

CPC Jurisdictional Scans Year at a Glance

Year:2018

Total # of Scans:	21
Themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Accessible Campsites ● Annual Management Plan Template ● Beach Safety Update from 2016 ** ● Biocontrols in Protected Areas ● Cannabis Use in Parks / (En Francais) ** ● Carrying Capacity/Visitor Attendance ● Climate Change in Management Plans ● Co-Management/Co-Stewardship Agreements ● Energy Use Self Sufficiency in Parks ● Enforcement in Non-Operating Parks ● Fentanyl NARCAN Survey ● Indigenous Use in PT Parks ** ● Job Descriptions: Market Research ● Levels of Service Frameworks ** ● Limited Offer Services ● Mining in Parks ● Parks Signage Manuals ** ● School and Youth Group Fees ● Traditional Use Policies ● Volunteers, Sponsorships, and Kiddie Pools ● Waste Reduction and Recycling Practices
Overall Response Rate:	30%
Scan with Highest Response Rate:	Fentanyl NARCAN Survey
Responded Most Often:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Alberta Parks at 67% Response Rate ● Manitoba Parks at 60% Response Rate ● B.C Parks at 47% Response Rate
Responded Least Often:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● P.E.I Parks/Nunavut Parks at 6% Response Rate ● Yukon Parks/Sépaq at 13% Response Rate ● Northwest Territories Parks/ Newfoundland & Labrador Parks at 19% Response Rate
Key Insights:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There is a shift towards providing tools for campers of different abilities to engage in more of the park experience rather than altering the park environment.

- That being said, there is still an increasing focus on Universal design and access to basic needs.
- “Accessible” campsites were rather few and far between for Newfoundland & Labrador and New Brunswick.
- Alberta is a leader in this area, their “Push to Open Nature” and “Everyone Belongs Outside” initiatives are being used as goal markers
- BC conducts annual management meetings in order to review parks plans and address any changes, their attached resources are very useful models
- Parks Canada resources also provided a helpful guide for approaching yearly management plans
- Jurisdictions generally allow the use of biological controls in their protected areas.
- Provincial level jurisdictions generally carry out the release of biological controls in collaboration with other entities such as the ministry of forestry, public land trusts, etc.
- Parks Canada has an extensive and thoughtful process for the release and monitoring of biological controls, including an Alien Species Community of Practice dedicated to discussing this type of topic.
- Capacity determination based on infrastructure is common - i.e. if the parking lot or campsite is full, then the park is at capacity. Park superintendents are meant to work with local authorities to help mitigate issues like parking along the sides of roads
- B.C Parks has been increasingly focused on Climate Change in their management plans over the past few years.
- Responding Jurisdictions generally had one park in particular that focused more on Climate Change than others due to factors like biodiversity and ecosystem management.
- Focus on Climate Change varies wildly throughout Jurisdictions and between individual Parks.

- The Yukon Example is a good example of highlighting, acknowledging, and then planning for the impacts of climate change. The plan seems to have been updated partially (perhaps fully) due to the changing arctic environment caused by climate change.
- An ecosystem-based monitoring plan seems more likely to have a focal point of climate change
- X
- The majority of the agreements on the provincial level were separate agreements, while a majority of the agreements at the federal level were claims based.
- Agreements were more likely to focus on parks planning rather than parks operations, however many agreements included operations as well.
- Federal agreements were less likely to include all traditional uses such as hunting, fishing, and trapping, however they were included in most agreements
- Forestry was rarely a focus of the agreement
- Of the two jurisdictions (AB & MB) that responded, neither have any parks that are 100% self-sufficient or Net-Zero in terms of energy use
- “Non-operating” is defined as a facility free protected area in Alberta, designation and size vary depending on location. About 90% of parks fall under this broader category. No budget for enforcement per say, but budget to support patrols and management for these areas.
- The enforcement strategy in Alberta consists of backcountry patrols, remote cameras, trail counters, partnerships, joint patrols, participation is a provincial “public lands enforcement program, a pre-paid contract with a local aviation company, and a First Nations Guardian program that is still in development.
- Common compliance issues in Alberta include random camping, damage to the land, hunting violations, ATV compliance issues, Fish and

Wildlife violations, Trapping and Guide Outfitting activity, depositing waste onto the land, and unlawful industrial /commercial use or incursion.

- In Alberta, no staff are designated to these areas 100% of their time, although additional staff is hired in peak seasons to cover increased demands. Minimum is two Conservation Officers of Park Rangers on the Patrol.
- Jurisdictions are generally aware of the fentanyl problem, but most are not encountering it as an imminent issue in their parks. Most jurisdictions have no plans to begin carrying NARCAN.
- Alberta Parks Conservation officers are training themselves in what to do in the event of chemical exposure, and a number of staff have been trained in carrying and administering Naxolone.
- The Government of the NWT is having deliberations to determine if Naxolone should be added to their first aid kits.
- Manitoba Parks is currently considering issuing NARCAN to Conservation Officers as they have had a number of 'close-calls'
- North Dakota Parks and Recreation is working on a policy for reducing fentanyl exposure and would be happy to share once it is completed and their staff has been issued NARCAN for self-administration only.
- Pennsylvania has already developed a public policy regarding Naxolone and 300 of their officers have been carrying NARCAN since May 2017. This jurisdiction saw 4 overdoses, 2 of whom resulted in fatalities.
- Some responding jurisdictions did have a position that covered the responsibilities laid out in the Market Research Position request from Ontario, i.e.
 - To conduct a broad range of market research projects, studies, data development and analyses to support the effectiveness of Ontario Parks' programs.
 - To lead the development and implementation of a performance

measurement system; including benchmarking, analysis of performance data and reporting of results in order to assess branch effectiveness.

- To provide leadership in the development and implementation of marketing and branch strategic plans.
- Position titles for Market Research positions included Policy and Research Analyst, Director of Strategy and Business Intelligence, Manager of Marketing & Public Information Services, Manager of Business Performance and Analysis, Tourism, Heritage and Culture Business Development Officer, Promotional Specialist, Landscape Design Specialist, and Economic Development Officer
- Many jurisdictions do not have a standard contract for “Limited Offer Services”, however they normally have a process for “Special Events”, which would cover most limited offer services.
- Special events are normally reviewed and treated individually for varying levels of permits, fees, and insurance required to operate.
- A clear distinction between for-profit and not-for-profit is not often made, however this difference would likely be identified during the individual application process each event undertakes.
- Mining is not strictly prohibited in all jurisdictions.
- Traditional uses of parks were more likely to be free while recreational use had the potential to be treated as normal park usage and therefore charge as such.
- [Executive Summary of Findings](#) - Bear Friendly Waste
- Most jurisdictions offer student or youth group accommodations at a highly discounted rate - some waive fees completely.
- It is common that jurisdictions have designated group sites that are provided without fees, and groups that would like to stay in regular campsites would need to pay regular fees.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Youth groups and students groups are normally considered the same or near to the same.
<p>Questions to Consider:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Revisit: How does your jurisdiction approach accessible campsites? ● Should all jurisdictions revisit their management plans annually? Is this a realistic standard to set for most parks? ● Revisit the question in the future to capture more responses. ● Is the Parks Canada Model of biocontrol use a reasonable structure to adopt in individual jurisdictions, perhaps with the modification of keeping a collaborative approach to release? ● Are there any metrics on the efficacy of infrastructure based carrying capacity strategies? ● What are some of the benefits/challenges to an infrastructure based approach to determining capacity? ● How common/effective is the strategy of redirecting visitors to “hidden gems” via social media and other communications? ● How is this change to the way we plan parks being communicated across jurisdictions? ● How many park management plans are being revisited due to the impacts that climate change is having on the park environment/to plan for the future impacts of climate change? ● Should all park plans be revisited to account for the impacts of climate change? What support would park managers require to accomplish this task? ● In the future, asking the jurisdictions to choose 1 or 2 examples of co-management agreements and explain what it is about the agreements that make them successful. ● Who was consulted/what was the process in developing the Fentanyl policies in the two U.S Parks that had them? ● At what point did those jurisdictions reach a point that they decided a policy was necessary?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Have their policies positively impacted the issue? What have they learned from having these policies? ● How has the fentanyl issue evolved since 2018? ● Would it be possible to create a database of job descriptions for Parks to pull from when creating/updating/researching job descriptions and postings? ● What kind of industrial activities are allowed in your jurisdictions? Under what circumstances and what approval would be required? ● Should all activities carried about by Indigenous individuals and groups in parks be free? ● Is there a way to standardize traditional land use policy across jurisdictions? ● How many jurisdictions have successful co-management case studies of harvesting and traditional land use planning that can be shared? ● Is there a benefit to waiving fees altogether for school/youth groups? ● Should school groups and youth groups be classified differently?
<p>Additional Findings/Resources:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Emerald Ash Borer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Kakabeka Falls Provincial Park Emerald Ash Borer Response Strategy ○ Canadian Food Inspection Agency Surveillance Guidelines for Emerald Ash Borer ○ Surveillance Guidelines for Emerald Ash Borer ● Tick Policies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ontario's Response to Tick Management

*Jurisdictional Response Rate Score is calculated based on # of times responded/(total # of scan requests - # inquiries from that jurisdiction).

** Scans that resulted in a formal summary in which the summary was the only resource available - did not count towards Jurisdictional Response Rate Scores