

Heather Kauer

From: Joseph Fall [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 16, 2021 6:55 PM
To: Lasqueti Island Local Trust Committee
Subject: on process and precedent

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Trustees,

let me say first that I don't care much for the debate about feral sheep and how they should or should not be mentioned in our OCP. I find the whole debate too polarized, with people on all sides staking out hardened positions instead of looking for shared values, cost/benefit, and solutions.

The latest mailer from the Lasqueti Wild Heritage Sheep & Co is a perfect example, filled with biased information, some blatantly incorrect, the authors choose to deride and misrepresent even the nature of the debate and what others in the community are doing and saying about it rather than presenting a fact-based argument to make their case.

Honestly, I can see why it is a pain-point for you in the OCP process, which covers issues of far more immediate and relevant nature for both the community and the Island's Trust. I truly empathize with any wish you might have to make this issue just go away so you can focus on articles that will actually make some difference.

However, I found puzzling the process used to amend the 2nd reading of the OCP at your last meeting. There are 2 problems with the path you took at that meeting:

- 1) You sent a message, loud and clear, that if one wants something done at the LTC, attending the public consultations and writing letters is a waste of time because those who simply "shout the loudest" or deploy bully tactics at the last hour ultimately win the day.
- 2) Anyone who was satisfied with the language from the original 2nd reading would be justified in assuming it wouldn't change, at least until after further public consultation. Since the item was not on the agenda, you failed to provide an adequate opportunity to those who might wish to speak against the proposed revision. Ultimately, I suspect, this maneuver simply swaps one problem for another, as now an entirely different segment will feel disaffected or betrayed by the LTC.

Again, I wish to re-iterate: I do not take a position on the feral sheep, nor on how they are represented in the OCP - I expressed my opinion during the public processes, along with 40 or 50 others and was satisfied with the compromises made there. But I am dismayed to see that process and the efforts that went into it subverted at the last minute in what appears to be an effort to appease bully-tactics.

I certainly recognize the process used to revise the 2nd reading is within bounds, no foul. But it sets a bad precedent, regardless of how pointless and meaningless this clause in the OCP is.

with best wishes and gratitude for a difficult job generally done well,
...Joseph