

## Heather Kauer

---

**From:** Dana Lepofsky [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 31, 2021 11:22 PM  
**To:** Lasqueti Island Local Trust Committee  
**Subject:** feedback on the OCP re:sheep

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**Categories:** @read

Hi folks,

I wanted to outline why the wording about sheep in the current OCP is so problematic and why it is very important to change it. The wording currently is:

To **preserve** and support balanced control of the local feral/**heritage** sheep **which are a valued part of the community and its history.**"

My reasons why this should be changed are as follows:

1. **Heritage** - is a value judgement in this case. There are formal definitions of heritage, but in this case, using this term is assigning broadly a sense of importance and history. I would also object to any statements about our heritage slugs and our heritage bullfrogs.

2. Sheep are a **valued** part of the community and history for *some*, not "the community". And again, this is a subjective statement. I see the sheep as part of a colonial history and a legacy, like logging, that we will be dealing with for centuries to come.

3. **Preserve** also implies something worth preserving. Which again, is a subjective, value-laden statement.

Completely stripped of all value-laden terms, the objective would read as follows.

**To support the balanced control of the local, feral sheep.**

This seems like a fair statement to me.

With thanks

Dana Lepofsky