

**Notes from LCA OCP Steering Committee Community Forum #2
Resource Stewardship/Heritage and Archeological Stewardship -
Saturday February 23, 2019**

Facilitator – Shoshana, **Speaker's List** – Jordan, **Note-taker** – Marti
additional committee members in attendance – Andrew, Nadine, Colin and Hilary
Attendees: Valeria, Terry T, Wendy S, Dana, Ken, Sue W, Ross, Peter J, Doane.
Caroline, Jenny V, Melinda, Joyce, Bruce G, Aigul, Craig McF, Tolling

Brainstorming (Interests related to Resources):

Crown lands,
Access to Wilderness,
Access to Beach,
Protect Understory,
Protect Environment first (before people),
Science based management,
Protect diverse forest services/ecosystem services,
Prioritize stewardship,
Assess ecosystem diversity,
Sheep and deer,
Density,
Quiet and darkness,
Respect archeological resources, (middens, etc)
Local control

Ken: Good stewardship fosters resource availability

Sue: everything is connected

Ross: density is the cornerstone of what affects resources

RESOURCE STEWARDSHIP – EXISTING OBJECTIVES IN CURRENT OCP

1.4, concern #3 – To conserve agricultural lands, forest lands, fresh water supplies and foreshore areas. This is currently a statement of 'island concerns' in the pre-ambule: do we want this to be a specifically expressed objective?

Unanimous support: YES

Dana: Add cultural resources to concerns. Putting agricultural and forest lands together may be contradictory.

Ken: How are we going to address these kinds of contradictions in the OCP?

3.2 Objective 1 – To minimize the negative impacts of economic activities and encourage agriculture, forestry, mariculture and local industry are practiced in a sustainable manner.

Should be rewritten as 2 objectives:

a) To minimize the negative impacts of agriculture, forestry, mariculture, and local industry.

b)To ensure these activities are practiced in a sustainable manner.
Support: YES (unanimous)

3.2 Objective 3 – To promote the development of the land in ways which are in sympathy with the landscape and which make the most of each site’s natural characteristics.

Peter J: We can’t enforce this objective

Colin: We are looking at best practices - it states ‘promote’

Ken: It would be better if cross-referenced with other sections

Melinda: There is always a problem with wordsmithing, so we don’t always need to have everything perfect once we have the overview

Colin: We are coming up with community values which are then given to planners and brought back to the community for approval.

Doane: “promote development” is not what we want

Melinda: Try “use” instead of ‘development’

Andrew: Today we are getting an overview which will go to a sub-committee

Dana: Try ‘minimize damage’ rather than ‘use’

Ken: Add ‘culture’ to the list. Promote the use of constraints

Wendy S: We need to define terms today regarding minimizing disturbances to natural and cultural features.

No poll of community taken.

3.2 Objective 5 – Encourage that the renewable resource base in maintained in a sustainable manner.

Do we want to clarify what renewable resource base refers to? Firewood, wild plants, animals, water?

Melinda: We need to enlarge the objective

Hilary: Add ‘science based’

Andrew: We may need a glossary

Peter: Take out ‘renewable’ Make it into 2 statements: Encourage resources without renewable. (no second part recorded)

Andrew: Maybe we need a second objective. Sand and gravel are not renewable so are not covered.

Colin: In the sections about forestry and marine, what does ‘sustainable’ mean?

No poll of community taken

3.4 Objective 1 – To discourage pervasive and excessive noise created by residential, commercial or industrial uses as well as noises originating off island, yet having impact on residents.

Colin: We value quiet and dark

Andrew: Some of these issues are about advocacy rather than enforcement

Community support YES

3.4 Objective 2 – Preserve and support balanced control of the local feral/heritage sheep which are a valued part of the community and it’s history.

Melinda – ‘Preserve’ and ‘support’ are not good, they (the sheep) are not actually ‘heritage’ nor ‘valued’

Doane – We want a science based statement this time

Nadine: Are we at the end of feral sheep as a community resource? We need to be careful not to lose this resource (as a food source).

Hilary: We don’t have to include sheep in the OCP

Aigul, Bruce: support Hilary’s statement

Facilitator: Should we remove sheep from the OCP? **Divided show of hands**

Melinda: Don’t take out this objective

Dana: Why separate sheep from other alien species? We are mixing and matching because it is so charged.

Andrew: Sheep are multi-use. This huge issue needs to be worked out, not swept under the rug. The pros and cons may need to have more discussion.

Ken: Other areas of the objectives address sheep, do we need a separate objective for sheep? This should go to a sub-committee

Wendy: Is this the only place to discuss this?

Doane: This issue should be looked at further, it will come up in other areas

Andrew: Re: separate sheep objective – Every objective needs at least one policy, and all policies need an objective

Ken: The steering committee should find ways to include sheep in various objectives.

Sue: We need to work towards a balance between maintaining local bio-diversity and a local food supply

Aigul: Nature works with us to limit sheep population

Craig: The breeding stock is being shot, and the sheep population is declining. Once the sheep are gone, then broom and wild grasses will become a serious fire hazard

Dana: The bigger issue is changing the natural bio-diversity. (Repeat of Sue’s comment above)

Melinda: The wording of this objective is poor, but it is important to have a sheep objective

3.4 Objective 4 – To support the creation of a public trail network throughout the island

Bruce: No trails are permitted on Crown Lands without permission

Peter: There are problems when trails are built near someone else

Community support YES

3.4 Objective 5 – To ensure compatible parks and recreation areas on the island are designed and located appropriately

Sue: remove ‘compatible’

Dana: appropriate relative to what?

Ken: Ensure parks and recreational areas is consistent with other objectives in the OCP

Hilary: Does this need to be in the OCP?

Melinda: Not sure why parks are in ‘resource management’, should just encourage parks and recreation areas

Dana: agreement with Melinda

Andrew: this objective could be moved to another part of the OCP
No community poll taken

3.4 Objective 6 – Community aims to ensure that 12% of the land base of Lasqueti Island is preserved and protected with appropriate representation of all ecosystems in the area.

** Note: from Doug Hopwood – He has calculated that 6.2% of the island is protected as parks and nature reserves, 10.9% of Lasqueti Trust area as a whole

Doane: Where did the 12% come from?

Ken: 12% was made up in a report in the 90's. Currently the province has 17%

Hilary: Protected Crown Land is elsewhere in objectives. More protection is better.
25% or higher was favoured in the group.

Ken: It is premature to put a number on protection. It needs more study – maybe Doug Hopwood could help with a new percentage figure.

Peter: The Crown may give a chunk of land to the Island Trust Fund

Andrew: The Crown land at the dump is the piece under consideration. It may be only a portion of that chunk

Ken: Old growth on Lasqueti is not under threat as much as on other Crown Lands, so there is not a focus on Lasqueti's Crown Lands

Peter: Wetlands are not well protected and preserved on Lasqueti.

3.8 To retain the Crown Lands as large parcels with low density and minimal development because the Lasqueti community believes that would provide the greatest benefit to the public of BC from these lands.

Good in principle.

Community poll: YES

3.8 Objective 1 To Preserve Crown Lands for public enjoyment and community use

Peter: The community should take over the Crown Lands

Community poll: YES

3.8 Objective 2 To take into account the conservation values on Crown Lands as the primary consideration in decision making

Community poll: YES

RESOURCE STEWARDSHIP – COMMUNITY EXPRESSED INTERESTS

Ensure population stays within limits of sustainability

Can't do this in OCP

Andrew: These suggestions aren't currently in the OCP and won't be added unless there is a ground swell of support

No community poll taken

Minimize our ecological footprint

Good value, already stated
No community poll taken

Preserve quiet and darkness

Community poll: YES

Add 'light' to 'noise' already in OCP

Bruce: concerned about large scale cannabis growing and federal regulations for high security lighting

To protect and ensure access to wild-gathered food resources from land and marine environments

Community Poll: YES

Support watershed planning to protect water supplies and ecosystems

Colin: Development can interfere with groundwater flow

Ken: Watershed planning needs to look beyond jurisdictions

Doane: new provincial regulations take care of this

Andrew: "watershed" needs to be in glossary

No community poll taken

Support establishment of a community woodlot

Andrew: Change this to 'community forest'; woodlot is administrated by the province rather than locally

Nadine: Take this out – it sounds like a place to go get firewood, rather than gathering wood from one's own parcel.

Peter: Does this mean firewood? We don't know the intent. Favors 'community forest' rather than 'woodlot'

Sue: Do we want to change this to 'community forest'?

Ken: 'Woodlot' and 'Community Forest' are provincial terms. We need community discussion in order to define this for the OCP

No community poll taken

Support public access to fresh water lakes

Nadine: Do we have fresh water resources on Crown Lands?

Bruce: There may be road access to Pete's Lake

Andrew: If there is sub-division of private lands that include lakes, then a provision might be made for public access to that lake if interest expressed in OCP

Nadine: Does this intrude on private land ownership of those parcels?

Andrew: Usually, the lake itself is public (owned by Crown) so public access could be made available.

No community poll taken

Grow as much of the food consumed on the island as possible through support for community gardens, shared use of established gardens and orchards, organic farming, seed library, local markets, etc.

Community support: Divided show of hands

Peter: would the OCP foster this?

Colin: Maybe this would come up years later, so the OCP can aid this value. Doesn't hurt to include it in the OCP

Peter: We need the word 'promote'

Melinda: Don't include in the OCP, it doesn't add value there

Jordan: Put this in the Vision Statement

Encourage local production of food for pets and livestock

Already included in previous item

No community poll taken

Improve local control over agricultural land designation and protection (Fear of federal and provincial government process for agricultural land not permitting local community input)

Peter: On Lasqueti, the ALR is not the best land, good land is often not included in the ALR. Try "improve agricultural land designations and protections"

Nadine: The community could take on asking the ALR to reform designations on Lasqueti maybe included in the RLUB

Bruce: as long as we have the 10 acre freeze, we can grow some food. ALR is often wetlands on Lasqueti, damaging wetlands upsets the ecosystem. Why make it more complicated?

Terry T: **"Identify agricultural land with local needs in mind"**

Andrew: agreement with Terry's statement

HERITAGE AND ARCHEOLOGICAL STEWARDSHIP

Existing objectives:

3.3 Objective: To ensure respectful treatment, fairness and equity to past, present, and future generations that have shared and will share Lasqueti Island and the Trust area

3.3 Policy 1: Lasqueti Island Local Trust Committee recognizes the cultural and historical significance of the Tla'amin First Nation has made in the Lasqueti Island Local Trust Area

Hilary: This is poorly worded

Andrew: There are other First Nations. Try "First Nations' or 'Coast Salish Peoples'

Dana: Change to 'first peoples on Lasqueti'

Andrew: Support change to objective

3.3 Policy 2: Respect all people who have and will contribute to the social fabric of Lasqueti Island, past present and future.

Andrew: We could combine Policy 1 and 2 into one Objective

Ken: The government mandates a low bar, the local community can do better. It is meaningful to express that we want to do that.

3.3 Policy 3: Support proactive and mutually respectful interests by consulting with the First Nations

Dana: the word 'consult' is too nebulous

Melinda: supports 'proactive' with 'local'

Andrew: the qRD is working on this as well; they may be able to give us aid

Peter: Trustee Peterson and himself are working on this effort to interface with local First Peoples

3.3 Policy 4: Recognize that past, present and future generations have shared and will share experiences. Encourage that fair and reasonable discussion and action occurs to preserve the natural and human-made sites.

Dana: It starts with Stewardship. Once again putting human and natural stewardship together

Ken: It needs wording that supports protection of archeological sites

Dana: Think about the human part of the landscape – for example crabapple orchards

Ken: It's easy to make general statements. It's hard to make policies that work

3.3 Policy 5: Assist, when possible, the responsible Ministry in their efforts to establish and protect sites of archeological or heritage significance or value

Bruce: Is the provincial government interested in heritage sites?

Dana: No. The provincial system is broken; the law is not enforced. Education and engagement are the only ways forward. So it is up to us to do local work. My vision is to ask a Lasqueti Committee before building

New Community Expressed Objectives:

To learn and respect indigenous rights, uses and management of land and resources

Community Poll: YES

Dana: should be educating as well as preserve and protect

Andrew: supports education

Peter: regulation and enforcement doesn't work here because there is no bureaucracy, so education is the tool