had not emerged in the quantitative data. This analysis primarily focused on Question 18, which asked: Are there any additional issues or values that have NOT been mentioned on this survey that you would like to have considered? 312 respondents answered this question and the responses were content analyzed to identify themes, patterns and common responses.

The answers for this question were generally disparate and no strong themes emerged. One theme that did emerge to some extent revolved around concerns relating to who plans, has influence and makes decisions for Slocan Lake as well as the purpose for the survey/study. A message that can be taken from these responses is the need to work together, be tolerant of other viewpoints and include everyone in a transparent planning process. Questions of whether a plan is really needed and is worth the cost also emerged. Some respondents suggested that

development pressures are not actually that strong, and that there is little point in developing new regulations if they cannot be enforced.

The majority of other themes that emerged in response to question 18 revolved around the main themes that emerged elsewhere in the survey such as striking a balance between the need for some development/growth/economic activity in order to keep families and full-time residents in the area and the need to protect the lake, and the desire to restrict motorized recreation versus the desire for tolerance of multiple-use and limited regulation.

A few issues/ideas were identified by one to three respondents, such as the desire for certain types of recreation, the need for faster medical response and the desire to keep Slocan Lake pesticide free. The full list of these issues can be found in Appendix 3.

10. Conclusions

The community values study, “Imagine Slocan Lake”, was unique in that it surveyed residents and property owners across several Slocan Lake communities as opposed to traditional community surveys that focus on the political boundaries of single communities. The results provide a regional picture of values and vision for the future of the Lake.

Residents and property owners aged 16 and over in RDCK Area H North and the villages of Slocan, Silverton and New Denver were surveyed as part of the study as to their values and vision for the future of Slocan Lake. The results from the 665 completed surveys illustrate that there are few differences among communities and between permanent and part-time residents with respect to their views, values and vision. Based on confidence calculations, we can be 95% certain (+/- 4%) that the answers from permanent residents reflects the true population. We can be 95% certain (+/- 6%) that the answers from part-time residents/absentee property owners reflects that true population.

Values, concerns and the future vision, for the majority of survey respondents, point to the paramount importance of clean water and healthy ecosystems. In most cases, respondents support potential changes, regulations and development that maintain and enhance these values.

There are many applications for the information collected in Slocan Lake Survey: Your Values and Vision. In particular, it could act as a reference document and community-building tool for community groups, local governments and community members at large. Along with scientific studies, it could help to inform a future Lake Management Plan, ongoing updates to existing Official Community Plans and more generally inform decision making with respect to what residents and property owners that live in and around Slocan Lake value and envision for their future.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Slocan Lake Survey: Your Values and Vision

Appendix 2: Survey Reports by Village and Rural Areas

Appendix 3: Qualitative Analysis Summary

Question 17:

Question 18:

Appendix 1: Slocan Lake Survey: Your Values and Vision

SLOCAN LAKE SURVEY: YOUR VALUES AND VISION

Welcome to the Survey!

This survey is intended to gather information regarding the personal values and preferences that residents and property owners hold with respect to Slocan Lake. There are 18 questions covering a range of topics. There is space at the end to add important values/issues related to the lake not addressed by the questions. Please give yourself at least 20 minutes to complete the survey (you can take as long as you wish). Read each question carefully before answering. If you make an error, you can un-check your answer by clicking the option again and making a different choice.

Everyone in the household, aged 16 and over, may complete a survey however EACH PERSON MAY ONLY COMPLETE THE SURVEY ONCE. To be eligible you MUST be 16 years or older and a resident or property owner in the Regional District of Central Kootenay Area H North including the villages of Slocan, Silverton and New Denver. All views and ideas matter and we want to hear from a diverse range of people.

Survey results will be shared with local governments including the Regional District of Central Kootenay and Villages of Slocan, Silverton and New Denver to assist them with future decision making. An initial report on what we learn will be available in January 2013. By participating you are giving your free and informed consent to share survey information. Your personal information WILL NOT be shared.

All survey responses are anonymous and voluntary. Your answers will not be connected with you in any way.

Once you have completed the survey, a single time, you will be eligible to enter a draw for \$100.00.

For your survey to be eligible (including for the cash draw) you must include your name, contact information and fill out all questions unless otherwise stated. This personal information is collected separately and will not be linked to the other information you provide in your survey.

Surveys must be completed online by October 14th, 2012 or in paper format by October 12th, 2012.

Paper copies are available at the Village offices of New Denver, Slocan and Silverton October 1-12th, 2012.

Please note that October 14th is a Sunday and Village offices will be closed. If you are submitting a paper copy of the survey, in order to make the deadline, you must submit the survey by October 11th or 12th, depending on the location.

Hours of operation for Village offices are the following:

- * Village of New Denver is open: Mon-Fri, 8-4
- * Village of Slocan is open: Mon-Thurs, 9-4
- * Village of Silverton is open: Tues-Thurs, 10-4

Please complete the following statement in order to continue:

*** 1. I confirm this is the only time I have completed this survey, I am sixteen or older AND I am a resident or property owner in the Regional District of Central Kootenay Area H North (including Villages of Slocan, Silverton and New Denver)**

- Yes
- No

SLOCAN LAKE SURVEY: YOUR VALUES AND VISION

Values

2. What is most important to you for the future of Slocan Lake?

Select up to 5 choices.

- | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Clean water | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic opportunities | <input type="checkbox"/> Quiet |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Clean beaches | <input type="checkbox"/> Lake management plan with wide public support | <input type="checkbox"/> Wilderness parks and conservation areas |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy fish stocks | <input type="checkbox"/> Enforcement of regulations | <input type="checkbox"/> Public access |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy ecosystems & biodiversity | <input type="checkbox"/> No over-regulation | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreational opportunities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Natural foreshore | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural viewscapes | |

*3. Are you concerned about the future of Slocan Lake?

- Yes Sort of No Don't know

SLOCAN LAKE SURVEY: YOUR VALUES AND VISION

4. What most concerns you when you think of the future of Slocan Lake?

Select up to 5 choices. (If not concerned, skip to question 5).

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Crowding, traffic on the lake | <input type="checkbox"/> Invasive species | <input type="checkbox"/> Inability to develop on lake front |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noise pollution | <input type="checkbox"/> Loss of biodiversity/reduced fish and wildlife | <input type="checkbox"/> Loss of public access to lake front |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fuel stations and related lake contamination | <input type="checkbox"/> Too much regulation | <input type="checkbox"/> Exclusion of user-groups |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reduced water quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of enforcement of regulations | <input type="checkbox"/> Selling Crown land |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Passing point of no return (cumulative negative impacts) | <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of economic development | |

5. What words come closest to describing your ideal vision for Slocan Lake for 2032 and beyond?

Select up to 5 choices.

- | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreational opportunities | <input type="checkbox"/> Clean water | <input type="checkbox"/> Current level of public access to lakeshore maintained |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Business/economic opportunities | <input type="checkbox"/> Quiet | <input type="checkbox"/> Crown land remains undeveloped |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Year-round residents (more than current) | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural viewsapes | <input type="checkbox"/> Lakefront development opportunities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Respect for different lake uses/types of recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Preservation of archaeological history | <input type="checkbox"/> Park-like wilderness area with development clustered in existing development areas |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems | <input type="checkbox"/> Enforcement of regulations | |

SLOCAN LAKE SURVEY: YOUR VALUES AND VISION

Recreation

***6. State your level of support for each recreational activity on and around Slocan Lake.**

	None should be allowed	Less than current situation	Current situation is satisfactory	We could have more, with regulations and enforcement	We could have more, even without regulations	Don't know
Hiking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Swimming	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fishing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Canoeing/Kayaking/Rowing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sailing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sea-dooing/jet-skiing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Small electric or 4-stroke motor boating	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ski Boating	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Wake Boating	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Houseboating	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Camping	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

SLOCAN LAKE SURVEY: YOUR VALUES AND VISION

Built Structures

The following terms will be used occasionally in the remainder of the survey.

FORESHORE - Foreshore is the land lying between the high and low water marks and includes beaches. In lakes, the foreshore may have docks and flooding. The foreshore is crown land, not private property. Sometimes the foreshore is referred to as the lakeshore.

RIPARIAN - Riparian areas refer to lands adjacent to a water body. A minimum distance of 30 metres from the high-water mark (measured horizontally) is often used around lakes, but the riparian area can be much wider. Riparian vegetation helps to maintain water quality, reduce stormwater runoff and soil erosion as well as provide protection for healthy aquatic systems. Riparian areas can include privately owned lands. Sometimes riparian areas are referred to as the shoreline.

*7. State your level of support for each statement for PUBLIC built structures.

	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
Maintain existing public wharves/docks/boat ramps for lakeside recreational activities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Develop additional public wharves/docks/boat ramps.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If new public wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters are developed, they should be limited to existing community areas in and around the villages of Slocan, Silverton, New Denver and the unincorporated communities of Rosebery and Hills.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If new public wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters are developed, they should be in areas outside of existing communities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*8. State your level of support for each statement for PRIVATE built structures.

	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
Allow unlimited private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Allow limited new private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

SLOCAN LAKE SURVEY: YOUR VALUES AND VISION

Boating/Marinas

*9. State your level of support for each of the following:

	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
Moorage expansions at existing docks.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dock and moorage facilities developed at additional locations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prohibiting fueling stations on the lake.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Limiting engine power of boats on the lake if possible.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Limiting power driven vessels to less-polluting types of motors if possible.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Boating restrictions in environmentally sensitive and swimming areas.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Guidelines for noise limits on boats.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Guidelines for wakes by boats.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

SLOCAN LAKE SURVEY: YOUR VALUES AND VISION

Planning, Land Use and Our Environment

Government regulations could be used to address issues related to future planning on the lake.

As a reminder, the terms foreshore and riparian are defined below as they are used in the questions to follow.

FORESHORE - Foreshore is the land lying between the high and low water marks and includes beaches. In lakes, the foreshore may have docks and flooding. The foreshore is crown land, not private property. Sometimes the foreshore is referred to as the lakeshore.

RIPARIAN - Riparian areas refer to lands adjacent to a water body. A minimum distance of 30 metres from the high-water mark (measured horizontally) is often used around lakes, but the riparian area can be much wider. Riparian vegetation helps to maintain water quality, reduce stormwater runoff and soil erosion as well as provide protection for healthy aquatic systems. Riparian areas can include privately owned lands. Sometimes riparian areas are referred to as the shoreline.

*10. State your level of support for each potential governmental regulation.

	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
Regulate setbacks of buildings from lakes and streams.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Regulate vegetation retention on foreshore & riparian areas.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Regulate stormwater that runs into the lake.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Regulate sewage that runs into the lake.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Regulate for preservation of views/aesthetic landscape.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Regulate to protect environmentally sensitive areas.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Encourage more active measures to ensure environmental protection of riparian areas on PUBLIC lands in the Slocan Lake area.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Encourage more active measures to ensure environmental protection of riparian areas on PRIVATE lands in the Slocan Lake area.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*11. State your level of support for the following statement.

	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
VACANT Crown land bordering the shores of Slocan Lake should be available for potential private ownership and development.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*12. In your opinion, planning for areas surrounding Slocan Lake should include land management directions for mountains and tributaries (Select one):

- Yes
 No
 Don't know

SLOCAN LAKE SURVEY: YOUR VALUES AND VISION

*13. State your level of agreement with the following statements:

	I would like to see more	I am okay with more	I don't want to see more	Don't know
Development on the lakeshore.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Development located in village areas away from the lakeshore.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Development located in rural areas away from the lakeshore.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*14. Local, Provincial and Federal governments can use regulations to limit and direct use of the lake and the foreshore.

What are your feelings pertaining to lake and foreshore regulations? (Select one):

- There are too many regulations for the lake and the foreshore now
- There is sufficient regulation for the lake and the foreshore now
- There is not enough regulation – we need more to ensure that the lake and foreshore are properly managed
- Don't know

SLOCAN LAKE SURVEY: YOUR VALUES AND VISION

Demographics

Check one answer for each question. If more than one answer applies, check the one you feel is most appropriate. A completed survey is required to be eligible for inclusion in the report and for the draw prize.

***15. I am a:**

- Permanent resident Part-time/seasonal resident Absentee land/home-owner

***16. I currently live or own property in:**

- Village of Slocan (V0G 2C0) Rural Silverton (V0G 2B0) Summit Lake (V0G 2S0)
- Enterprise Creek (V0G 2C0) Village of New Denver (V0G 1S0)
- Village of Silverton (V0G 2B0) Rural New Denver (including Rosebery and Hills)(V0G 1S0/1S1)
- Other (please specify location and postal code)

17. Briefly describe your vision for the future of Slocan Lake.

18. Are there any additional issues or values that have NOT been mentioned on this survey that you would like to have considered? Please list and describe:

Appendix 2: Survey Reports by Village and Rural Areas

SLOCAN LAKE SURVEY: NEW DENVER

I confirm this is the only time I have completed this survey. I am sixteen or older AND I am a resident or property owner in the Regional District of Central Kootenay Area H North (including Villages of Slocan, Silvertown and New Denver)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	214
No	0.0%	0

What is most important to you for the future of Slocan Lake? Select up to 5 choices.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Clean water	84.4%	179
Clean beaches	39.6%	84
Healthy fish stocks	32.1%	68
Healthy ecosystems & biodiversity	58.5%	124
Natural foreshore	32.1%	68
Economic opportunities	16.0%	34
Lake management plan with wide public support	30.7%	65
Enforcement of regulations	16.5%	35
No over-regulation	19.3%	41
Natural viewscapes	19.8%	42
Quiet	28.3%	60
Wilderness parks and conservation areas	40.1%	85
Public access	36.3%	77
Recreational opportunities	25.9%	55
	<i>answered question</i>	212
	<i>skipped question</i>	2

* Answered/question skipped question data only provided for optional questions.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Are you concerned about the future of Slocan Lake?		

Yes	77.1%	165
Sort of	13.1%	28
No	7.5%	16
Don't know	2.3%	5

What most concerns you when you think of the future of Slocan Lake? Select up to 5 choices. (If not concerned, skip to question 5).

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Crowding, traffic on the lake	40.1%	81
Noise pollution	45.0%	91
Fuel stations and related lake contamination	53.5%	108
Reduced water quality	60.4%	122
Passing point of no return (cumulative negative impacts)	37.6%	76
Invasive species	21.8%	44
Loss of biodiversity/reduced fish and wildlife	43.6%	88
Too much regulation	21.3%	43
Lack of enforcement of regulations	20.8%	42
Lack of economic development	16.3%	33
Inability to develop on lake front	8.9%	18
Loss of public access to lake front	39.1%	79
Exclusion of user-groups	12.9%	26
Selling Crown land	39.1%	79
<i>answered question</i>		202
<i>skipped question</i>		12

What words come closest to describing your ideal vision for Slocan Lake for 2032 and beyond? Select up to 5 choices.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Recreational opportunities	29.0%	62
Business/economic opportunities	21.5%	46
Year-round residents (more than current)	30.8%	66
Respect for different lake uses/types of recreation	26.2%	56
Healthy aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems	57.5%	123
Clean water	79.0%	169
Quiet	36.9%	79

Natural viewscapes						29.4%	63
Preservation of archaeological history						13.1%	28
Enforcement of regulations						14.5%	31
Current level of public access to lakeshore maintained						39.7%	85
Crown land remains undeveloped						41.1%	88
Lakefront development opportunities						8.4%	18
Park-like wilderness area with development clustered in existing development areas						41.6%	89

State your level of support for each recreational activity on and around Slocan Lake.

Answer Options	None should be allowed	Less than current situation	Current situation is satisfactory	We could have more, with regulations and enforcement	We could have more, even without regulations	Don't know
Hiking	0.5%	1.9%	34.6%	17.8%	43.9%	1.4%
Swimming	0.5%	0.5%	47.7%	10.3%	40.7%	0.5%
Fishing	0.0%	2.3%	56.5%	18.2%	17.8%	5.1%
Canoeing/Kayaking/Rowing	2.3%	0.5%	46.7%	11.7%	38.8%	0.0%
Sailing	2.8%	0.0%	46.7%	15.0%	32.7%	2.8%
Sea-dooing/jet-skiing	55.1%	12.6%	16.4%	5.6%	8.4%	1.9%
Small electric or 4-stroke motor boating	3.3%	6.5%	54.2%	18.2%	16.4%	1.4%
Ski Boating	26.6%	15.9%	36.4%	7.9%	10.3%	2.8%
Wake Boating	35.0%	13.6%	26.6%	6.5%	9.8%	8.4%
Houseboating	62.1%	3.7%	17.8%	6.5%	7.0%	2.8%
Camping	0.9%	1.4%	37.4%	36.4%	22.0%	1.9%

State your level of support for each statement for PUBLIC built structures.

Answer Options	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
Maintain existing public wharves/docks/boat ramps for lakeside recreational	2.3%	15.4%	25.7%	56.1%	0.5%

activities.									
Develop additional public wharves/docks/boat ramps.		42.5%	29.9%	9.8%	16.4%	1.4%			
If new public wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters are developed, they should be limited to existing community areas in and around the villages of Slocan, Silvertown, New Denver and the unincorporated communities of Rosebery and Hills.		20.1%	18.2%	21.5%	37.4%	2.8%			
If new public wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters are developed, they should be in areas outside of existing communities.		71.0%	13.1%	4.7%	5.6%	5.6%			

State your level of support for each statement for PRIVATE built structures.

Answer Options	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
Allow unlimited private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore.	80.8%	8.9%	2.8%	6.1%	1.4%
Allow limited new private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore.	50.9%	29.9%	11.2%	7.0%	0.9%

State your level of support for each of the following:

Answer Options	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
Moorage expansions at existing docks.	25.7%	39.7%	16.8%	15.0%	2.8%
Dock and moorage facilities developed at additional locations.	48.1%	26.2%	10.3%	13.1%	2.3%
Prohibiting fueling stations on the lake.	19.2%	7.9%	6.1%	65.0%	1.9%
Limiting engine power of boats on the lake if possible.	26.2%	15.0%	9.3%	48.6%	0.9%
Limiting power driven vessels to less-polluting types of motors if possible.	20.6%	17.3%	10.7%	50.9%	0.5%
Boating restrictions in environmentally sensitive and swimming areas.	10.3%	13.1%	7.0%	69.6%	0.0%
Guidelines for noise limits on boats.	13.1%	10.3%	10.3%	65.9%	0.5%
Guidelines for wakes by boats.	16.4%	13.6%	13.6%	54.7%	1.9%

State your level of support for each potential governmental regulation.

Answer Options	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know

Regulate setbacks of buildings from lakes and streams.	6.1%	13.1%	21.5%	57.5%	1.9%
Regulate vegetation retention on foreshore & riparian areas.	12.1%	15.0%	21.5%	48.6%	2.8%
Regulate stormwater that runs into the lake.	14.0%	17.3%	19.2%	42.1%	7.5%
Regulate sewage that runs into the lake.	2.3%	1.9%	10.3%	84.6%	0.9%
Regulate for preservation of views/aesthetic landscape.	11.7%	11.7%	20.1%	54.7%	1.9%
Regulate to protect environmentally sensitive areas.	7.5%	8.9%	20.1%	62.1%	1.4%
Encourage more active measures to ensure environmental protection of riparian areas on PUBLIC lands in the Slocan Lake area.	13.1%	13.6%	15.9%	56.1%	1.4%
Encourage more active measures to ensure environmental protection of riparian areas on PRIVATE lands in the Slocan Lake area.	16.8%	13.6%	18.2%	48.6%	2.8%

State your level of support for the following statement.

Answer Options	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
VACANT Crown land bordering the shores of Slocan Lake should be available for potential private ownership and development.	69.2%	14.0%	7.0%	8.4%	1.4%

In your opinion, planning for areas surrounding Slocan Lake should include land management directions for mountains and tributaries (Select one):

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	70.6%	151
No	16.4%	35
Don't know	13.1%	28

State your level of agreement with the following statements:

Answer Options	I would like to see more	I am okay with more	I don't want to see more	Don't know
Development on the lakeshore.	9.3%	20.1%	67.8%	2.8%
Development located in village areas away from the lakeshore.	32.2%	53.7%	11.7%	2.3%
Development located in rural areas away from the lakeshore.	23.8%	53.3%	18.2%	4.7%

Local, Provincial and Federal governments can use regulations to limit and direct use of the lake and the foreshore. What are your feelings pertaining to lake and foreshore regulations? (Select one):

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
There are too many regulations for the lake and the foreshore now	5.1%	11
There is sufficient regulation for the lake and the foreshore now	31.3%	67
There is not enough regulation - we need more to ensure that the lake and foreshore are properly managed	49.1%	105
Don't know	14.5%	31

I am a:

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Permanent resident	74.3%	159
Part-time/seasonal resident	17.8%	38
Absentee land/home-owner	7.9%	17

SLOCAN LAKE SURVEY: SLOCAN

I confirm this is the only time I have completed this survey. I am sixteen or older AND I am a resident or property owner in the Regional District of Central Kootenay Area H North (including Villages of Slocan, Silvertown and New Denver)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	71
No	0.0%	0

What is most important to you for the future of Slocan Lake? Select up to 5 choices.		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Clean water	87.3%	62
Clean beaches	40.8%	29
Healthy fish stocks	50.7%	36
Healthy ecosystems & biodiversity	57.7%	41
Natural foreshore	26.8%	19
Economic opportunities	19.7%	14
Lake management plan with wide public support	25.4%	18
Enforcement of regulations	18.3%	13
No over-regulation	9.9%	7
Natural viewscapes	18.3%	13
Quiet	22.5%	16
Wilderness parks and conservation areas	53.5%	38
Public access	29.6%	21
Recreational opportunities	26.8%	19
	<i>answered question</i>	71
	<i>skipped question</i>	0

Are you concerned about the future of Slocan Lake?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	80.3%	57

Sort of	16.9%	12
No	1.4%	1
Don't know	1.4%	1

What most concerns you when you think of the future of Slocan Lake? Select up to 5 choices. (If not concerned, skip to question 5).		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Crowding, traffic on the lake	45.7%	32
Noise pollution	37.1%	26
Fuel stations and related lake contamination	42.9%	30
Reduced water quality	61.4%	43
Passing point of no return (cumulative negative impacts)	22.9%	16
Invasive species	30.0%	21
Loss of biodiversity/reduced fish and wildlife	57.1%	40
Too much regulation	14.3%	10
Lack of enforcement of regulations	18.6%	13
Lack of economic development	17.1%	12
Inability to develop on lake front	14.3%	10
Loss of public access to lake front	48.6%	34
Exclusion of user-groups	12.9%	9
Selling Crown land	44.3%	31
<i>answered question</i>		70
<i>skipped question</i>		1

What words come closest to describing your ideal vision for Slocan Lake for 2032 and beyond? Select up to 5 choices.		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Recreational opportunities	32.4%	23
Business/economic opportunities	21.1%	15
Year-round residents (more than current)	15.5%	11
Respect for different lake uses/types of recreation	19.7%	14
Healthy aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems	64.8%	46
Clean water	81.7%	58
Quiet	32.4%	23
Natural viewscapes	33.8%	24

Preservation of archaeological history	16.9%	12
Enforcement of regulations	15.5%	11
Current level of public access to lakeshore maintained	38.0%	27
Crown land remains undeveloped	47.9%	34
Lakefront development opportunities	12.7%	9
Park-like wilderness area with development clustered in existing development areas	39.4%	28

State your level of support for each recreational activity on and around Slocan Lake.

Answer Options	None should be allowed	Less than current situation	Current situation is satisfactory	We could have more, with regulations and enforcement	We could have more, even without regulations	Don't know
Hiking	0.0%	0.0%	43.7%	23.9%	31.0%	1.4%
Swimming	0.0%	0.0%	64.8%	9.9%	23.9%	1.4%
Fishing	0.0%	4.2%	62.0%	21.1%	7.0%	5.6%
Canoeing/Kayaking/Rowing	0.0%	0.0%	57.7%	11.3%	29.6%	1.4%
Sailing	0.0%	1.4%	57.7%	15.5%	21.1%	4.2%
Sea-dooing/jet-skiing	42.3%	21.1%	21.1%	9.9%	1.4%	4.2%
Small electric or 4-stroke motor boating	5.6%	7.0%	60.6%	16.9%	7.0%	2.8%
Ski Boating	26.8%	22.5%	32.4%	12.7%	0.0%	5.6%
Wake Boating	31.0%	19.7%	26.8%	12.7%	0.0%	9.9%
Houseboating	42.3%	9.9%	33.8%	9.9%	1.4%	2.8%
Camping	0.0%	0.0%	46.5%	35.2%	15.5%	2.8%

State your level of support for each statement for PUBLIC built structures.

Answer Options	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
Maintain existing public wharves/docks/boat ramps for lakeside recreational activities.	2.8%	11.3%	25.4%	60.6%	0.0%
Develop additional public wharves/docks/boat ramps.	39.4%	35.2%	11.3%	14.1%	0.0%

If new public wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters are developed, they should be limited to existing community areas in and around the villages of Slocan, Silverton, New Denver and the unincorporated communities of Rosebery and Hills.	14.1%	19.7%	19.7%	40.8%	5.6%
If new public wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters are developed, they should be in areas outside of existing communities.	66.2%	15.5%	5.6%	4.2%	8.5%

State your level of support for each statement for PRIVATE built structures.

Answer Options	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
Allow unlimited private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore.	87.3%	7.0%	2.8%	0.0%	2.8%
Allow limited new private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore.	43.7%	26.8%	15.5%	8.5%	5.6%

State your level of support for each of the following:

Answer Options	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
Moorage expansions at existing docks.	26.8%	40.8%	12.7%	18.3%	1.4%
Dock and moorage facilities developed at additional locations.	43.7%	36.6%	7.0%	11.3%	1.4%
Prohibiting fueling stations on the lake.	21.1%	12.7%	8.5%	54.9%	2.8%
Limiting engine power of boats on the lake if possible.	31.0%	11.3%	14.1%	42.3%	1.4%
Limiting power driven vessels to less-polluting types of motors if possible.	19.7%	28.2%	11.3%	39.4%	1.4%
Boating restrictions in environmentally sensitive and swimming areas.	7.0%	12.7%	12.7%	67.6%	0.0%
Guidelines for noise limits on boats.	8.5%	25.4%	12.7%	53.5%	0.0%
Guidelines for wakes by boats.	14.1%	22.5%	15.5%	46.5%	1.4%

State your level of support for each potential governmental regulation.

Answer Options	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
Regulate setbacks of buildings from lakes and streams.	5.6%	16.9%	28.2%	49.3%	0.0%
Regulate vegetation retention on foreshore & riparian areas.	4.2%	19.7%	26.8%	47.9%	1.4%

Regulate stormwater that runs into the lake.	11.3%	15.5%	19.7%	49.3%	4.2%
Regulate sewage that runs into the lake.	1.4%	4.2%	7.0%	87.3%	0.0%
Regulate for preservation of views/aesthetic landscape.	2.8%	14.1%	19.7%	63.4%	0.0%
Regulate to protect environmentally sensitive areas.	1.4%	12.7%	21.1%	64.8%	0.0%
Encourage more active measures to ensure environmental protection of riparian areas on PUBLIC lands in the Slooan Lake area.	5.6%	15.5%	18.3%	60.6%	0.0%
Encourage more active measures to ensure environmental protection of riparian areas on PRIVATE lands in the Slooan Lake area.	9.9%	18.3%	14.1%	56.3%	1.4%

State your level of support for the following statement.

Answer Options	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
VACANT Crown land bordering the shores of Slooan Lake should be available for potential private ownership and development.	66.2%	23.9%	4.2%	4.2%	1.4%

In your opinion, planning for areas surrounding Slooan Lake should include land management directions for mountains and tributaries (Select one):

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	77.5%	55
No	9.9%	7
Don't know	12.7%	9

State your level of agreement with the following statements:

Answer Options	I would like to see more	I am okay with more	I don't want to see more	Don't know
Development on the lakeshore.	11.3%	28.2%	59.2%	1.4%
Development located in village areas away from the lakeshore.	36.6%	57.7%	4.2%	1.4%
Development located in rural areas away from the lakeshore.	23.9%	57.7%	15.5%	2.8%

Local, Provincial and Federal governments can use regulations to limit and direct use of the lake and the foreshore. What are your feelings pertaining to lake and foreshore regulations? (Select one):

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
There are too many regulations for the lake and the foreshore now	2.8%	2
There is sufficient regulation for the lake and the foreshore now	29.6%	21
There is not enough regulation - we need more to ensure that the lake and foreshore are properly managed	42.3%	30
Don't know	25.4%	18

I am a:	Response Percent	Response Count
Answer Options		
Permanent resident	60.6%	43
Part-time/seasonal resident	15.5%	11
Absentee land/home-owner	23.9%	17

SLOCAN LAKE SURVEY: SILVERTON

I confirm this is the only time I have completed this survey. I am sixteen or older AND I am a resident or property owner in the Regional District of Central Kootenay Area H North (including Villages of Slocan, Silvertown and New Denver)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	94
No	0.0%	0

What is most important to you for the future of Slocan Lake?	Select up to 5 choices.	Response Percent	Response Count
Clean water		76.6%	72
Clean beaches		43.6%	41
Healthy fish stocks		33.0%	31
Healthy ecosystems & biodiversity		51.1%	48
Natural foreshore		38.3%	36
Economic opportunities		19.1%	18
Lake management plan with wide public support		21.3%	20
Enforcement of regulations		9.6%	9
No over-regulation		24.5%	23
Natural viewscapes		20.2%	19
Quiet		38.3%	36
Wilderness parks and conservation areas		48.9%	46
Public access		30.9%	29
Recreational opportunities		31.9%	30
		<i>answered question</i>	94
		<i>skipped question</i>	0

Are you concerned about the future of Slocan Lake?	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	75.5%	71

Sort of	12.8%	12
No	11.7%	11
Don't know	0.0%	0

What most concerns you when you think of the future of Slocan Lake? Select up to 5 choices. (If not concerned, skip to question 5).		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Crowding, traffic on the lake	51.8%	43
Noise pollution	43.4%	36
Fuel stations and related lake contamination	61.4%	51
Reduced water quality	55.4%	46
Passing point of no return (cumulative negative impacts)	27.7%	23
Invasive species	30.1%	25
Loss of biodiversity/reduced fish and wildlife	41.0%	34
Too much regulation	19.3%	16
Lack of enforcement of regulations	18.1%	15
Lack of economic development	10.8%	9
Inability to develop on lake front	7.2%	6
Loss of public access to lake front	37.3%	31
Exclusion of user-groups	12.0%	10
Selling Crown land	45.8%	38
<i>answered question</i>		83
<i>skipped question</i>		11

What words come closest to describing your ideal vision for Slocan Lake for 2032 and beyond? Select up to 5 choices.		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Recreational opportunities	31.2%	29
Business/economic opportunities	18.3%	17
Year-round residents (more than current)	32.3%	30
Respect for different lake uses/types of recreation	26.9%	25
Healthy aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems	52.7%	49
Clean water	75.3%	70
Quiet	45.2%	42
Natural viewscapes	34.4%	32

Preservation of archaeological history	11.8%	11
Enforcement of regulations	14.0%	13
Current level of public access to lakeshore maintained	41.9%	39
Crown land remains undeveloped	48.4%	45
Lakefront development opportunities	12.9%	12
Park-like wilderness area with development clustered in existing development areas	25.8%	24

State your level of support for each recreational activity on and around Slocan Lake.

Answer Options	None should be allowed	Less than current situation	Current situation is satisfactory	We could have more, with regulations and enforcement	We could have more, even without regulations	Don't know
Hiking	1.1%	1.1%	51.1%	18.1%	27.7%	1.1%
Swimming	0.0%	0.0%	68.1%	10.6%	20.2%	1.1%
Fishing	0.0%	2.1%	70.2%	11.7%	10.6%	5.3%
Canoeing/Kayaking/Rowing	3.2%	0.0%	62.8%	11.7%	22.3%	0.0%
Sailing	4.3%	0.0%	54.3%	12.8%	20.2%	8.5%
Sea-dooing/jet-skiing	57.4%	12.8%	20.2%	0.0%	9.6%	0.0%
Small electric or 4-stroke motor boating	2.1%	4.3%	68.1%	7.4%	17.0%	1.1%
Ski Boating	30.9%	11.7%	40.4%	5.3%	10.6%	1.1%
Wake Boating	34.0%	13.8%	30.9%	5.3%	9.6%	6.4%
Houseboating	50.0%	3.2%	28.7%	6.4%	6.4%	5.3%
Camping	0.0%	2.1%	54.3%	29.8%	13.8%	0.0%

State your level of support for each statement for PUBLIC built structures.

Answer Options	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
Maintain existing public wharves/docks/boat ramps for lakeside recreational	1.1%	11.7%	29.8%	57.4%	0.0%

activities.									
Develop additional public wharves/docks/boat ramps.		51.1%	22.3%	5.3%	18.1%	3.2%			
If new public wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters are developed, they should be limited to existing community areas in and around the villages of Slocan, Silvertown, New Denver and the unincorporated communities of Rosebery and Hills.		23.4%	22.3%	20.2%	34.0%	0.0%			
If new public wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters are developed, they should be in areas outside of existing communities.		69.1%	16.0%	2.1%	5.3%	7.4%			

State your level of support for each statement for PRIVATE built structures.

Answer Options	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
Allow unlimited private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore.	87.2%	3.2%	3.2%	6.4%	0.0%
Allow limited new private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore.	56.4%	26.6%	10.6%	6.4%	0.0%

State your level of support for each of the following:

Answer Options	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
Moorage expansions at existing docks.	35.11%	34.04%	17.02%	9.57%	4.26%
Dock and moorage facilities developed at additional locations.	56.38%	20.21%	8.51%	11.70%	3.19%
Prohibiting fueling stations on the lake.	17.02%	6.38%	6.38%	69.15%	1.06%
Limiting engine power of boats on the lake if possible.	28.72%	9.57%	11.70%	48.94%	1.06%
Limiting power driven vessels to less-polluting types of motors if possible.	23.40%	14.89%	10.64%	50.00%	1.06%
Boating restrictions in environmentally sensitive and swimming areas.	15.96%	8.51%	12.77%	62.77%	0.00%
Guidelines for noise limits on boats.	12.77%	18.09%	10.64%	57.45%	1.06%
Guidelines for wakes by boats.	15.96%	17.02%	13.83%	47.87%	5.32%

State your level of support for each potential governmental regulation.

Answer Options	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know

Regulate setbacks of buildings from lakes and streams.	11.7%	9.6%	18.1%	58.5%	2.1%
Regulate vegetation retention on foreshore & riparian areas.	18.1%	14.9%	19.1%	44.7%	3.2%
Regulate stormwater that runs into the lake.	20.2%	16.0%	21.3%	37.2%	5.3%
Regulate sewage that runs into the lake.	9.6%	3.2%	11.7%	74.5%	1.1%
Regulate for preservation of views/aesthetic landscape.	17.0%	13.8%	19.1%	48.9%	1.1%
Regulate to protect environmentally sensitive areas.	13.8%	10.6%	20.2%	54.3%	1.1%
Encourage more active measures to ensure environmental protection of riparian areas on PUBLIC lands in the Slocan Lake area.	16.0%	17.0%	16.0%	50.0%	1.1%
Encourage more active measures to ensure environmental protection of riparian areas on PRIVATE lands in the Slocan Lake area.	20.2%	18.1%	22.3%	38.3%	1.1%

State your level of support for the following statement.

Answer Options	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
VACANT Crown land bordering the shores of Slocan Lake should be available for potential private ownership and development.	72.3%	13.8%	6.4%	6.4%	1.1%

In your opinion, planning for areas surrounding Slocan Lake should include land management directions for mountains and tributaries (Select one):

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	56.4%	53
No	26.6%	25
Don't know	17.0%	16

State your level of agreement with the following statements:

Answer Options	I would like to see more	I am okay with more	I don't want to see more	Don't know
Development on the lakeshore.	4.3%	18.1%	74.5%	3.2%
Development located in village areas away from the lakeshore.	34.0%	47.9%	16.0%	2.1%
Development located in rural areas away from the lakeshore.	26.6%	48.9%	20.2%	4.3%

Local, Provincial and Federal governments can use regulations to limit and direct use of the lake and the foreshore. What are your feelings pertaining to lake and foreshore regulations? (Select one):

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
There are too many regulations for the lake and the foreshore now	7.4%	7
There is sufficient regulation for the lake and the foreshore now	28.7%	27
There is not enough regulation - we need more to ensure that the lake and foreshore are properly managed	44.7%	42
Don't know	19.1%	18

I am a:

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Permanent resident	53.2%	50
Part-time/seasonal resident	40.4%	38
Absentee land/home-owner	6.4%	6

SLOCAN LAKE SURVEY: RURAL AREAS

I confirm this is the only time I have completed this survey. I am sixteen or older AND I am a resident or property owner in the Regional District of Central Kootenay Area H North (including Villages of Slocan, Silvertown and New Denver)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	286
No	0.0%	0

What is most important to you for the future of Slocan Lake?	Select up to 5 choices.	Response Percent	Response Count
Clean water		84.2%	240
Clean beaches		36.8%	105
Healthy fish stocks		37.2%	106
Healthy ecosystems & biodiversity		62.1%	177
Natural foreshore		33.0%	94
Economic opportunities		15.4%	44
Lake management plan with wide public support		21.1%	60
Enforcement of regulations		16.1%	46
No over-regulation		26.0%	74
Natural views/capes		22.1%	63
Quiet		40.0%	114
Wilderness parks and conservation areas		42.5%	121
Public access		28.1%	80
Recreational opportunities		19.6%	56
		<i>answered question</i>	285
		<i>skipped question</i>	1

Are you concerned about the future of Slocan Lake?	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	77.6%	222

Sort of	Response Percent	Response Count
No	8.7%	25
Don't know	1.0%	3

What most concerns you when you think of the future of Slocan Lake? Select up to 5 choices. (If not concerned, skip to question 5).

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Crowding, traffic on the lake	49.6%	133
Noise pollution	46.3%	124
Fuel stations and related lake contamination	52.6%	141
Reduced water quality	65.3%	175
Passing point of no return (cumulative negative impacts)	25.4%	68
Invasive species	28.4%	76
Loss of biodiversity/reduced fish and wildlife	50.4%	135
Too much regulation	18.7%	50
Lack of enforcement of regulations	22.4%	60
Lack of economic development	11.9%	32
Inability to develop on lake front	9.3%	25
Loss of public access to lake front	31.3%	84
Exclusion of user-groups	8.2%	22
Selling Crown land	50.7%	136
<i>answered question</i>		268
<i>skipped question</i>		18

What words come closest to describing your ideal vision for Slocan Lake for 2032 and beyond? Select up to 5 choices.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Recreational opportunities	22.9%	65
Business/economic opportunities	13.0%	37
Year-round residents (more than current)	17.6%	50
Respect for different lake uses/types of recreation	25.4%	72
Healthy aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems	62.0%	176
Clean water	80.6%	229
Quiet	48.2%	137
Natural viewscapes	36.6%	104

Preservation of archaeological history	14.4%	41
Enforcement of regulations	13.4%	38
Current level of public access to lakeshore maintained	36.6%	104
Crown land remains undeveloped	56.0%	159
Lakefront development opportunities	10.9%	31
Park-like wilderness area with development clustered in existing development areas	41.9%	119
	<i>answered question</i>	284
	<i>skipped question</i>	2

State your level of support for each recreational activity on and around Slocan Lake.

Answer Options	None should be allowed	Less than current situation	Current situation is satisfactory	We could have more, with regulations and enforcement	We could have more, even without regulations	Don't know
Hiking	0.0%	0.0%	43.0%	22.4%	34.3%	0.3%
Swimming	0.0%	0.0%	62.6%	8.7%	28.3%	0.3%
Fishing	0.0%	2.8%	66.8%	17.1%	9.1%	4.2%
Canoeing/Kayaking/Rowing	0.0%	0.3%	58.7%	11.9%	29.0%	0.0%
Sailing	0.7%	1.0%	60.1%	11.5%	23.4%	3.1%
Sea-dooing/jet-skiing	60.5%	8.4%	18.9%	6.6%	3.8%	1.7%
Small electric or 4-stroke motor boating	4.5%	7.7%	60.1%	14.7%	9.4%	3.5%
Ski Boating	27.6%	15.7%	39.2%	7.0%	8.0%	2.4%
Wake Boating	37.1%	13.3%	29.4%	5.9%	5.6%	8.7%
Houseboating	65.7%	4.5%	15.7%	7.0%	3.5%	3.5%
Camping	0.3%	0.3%	50.7%	31.1%	15.4%	2.1%

State your level of support for each statement for PUBLIC built structures.

Answer Options	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know

Maintain existing public wharves/docks/boat ramps for lakeside recreational activities.	2.1%	24.5%	23.1%	50.0%	0.3%
Develop additional public wharves/docks/boat ramps.	49.7%	29.0%	4.9%	12.6%	3.8%
If new public wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters are developed, they should be limited to existing community areas in and around the villages of Slocan, Silvertown, New Denver and the unincorporated communities of Rosebery and Hills.	15.4%	24.5%	23.8%	33.2%	3.1%
If new public wharves/docks/boat ramps/breakwaters are developed, they should be in areas outside of existing communities.	74.8%	11.2%	3.8%	3.8%	6.3%

State your level of support for each statement for PRIVATE built structures.

Answer Options	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
Allow unlimited private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore.	78.7%	7.0%	5.9%	6.6%	1.7%
Allow limited new private development of wharves/docks/permanent and floating structures/breakwaters on the foreshore.	47.9%	31.1%	9.1%	11.2%	0.7%

State your level of support for each of the following:

Answer Options	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
Moorage expansions at existing docks.	28.0%	44.1%	12.6%	11.9%	3.5%
Dock and moorage facilities developed at additional locations.	54.9%	25.2%	7.3%	9.4%	3.1%
Prohibiting fueling stations on the lake.	15.7%	5.9%	10.5%	66.4%	1.4%
Limiting engine power of boats on the lake if possible.	26.9%	9.8%	13.6%	48.3%	1.4%
Limiting power driven vessels to less-polluting types of motors if possible.	19.9%	14.7%	13.6%	49.7%	2.1%
Boating restrictions in environmentally sensitive and swimming areas.	10.1%	10.5%	14.0%	64.0%	1.4%
Guidelines for noise limits on boats.	11.2%	13.3%	14.0%	60.8%	0.7%
Guidelines for wakes by boats.	14.3%	13.6%	14.3%	52.8%	4.9%

State your level of support for each potential governmental regulation.

Answer Options	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
Regulate setbacks of buildings from lakes and streams.	9.4%	15.0%	20.3%	53.8%	1.4%
Regulate vegetation retention on foreshore & riparian areas.	13.3%	15.4%	20.3%	47.9%	3.1%
Regulate stormwater that runs into the lake.	11.2%	14.3%	20.6%	44.4%	9.4%
Regulate sewage that runs into the lake.	2.1%	2.4%	7.7%	87.4%	0.3%
Regulate for preservation of views/aesthetic landscape.	8.4%	16.1%	22.0%	52.1%	1.4%
Encourage more active measures to ensure environmental protection of riparian areas on PUBLIC lands in the Slocan Lake area.	5.9%	12.2%	12.9%	66.8%	2.1%
Encourage more active measures to ensure environmental protection of riparian areas on PRIVATE lands in the Slocan Lake area.	6.6%	14.7%	15.7%	60.8%	2.1%
	19.2%	17.1%	17.1%	45.1%	1.4%

State your level of support for the following statement:

Answer Options	No Support	Modest Support	Substantial Support	Total Support	Don't Know
VACANT Crown land bordering the shores of Slocan Lake should be available for potential private ownership and development.	73.8%	16.4%	3.8%	4.2%	1.7%

In your opinion, planning for areas surrounding Slocan Lake should include land management directions for mountains and tributaries (Select one):

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	69.6%	199
No	11.2%	32
Don't know	19.2%	55

State your level of agreement with the following statements:

Answer Options	I would like to see more	I am okay with more	I don't want to see more	Don't know
Development on the lakeshore.	5.6%	20.6%	70.3%	3.5%
Development located in village areas away from the lakeshore.	30.4%	55.9%	10.1%	3.5%

Development located in rural areas away from the lakeshore.	19.2%	57.0%	19.9%	3.8%
-------------------------------------------------------------	-------	-------	-------	------

Local, Provincial and Federal governments can use regulations to limit and direct use of the lake and the foreshore. What are your feelings pertaining to lake and foreshore regulations? (Select one):

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
There are too many regulations for the lake and the foreshore now	7.7%	22
There is sufficient regulation for the lake and the foreshore now	25.5%	73
There is not enough regulation - we need more to ensure that the lake and foreshore are properly managed	47.6%	136
Don't know	19.2%	55

I am a:

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Permanent resident	62.6%	179
Part-time/seasonal resident	30.8%	88
Absentee land/home-owner	6.6%	19

I currently live or own property in:

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Village of Slocan (V0G 2C0)	0.0%	0
Enterprise Creek (V0G 2C0)	4.5%	13
Village of Silvertown (V0G 2B0)	0.0%	0
Rural Silvertown (V0G 2B0)	19.2%	55
Village of New Denver (V0G 1S0)	0.0%	0
Rural New Denver (including Rosebery and Hills)(V0G 1S0/1S1)	67.1%	192
Summit Lake (V0G 2S0)	3.1%	9
Other (please specify location and postal code)	5.9%	17

Appendix 3: Qualitative Analysis Summary

The two open-ended questions included in the survey (questions 17 and 18) were content analyzed to identify key themes, patterns and common responses. All open-ended questions were read and categories of responses were created. All of the responses were coded and then statistics were kept for the number of respondents providing certain answers. 557 respondents answered question 17 and 312 respondents answered question 18.

Question 17:

Briefly describe your vision for Slocan Lake

For question 17, the total number of respondents touching on certain themes was aggregated to identify key emergent themes. Thus for question one, for headings in italics, the number of respondents provided in italics is the aggregate of the bulleted list below it i.e. the total number of respondents that touched upon that theme is provided and the list of types of statements that were considered to be part of the theme are provided in the bulleted list, often with the number of associated respondents. The number of respondents in the italics is not simply the total respondents in the bulleted list below, as some respondents touched on more than one item in the bulleted list.

For themes or responses that could not be aggregated, the total number of respondents making that statement is simply provided.

The emergent themes were then grouped into broader categories: ecosystems and environmental quality, people and communities, recreation, development/economic activity and growth, regulation and enforcement, industrial facilities and activities, planning/research and transportation.

Ecosystems and Environmental Quality

Pristine/Natural/Beautiful/Preserved/Healthy – 237 respondents

- Pristine – 96 respondents
- Beautiful – 70 respondents
- Natural – 65 respondents
- Healthy – 44 respondents
- Preserved for future generations – 22 respondents
- No human impact – 5 respondents
- More natural/returned to original state – 5 respondents

Clean/Unpolluted/Clean Lake/Clean beaches/No sewage – 160 respondents

- Clean potable/drinkable water – 56 respondents

Quiet/Peaceful/Limited noise – 107 respondents

Left as is – 84 respondents

(Leave it as is/don't change anything/make sure it is as good as it is now)

A place the world can praise – 17 respondents

Views – 20 respondents

- Clear views of mountains and lakes/natural viewscapes – 15 respondents
- Remove trees to improve views – 3 respondents
- Limit building heights – 1 respondent

Protected areas other than just the lake – 75 respondents

- Watershed/Tributaries – 12 respondents
- Riparian areas – 10 respondents
- Wildlife/biodiversity – 23 respondents
- Environment/Ecosystems – 23 respondents
- Wilderness – 14 respondents
- Abundant fish – 11 respondents
- Clean Air – 5 respondents

Restored ecosystems – 5 respondents

No over use – 2 respondents

People and Communities

People who respect land/communities/lakes/connected to nature/stewards – 39 respondents

Educated locals and visitors re responsible use with pamphlets and signs – 7 respondents

Sustainable communities – 7 respondents

Prosperous communities – 2 respondents

Uncrowded communities and lake – 9 respondents

Safe communities – 5 respondents

Communities with hospitals and schools – 6 respondents

More tolerance for multiple use and neighbours – 9 respondents

Everyone included in discussions – 4 respondents

Bear Smart communities – 2 respondents

Affordable – 1 respondent

Managed for benefit of everyone – 1 respondent

Community celebrations – 1 respondent

Recreation

Promote non-motorized recreation and enhance recreational facilities – 76 respondents

Types of Recreation

- Quiet environmentally friendly recreation – 6 respondents
- Recreational/Eco Tourism (but no development) – 13 respondents
- Non-motorized recreation only – 14 respondents
- Hiking – 22 respondents
- Swimming – 24 respondents
- Canoeing – 30 respondents
- Kayaking – 29 respondents
- Sailing – 10 respondents
- Camping – 14 respondents
- Fishing – 16 respondents
- Biking – 3 respondents
- Scuba diving – 1 respondent
- Nordic skiing – 3 respondents
- Paragliding – 1 respondent
- Kite surfing – 1 respondent

Recreational Facilities

- Better wharves/public washrooms/beach facilities – 4 respondents
- Better remote moorage/picnic sites – 2 respondents
- More/better campsites – 8 respondents
- Full service camping – 1 respondent
- Better maintenance/cleanup of campsites – 2 respondents
- Enhanced/fertilize/stock lakes – 5 respondents
- Kill off white fish as they are taking over trout – 1 respondent
- Mountain biking trails – 3 respondents
- Better/more trails/trails on west side/Nordic trails/trail network – 18 respondents
- Valhalla park boat and trail access only – 2 respondents
- Water taxi to other side of lake – 4 respondents
- Better launch moorage sites for kayaks, canoes and sailboats – 6 respondents

Establish some form of motorized boating restrictions – 115 respondents

- Sailboats, Kayaks, row boats, canoes, small motors only – 6 respondents
- No waterskiing – 4 respondents
- No houseboats – 18 respondents
- No commercial rental of motor boats – 4 respondents
- No jet skis/sea doos – 26 respondents
- Noise bylaw on jet boats and ski doos – 14 respondents
- Ban motor boats/Rescue vessels only – 19 respondents
- Allow no increase in boat traffic – 3 respondents
- Limit the number of motor boats – 24 respondents
- Limit the size of motor boats/No 2 stroke engines – 24 respondents
- No fueling stations – 6 respondents
- Reduce the number of motor boats – 5 respondents

- Allow electric motors only – 5 respondents
- Regulate motor boat speed – 6 respondents
- Regulate jet skis and wakeboats – 1 respondent
- Regulate water boat locations – 2 respondents
- Responsible boating only – 2 respondents

Allow motor boats/water sports on lake – 29 respondents

- Do not ban motor boats – 19 respondents
- Increase moorage and docks for motor boats – 5 respondents
- Increase fueling stations/small marinas – 5 respondents
- Allow waterskiing – 3 respondents
- Allow sea doing – 1 respondent
- Allow boat rentals – 1 respondent

Promote unrestricted/shared recreation use – 17 respondents

- Promote multiple/shared use – 15 respondents
- Allow unrestricted recreation – 2 respondents

Ensure the foreshore/lake/water is accessible – 47 respondents

(Ensure the lake is accessible to all/maintain accessibility to beaches/more age friendly and physically challenged access to lakeshore/ensure access for everyone)

Create more parks/protected areas – 21 respondents

- More parks in general – 7 respondents
- More beach front parks with facilities – 6 respondents
- Make the lake a park – 1 respondent
- Make the marsh a park – 3 respondents
- Make all crown land on foreshore a park or protected area – 5 respondents
- Increase number of parks on west side – 1 respondent

Development/Economic Activity and Growth

No development/growth at all – 30 respondents

No development/sale of crown land on lake/foreshore – 57 respondents

Okay with restricted development/growth/No big development/Limit development – 53 respondents

- No condos/hotels/high rises – 5 respondents
- No development west side of lake – 5 respondents
- No developers – 5 respondents
- Only low impact/low density/sustainable development – 12 respondents
- If development has to happen restrict to around villages – 8 respondents
- Cycling/pedestrian oriented development – 4 respondents

- No damaging development – 1 respondent

Want some limited development/growth – 90 respondents

- Emphasis on responsible sustainable development/doing it right/doing it in the right locations/ balance – 75 respondents
- Emphasis on growth with no limit – 15 respondents
- Need more tourism – 28 respondents
- Need more sustainable and appropriate economic development – 24 respondents
- Need more employment/business opportunities – 19 respondents
- More full time residents – 15 respondents
- Thriving community focused on families – 8 respondents
- Need more shops, restaurants and craft stores in villages – 5 respondents
- More infrastructure for telecommuting and advertizing to attract professionals – 2 respondents
- Development of the lakeshore okay if regulated/slow/small scale – 9 respondents
- Small resort – 2 respondents
- Hiking guide – 1 respondent
- Yacht club – 1 respondent
- No big stores or highrises – 1 respondent
- Hotel – 1 respondent
- Innovative businesses such as eco-logging, lumber manufacturing, food production – 4 respondents
- More industry – 1 respondent

Maintain current economic opportunities – 4 respondents

Regulation and Enforcement

More regulations to protect lake – 27 respondents

No more regulations/no overregulation – 28 respondents

Balance of regulations vs. no regulations – 5 respondents

More enforcement/more rangers – 17 respondents

Industrial Facilities and Activities

Get rid of/clean up mill site/Roseberry – 19 respondents

No more logging anywhere – 9 respondents

Responsible logging/mining practices – 3 respondents

Develop old industrial facilities as a public beach/restaurant/hotel – 3 respondents

Planning/Research

An environmental study – 2 respondents

A Plan for the lake – 4 respondents

Explored archeological sites – 1 respondent

Transportation

Reduced traffic – 2 respondents

Steamboat/electrical rail transport between villages – 1 respondent

Water front trails connecting all the villages – 5 respondents

Question 18:

Are there any additional issues or values that have NOT been mentioned on this survey that you would like to have considered? Please list and describe:

Aggregation of number of respondents for each theme was not undertaken for question 18 as it was for question 17, as there was more disparity in the answers and fewer emergent themes. The responses are grouped broadly according to theme and the number of respondents providing each response is included as the number associated with each statement.

No other issues – 32

Planning/Overregulation/ Work together/Recognizing the needs of others

- SLSS/Special interest groups/certain sectors of the population are not representative and should not have undue influence – 16
- Do not over-regulate – 6
- Need to recognize there was industry here before and lake is fine/leave it alone – 5
- People who have lived here for many years feeling pushed out of process and over regulated – 5
- No big political planning process and red tape – 3
- Need to work together – 3
- Recognize First Nation rights and needs – 3
- Need to share lake – 2
- Non-residents should not be included in the process – 2
- This is an expensive and useless process as regulations be too costly and therefore will not be enforced – 2
- Many regulations already exist and are enforced – 3
- Need more information on bylaws/regulations already in existence – 1
- There needs to be a transparent public planning process - 1
- If a plan is developed it needs regulatory teeth – 1
- Need a community development plan – 1
- Love this community and the people – 1
- Recognize the diverse traditions of different residents – 1
- Need to stop slander and attempts at control by SLSS and other groups – 1
- Want information on who funds SLSS – 1
- Need to allow input of Slokan Valley south residents particularly with regard to water quality – 1

Survey

- Survey biased/poor/misleading – 21 (there is a hidden agenda, did not allow me to answer the way I wanted, seems like thinly disguised plan to get answers that survey designer wants, results will be interpreted how group wants them to be, the timing of the survey after summer residents have gone seems calculated, survey should have focused on winter activities too, definitions poor i.e. development needs to be defined and people allowed to pick small vs large scale development or commercial vs private, people need to know how the regulations would look before they can agree to them, foreshore definition was wrong – high water mark includes private land during high water years, need more information on what regulations exist now and what is being enforced and what has been done historically)
- Good survey – 8
- Commendable to do survey – 1
- Not sure of purpose of survey as there are already regulations – 1
- Survey should be done by local government – 1
- Survey was waste of time and money as nothing will be done – 1
- Is there even interest in development – why survey - 1

Stewardship/Education

- Need more education for people especially visitors regarding the natural lake ecosystem including signs – 4
- Need a volunteer stewardship covenant that is passed down to new owners – 1
- Educate students and future generations regarding the importance of the lake – 1

Enhance recreation/tourism options

- Improve fishing (fertilizing, stocking, ecosystem enhancement) - 9
- Modest trail development (especially between communities and to lake) – 7
- Cut down trees around lakes and along highway to enhance views – 5
- Moderate campground development (currently overcrowded) – 4
- Develop mountain biking/cycling trails – 4
- Need another marina/larger marinas – 2
- Fully protect and maintain Valhalla – 2
- Need piers in villages with canoe/kayak/rowboat launches - 1
- Maintain campgrounds better – 1
- Lake tours for tourists – 1
- Need better beaches with better facilities in New Denver – 1
- Develop a retreat to take advantage of aesthetics – 1
- Welcome signs – 1
- Put in water taxi for hiking/boat access – 1
- Develop educational programs (academic and for tourists) regarding an intact lake ecosystem – 1
- Develop educational programs focusing on the cultural history of the area – 1

- More boat launches – 1
- Enhance biking/kayaking/canoeing – 1

Access

- Improve access to lake for seniors and the disabled (piers/boardwalk trails) – 4
- Lakeshore should remain accessible by all – 3
- Need more pull out areas/parking areas on highways and between villages with trails to lake – 2

Regulate/Restrict certain recreational activities

- Ban or tax loud/2 stroke motorboats –10
- Keep jet skis off the lake – 8
- Deal with all the canoes and kayaks tied to shore (safety issue) - 4
- Keep out seaplanes and helicopters – 3
- No houseboats – 3
- No sailboats with bathrooms and kitchens - 2
- Limit the number of boats on the lake/keep water traffic down – 2
- Restrict boating hours – 1
- No gas bars on the lake – 1
- Get rid of motorbikes on highway – 2
- No hunting in the park – 4
- No cat skiing operations – 1
- No mountain biking – 1
- No dirt bikes – 1
- Restrict noise - 1
- Limit camping on west side – 1
- Stop illegal camping at Rosebery – 1
- Move crowded campsites away from residential areas – 1
- Stricter hunting regulations – 1
- Regulate pollution from boat motors – 1

Regulate/Restrict development and industrial activity

- Complete protection/preservation of all Crown land around lake – 8
- No development whatsoever as it just leads to more development – 5
- Deal with truck traffic on Highway 6 (too noisy, too unsafe) – divert, promote use of barges and rail or restrict hours – 5
- Include the river, tributaries and watershed in lake management planning - 4
- No corporate development/big business – 2
- No industrial development/logging/mining on foreshore – 3
- Protect and monitor the watersheds and tributaries – 2
- No ugly development – 1
- No logging or mining anywhere in/near the park – 2

- Monitor logging and mining – 1
- Need more regulations – 1

Allow/Promote some development

- Okay with small scale/low density/sustainable development – 8
- Promote creative economic development to benefit people and region not big business (i.e. thermal heating from composting, recreation, ecotourism, adventure tourism, historical tours/education, lumber manufacturing, reopen Springer Creek sawmill) – 9
- Need to recognize need for economic activity/tourism – 6
- Need families and jobs in this area - 5
- Recognize that some development can happen without destroying the lake – 3
- Establish zoning to determine future, commercial, residential and industrial areas – 1
- Make getting a building permit easier – 1
- Want schools and hospitals to stay - 1

Protect Areas/Clean areas up

- Need to protect Slocan lake and not indulge in short term economic gain – 13
- Need to clean up mill site and log booms – industry and government should help – 8
- Need to deal with sewage issue/septic systems from villages/hotels before water quality is affected – 8
- Need pet regulations and requirements that dog feces be picked up – 3
- Bring back the kokanee/fix kokanee spawning grounds/study the issue – 8
- Deal with fire hazard of accumulated materials above high water line (deal with Fisheries Act which requires that debris be left on beaches) – 5
- Protect wildlife – 3
- Deal with contamination/pollution of lake with sewage - 2
- Don't shoot bears – 2
- No sale of water – 2
- Study the lake's health and repair it – 1
- Clean up debris along foreshore – 1
- Protect marsh – 1
- Deal with pollution/garbage/chlorine etc. – 1
- Repair human impacts on ecosystems – 1
- Need more regulations for owners who alter the foreshore – 1
- Make the whole valley a park – 1

Enforce regulations

- Need a ranger or two in the park and camp attendants to enforce regulations and do trail/camp maintenance – 9
- Need to enforce boating regulations – 2
- Need to enforce regulations on foreshore and lake – 1
- Who is going to enforce regulations if they are established - 1

- Need attendant at boat washing station to check for invasive species – 1

Safety

- Recognize the need for motorboats for rescues and safety – 5
- Need to educate canoe/kayak/paddlers/boaters re storms and safety issues – 3
- Need more marinas/boat launches/shelters in more locations so boaters have more places to go during storms – 4
- Small boats and boats with electric motors are at huge risk during storms – 2
- Improve cell service – 2
- Need SAR in area given increase in boat traffic – 1
- Widen road between Nakusp and Enterprise Creek for winter travel – 1
- Improve police response times – 1
- Improve medical service response times - 1

Boating

- Boats of any power should be allowed – 1
- If certain kinds of motorboats are to be restricted there should be a phase out period - 1

Other

- Don't want a Christina Lake/Okanagan Lake/Shuswap Lake – 7
- More limits on EMR – 1
- No dam - 1
- Need to be prepared for climate change storms – 1
- Build a bridge/tunnel from Revelstoke – 1
- Limit development to 2 storeys – 2
- More people = more pollution – 1
- Lake regulations need to be in place before there is a bridge from Revelstoke – 1
- Slokan Lake needs to be pesticide free – 1
- Allow private docks on private property – 1
- Restore all rural health care facilities – 1
- Villages and Rural Areas should ask Federal Government for control of lake – 1
- CBT should pay for reeducation of population given the damage it has caused – 1
- Protect against erosion – 1
- Protect against chemtrails, geoengineering, arial spray – 1
- Triple/quadruple taxes for non-residents – 1
- More bear education – 1
- More control of cougars and bears in residential areas – 1
- Reduce trespassing with signs indicating old trails are closed – 1
- Establish a non-profit assisted living facility along the lake – 1