

**APPENDIX A:
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION - CHANGES IN LEGISLATION, POLICIES AND RDN INITIATIVES SINCE 1997**

Topic	Source of Change	Details	RDN initiatives since 1997
Official Community Plans	<i>Local Government Act</i> (LGA) sec.878	Official community plans may include "policies of the local government relating to the preservation, protection, restoration and enhancement of the natural environment, its ecosystems and biological diversity." While addressing the environment was never precluded from OCPs in the past, this addition to the LGA expressly recognizes the role that local governments and OCPs play.	OCPs in the RDN now contain policies regarding environmental protection.
Development permit areas	LGA sec. 919.1, 920	<p>Prior to 1997, DPAs could be designated for "protection of the natural environment", but amendments in October 1997 made the designation more encompassing by adding "protection of the natural environment, its ecosystems and biological diversity". DPAs can also be designated for "protection of development from hazardous conditions" and "protection of farming".</p> <p>In January 2001, new authority was added to designate DPAs for "the establishment of objectives for the form and character of intensive residential development" such as infill, small lot and clustered or green space development. Local governments can use this tool to encourage housing forms that can avoid environmentally sensitive areas, green corridors, steep slopes and flood plains, while still providing for conventional residential densities and design control.</p> <p>As of January 2001, guidelines for DPAs can be specified in either OCPs or in zoning bylaws. This allows local governments to maintain OCPs as general policy documents and focusing development regulation in zoning bylaws.</p>	<p>DPAs regarding environmental protection and protection from environmental hazard have been established in almost all OCPs in the RDN. Most focus on the protection of watercourses and riparian habitat. Some OCPs also establish DPAs around terrestrial environmentally sensitive areas in the interest of protecting these ecosystems and the biodiversity they represent.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">--</p> <p style="text-align: center;">--</p>
Stormwater/runoff management and impervious surface control	LGA sec. 907	<p>Local governments may establish bylaws that:</p> <p>(1) "Require that an owner of land who carries out construction of a paved area or roof area, manage and provide for the ongoing disposal of surface runoff and storm water in accordance with the requirements of the bylaw."</p> <p>(2) "establish the maximum percentage of the area of land that can be covered by impermeable material."</p>	The RDN has not exercised this authority as yet. However, a study on stormwater management planning in the regional district may provide some direction on when and where this may be appropriate.

Topic	Source of Change	Details	RDN initiatives since 1997
Development approval information areas or circumstances	LGA sec. 920.01, 920.1	OCPs may specify circumstances or designate areas in which "development approval information" (DAI) may be required. DAI is information on the anticipated impact of the proposed activity or development on the community, including impacts on the natural environment. If DAI areas or circumstances are designated, the local government must pass a bylaw that establishes procedures for requiring such information and identifies the substance of the information itself. The local government can then require applicants for rezoning, development permits and temporary industrial and commercial use permits to provide information in accordance with the processes set out in the bylaw. This provision in effect legitimizes a local government's requirement for impact assessments.	In 1999, the RDN passed Bylaw No.1165 "Regional District of Nanaimo Impact Assessment Bylaw". It sets out procedures for and the content of Impact Report Proposals and Impact Reports. In accordance with the requirements of the Act, it also sets out a process that allows an applicant to request reconsideration of a requirement made by a manager under this bylaw.
Use of security	LGA sec.925	Security may now be required as part of a permit approval to repair of "damage to the natural environment [that] has resulted as a consequence of a contravention of a condition in a permit".	--
Landscaping requirements	LGA sec.909	A local government may, by bylaw, "require, set standards for and regulate the provision of screening or landscaping" for "preserving, protecting, restoring and enhancing the natural environment" and "preventing hazardous conditions". In effect, this expands the definition of "landscaping" to include natural replanting and restoration requirements as part of a development.	--
Stream protection	<i>Fish Protection Act - Streamside Protection Regulation</i>	The provincial government passed the <i>Fish Protection Act</i> in July 1997 to help ensure fish have sufficient water and habitat in the future as B.C. continues to grow and develop. The Streamside Protection Regulation, passed under the Act in January 2001, requires local governments to establish "streamside protection and enhancement areas" (SPEAs) and to protect them through their land use plans and regulations. Within these areas, buildings and other structures are to be set back from streams, and streamside vegetation is to be protected or enhanced. The Regulation sets out a series of required widths of SPEAs based on 3 main stream characteristics: fish presence, nature of streamflows (i.e., permanent or seasonal) and the status of streamside vegetation. Local governments have 5 years (until January 2006) to adopt the equivalent (or greater) of these widths in their land use regulations. Varying from these widths is possible through intergovernmental cooperation agreements with senior environmental agencies. Implementation of the SPR is temporarily "on hold" pending a review by the newly elected provincial government. The review is expected to be completed by December 2001.	Over the last 6 years, streams and streamside areas (often called leave strips) have been identified and established as development permit areas in OCPs throughout the RDN. In addition, the RDN and the city of Nanaimo have established intergovernmental agreements (see below) as a means of supporting and streamlining environmental protection activities. These measures go a long way to "meeting or beating" the requirements of the SPR. As a result, over the next 5 years, the main task will be to review these regulations and agreements for their conformity with the Streamside Protection Regulation.

Topic	Source of Change	Details	RDN initiatives since 1997
ESA protection	Sensitive Ecosystem Inventory for Southeast Vancouver Island and the Gulf Islands (SEI)	The SEI was developed by federal and provincial environmental agencies to support land use decisions that protect the remaining intact ecosystems on east Vancouver Island. Nine types of sensitive ecosystems were systematically identified and mapped and the information published in 66 map sheets, an electronic database, and a technical report. The agencies also published a conservation manual that sets out recommended tools and methods for protecting these sensitive areas.	The RDN developed and published an Atlas of Environmentally Sensitive Areas in 1998, which includes the areas (polygons) identified in the SEI. Many of the SEI sites have also been recognized in electoral area OCPs and in the city of Nanaimo's OCP. These act primarily as a "flag" when considering development applications, although in a few cases, SEI sites are protected by development permit areas.
Intergovernmental coordination agreements	LGA, Part 25, sec. 867 & 868 <i>Streamside Protection Regulation, sec.6</i>	Regional boards are encouraged to establish intergovernmental advisory committees to: (a) advise on the development and implementation of regional growth strategies; and (b) facilitate coordination of Provincial and local government actions, policies and programs as they relate to the development and implementation of a regional growth strategy. Regional boards are also encouraged to enter into agreements with provincial and federal agencies, other local governments, first nations, school district boards, and other boards and local authorities to coordinate activities relating to the implementation of a growth strategy. Intergovernmental coordination agreements (ICA) are required as a means of varying from the streamside protection and enhancement area widths specified in the Regulation. ICAs are also encouraged as a way of developing intergovernmental support and coordination for implementing the intent of the Regulation.	The RDN established an Intergovernmental Advisory Committee to support the implementation of the Regional Growth Management Plan. In 2000, the RDN signed an "Intergovernmental Partnership Agreement for Protection of ESAs 2000-2003" with the Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection and Fisheries and Oceans Canada. Its overall purpose is to implement a new collaborative process and cooperative framework for environmental management, and to recognize the authority of the RDN to assess and determine environmental impacts of land use and development decisions. It addresses a number of topics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data management & sharing • Development application reviews • Training • Public awareness measures • Environmental policy reviews • Waste management: • Emergency planning • Term, meetings • Liability and enforcement • Dispute resolution

Topic	Source of Change	Details	RDN initiatives since 1997
Land development referrals	BC Environment best management practices manual	The Vancouver Island Region of the Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection (MWLAP) released a document "Environmental Objectives, Best Management Practices and Requirements for Land Developments" in March 2001. The intent is to "provide a consistent proactive environmental management and protection response to authorities responsible for regulating and conducting land development activities". It is expected that that use of this document will reduce the need for, and eventually replace referrals on most common situations.	Use of this manual along with ongoing consultation under the Intergovernmental Partnership Agreement is gradually replacing the site-by-site referral process. The consequence is anticipated to be a more streamlined and informed process for environmental protection in land use decisions.
Agricultural lands	Partnership Committee on Agriculture and the Environment	This committee was established in 1998 to foster communication between industry and the government and to develop solutions regarding agricultural and environmental conflicts. Membership includes the BC Agriculture Council, Union of BC Municipalities, BC Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection, and Department of Fisheries and Oceans. The committee has issued an Agricultural Watercourse Maintenance Guide that considers the needs of both the agriculture and fishery resources. The process and guidelines outlined in the Guide form a basis for conducting agricultural ditch maintenance in the Fraser Valley and Vancouver Island. The Guide, current until September 30, 2001, is being reviewed and updated; concurrence with the Streamside Protection Regulation is part of that review. The Guide and further background on the Partnership Committee can be obtained from http://www.agf.gov.bc.ca/resmgmt/ditchpol/index.htm or by contacting the Ministry of Agriculture and Food.	

APPENDIX B

Growth Management Plan Review -Environmental Protection Workshop September 24, 2001

Workshop Agenda

Attendee List

Workshop Notes

**RDN GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLAN - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION REVIEW
WORKSHOP SEPTEMBER 24, 2001 9:00 AM –3:00 PM
Coast Bastion Inn, Nanaimo**

OBJECTIVES

- Discuss and clarify the *regional perspective* on environmental protection; what role does (or should) the Growth Management Plan play in environmental protection in the Region?
- Review the Plan's current environmental protection policies and proposed revisions to them.

AGENDA - REVISED

9:00-9:15 AM	1. Welcome and Introductions (<i>Christina Thomas, Harriet Rueggeberg</i>) a) Around the table b) Review objectives of the Workshop
9:15-10:00 AM	2. Overviews: a) The Growth Management Plan (<i>Neil Connelly</i>) b) Goal 4 "Environmental Protection" (<i>Christina Thomas</i>) c) The Environmentally Sensitive Areas Atlas (<i>Brigid Reynolds</i>)
10:00-10:30 AM	3. Review the environmental protection policy <u>themes</u> : (<i>HR</i>) Do they cover what should be in a RDN perspective on environmental protection? Are there topics that are missing? Do some topics need more, or less, emphasis?
10:30-10:45 AM	Break
10:45–12:00 AM	(continued) Complete review of policy themes. 4. Review each policy: do they provide clear direction while retaining a regional perspective?
12:00-12:30 PM	Lunch
12:30-2:45 PM	(continued) Complete the review of policies.
3:00 PM	5. Wrap-up

Notes to assist your review:

- Goal 4 "Environmental Protection" and its accompanying policies are the main, but not the sole, component of the Plan that addresses environmental matters. Other goals affect, and achieve, environmental priorities; e.g., Goal 5 regarding the reduction of automobile dependence, and Goal 1 and 2 regarding efforts to control sprawl. To peruse these other goals, you can view the entire Plan under the Growth Management section of the RDN's website www.rdn.bc.ca.
- Under Goal 4, the policy statements in **bold** are considered the "must do's" of the Plan. The accompanying text under each policy statement is intended for explanation but is not mandatory on the RDN or its electoral areas and municipalities. Also, the "Environmental Protection Guidelines" at the end of Goal 4 are considered to be suggestions rather than guiding policies.

Growth Management Plan Review -Environmental Protection Workshop
September 24, 2001

ATTENDEES

Invitee	Organization
Mr. John Maher	BC Hydro, Environment Committee
Mr. Roger Cheetham	BC Land Reserve Commission
Mr. Neil Dawe	Canadian Wildlife Service, Environment Canada
Ms. Peggy Ward	Canadian Wildlife Service, Environment Canada
Mr. Kevin Brydges	City of Nanaimo, Environmental Coordinator
Mr. Rob Lawrance	City of Nanaimo, Environmental Planner
Mr. Graham Savage	City of Nanaimo, Manager Engineering and Environmental Services
Ms. Sharon Fletcher	City of Nanaimo, Manager of Community Planning
Mr. Richard Harding	City of Nanaimo, Parks and Recreation
Mr. David Widdis	City of Parksville, City of Nanaimo
Mr. Geoffrey Thornburn	Environment Canada
Harriet Rueggeberg	Lanarc Consultants Ltd., Environmental Planner
Dorthe Jakobsen	Ministry Energy and Mines
Ms. Sharon Erickson	Ministry of Water Land and Air Protection
Mr. Erik Karlsen	Municipal Affairs
Mr. Howie Edwards	Nanoose First Nation
Natalie Cielanga	RDN Environmental Services
Neil Connelly	RDN, Director of Planning
Mr. John Finnie	RDN, General Manager Environmental Services
Mr. Bob Lapham	RDN, General Manager of Development Services
Mr. Tom Sohler	RDN, GIS Coordinator
Ms. Pam Shaw	RDN, Manager of Community Planning
Mr. Dennis Trudeau	RDN, Manager of Liquid Waste
Mr. Tom Osborn	RDN, Manager of Recreation and Parks
Ms. Carey Mclver	RDN, Manager of Solid Waste
Ms. Brigid Reynolds	RDN, Planner
Christina Thomas	RDN, Senior Planner
Ms. Kathleen Johnnie	Snuneymuxw First Nation, Lands & Resources Coordinator
Mr. Paul Butler	Town of Qualicum Beach, Director Planning

RDN Growth Management Plan
GOAL 4 - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION REVIEW

COMMENTS FROM 24 SEPTEMBER 2001 WORKSHOP

General:

- Policy statements should be more 'punchy.'
- Agreements with senior agencies will these be formally developed, eg MOUs.
- Authority for local government to request senior agencies to do something?
- Not clear re commitments required from different levels of government.
- Should have general statement addressing orders of government, including reference to partnerships, etc . Statement of action is necessary.
- Refer to protocol agreement being developed at UBCM
- Common language re. Using protect, promote, maintain, etc
- What about enhancement? 'Protection' of an ESA may be in conflict between different depts in the RDN.
- What about First Nations? Three First Nations concerned with this planning process.
- Use of term 'development'. May need to be specific about type of development, eg. Aggregate extraction.
- Loss of content from old to new GMP. Too much focus on agreements and not enough on specific resources, eg aquifer.
- Protection of natural systems – only specific resources are identified eg coastal but what about general ecosystem protection.
- Concern about fettering authority and what does this GMP require.
- Role of implementation agreements would address the sign off from senior agencies.
- ALR/FLR exempt from local government regulation and should be an additional theme.
- Liquid waste management should be a theme.
- Proposed policy for solid waste may not provide the most environmental protection, for example.
- Refer to Waste Management rather than separate liquid and solid waste.
- Encourage diversion of waste from public spaces to land fill.
- Energy conservation and water conservation.
- Climate change tied to air quality but broader issue.
- Some reference to working with landowner re. Environmental protection. Cooperation of landowner necessary to achieve this goal.
- Species at Risk should be identified. Senior agency authority.
- GBEI biodiversity strategy – developed by senior agencies and stewardship groups. Builds on GVRDs green zone policy.
- Build broader vision for GMP rather than specific ecosystems.
- Links between human health and ecosystem health.

Theme - Open space protection (policies 4A and 4C.):

- SEI not up to date and the Atlas doesn't include recent updates housed by CDC. This and other sources need to be recognized and should be incorporated into the Atlas and any updates.
- Define open spaces in relation to where they are located, urban node vs. rural area or environmental protection open space.
- GVRD document – from Eric
- May need to have separate policy re. Parks.
- Ecosystem services
- Integrating these policies with economic strategy.
- The GMP not addressing the root cause of problem which is growth. 'Managing growth' problematic.
- Growth also pays for things that we want to protect?
- Define RDN's perspective on growth. Is this population growth, economic growth, resource use?
- Has work been done around carrying capacities? RDN focus on quality of life
- Senior governments agree – very strong. Does this include agencies that may not have a mandate for the particular subject matter? What if senior agency doesn't agree with this statement? MEM may not. They are unfamiliar with Atlas. Mines Act wouldn't allow this to be stated.
- Can't mandate agencies beyond their specific mandate area.
- Common agreement at IAC regarding how senior agencies should be involved.

- RDN needs to outline what it wants to do and consult with senior agencies re. Gaining agreement from these agencies.
- Resource zoning may conflict with these goals. How can public access these processes?
- If the RDN wants agreement from senior agencies then the GMP must be clear on what is being discussed.
- Definition for open space limited for park planning. Other definitions may cause problems, eg greenways vs trails.
- Focus on a sustainable region – positive and encouraging. Sustainable region for our needs not our wants.
- Through Liquid and solid waste concept of sustainability being incorporated.
- Ties into people buying into the principles. Many people want to keep doing what they have always done regardless of the consequences. We need to do a lot more re. Education and public awareness
- We need growth to support baby boomers.

Theme - ESAs [policy 4B]

- Need to 'protect' the ESAs identified in the ESA Atlas. Public perception that ESAs are protected because they've been identified.
- MWLAP audited SEI sites and found they were lost or impacted.
- Caution that data has not been extensively ground truthed and this should be mentioned.
- Economic disincentive.
- The plan should fit the land. Works may be supported in an other location or with mitigation plans, etc.
- ESA DPAs useful tool and need trigger which is the Atlas. Public perception that stream values are obvious but not the case with SEI/ESAs. Protecting the latter has been difficult in some electoral area OCP reviews.
- Public react to 'protect' – need to use 4 tools: incentives, acquisition, volunteerism and regulation. Better definition of protection to include the 4 tools.
- The expectation being created for those that might support or oppose ESA protection. Need to be specific or refer to protecting the form and function of the ESA.
- Criteria for determining which ESAs to protect.
- Need 'teeth' in GMP.
- Reference in GMP to SEI manuals and the tools outlined in these documents.
- 6% of developed area in region identified in SEI .
- Need to be able to translate these policies into how we might achieve this protection at the site level.
- Need to develop implementable policies.
- Downloading of protection without resources from senior agencies. This is part of political decision making process.
- All levels of governments need to consider and prioritize acquisition strategies and incentives strategies.
- Public perception re. RDNs responsibility for protecting a ESAs.
- Priorizing characteristics of ESAs to be protected.
- Washington protects specific resources and provides strategies for doing this by using best available science.
- Species at risk

Theme - Land use planning and regulation (Aspects of policies 4A and 4B, and guidelines 4a and 4c)

- Is there any language re. Adopting a watershed approach? Watershed approach should not be limited to water quality.
- LRC keen to work with RDN but some bylaws may run contrary to LC regulations.
- 'In association with new development' vs existing development. Need to have clear definition for development and what the RDN can regulate, for eg, not mines, not forestry, etc.
- MEM could not agree to what is written but may agree in principle. What about a section on aggregates specifically? There is overlap between local and provincial mandate to regulate aggregates. Could refer back to economic section of GMP.
- Province will be developing broad statements/policies re resource use. Provincial interest section could be included under Goal 8.

Theme - Aquatic habitat and floodplain protection (policy 4D and 4F)

- 4e – change reference to Integrated Watershed mgmt
- Watershed based planning to include the following subcategories:
- Aquatic ecosystems; ISMPlanning; Groundwater
- Does this include land based ecosystems if using watershed approach? May not
- Watershed fits for aquatic ecosystems but may not for terrestrial ecosystems. Could have broad policy re. ESAs and other policies follow.

- Old policy refers to hazard lands (flood risk, steep slope development). How is this integrated into policies? Referenced in current 4F re. To flood risk.
- Coastal zone dealt with as individual subject area.
- Are we focusing on policy writing? Are you willing to encourage more environmental protection in the RDN? Do we have public support for this? Ask the public “do you want us to do more?”
- We need to think forward 25 years to systemic issues that will affect us.
- Provide list of themes to take to the public? Watersheds supercede political boundaries as does aggregates.
- Are you prepared to consider environmental resources as opportunities and not just constraints? Relates to concept of sustainability.
- Develop the model and then determine how we will move towards this model.
- A lot of changes since GMP written. This discussion provides some indication of scope of what RDN has to deal with.
- To implement the GMP we need public buy in. When presenting environmental goals people may support it but they want to know what it will cost and how it will impact them. And then they might not support the goals. This info should be addressed. Provide examples, if you have a stream on your property this will affect you.
- Protection in an absolute sense is not possible for local government.
- Need to get some sense to determine how far we will go.
- IF the public is interested in this subject area what does the RDN want to do?
- Because of current sensitivity about SPR maybe it should be tied to the next policy. But that would require the next policy to incorporate riparian areas and not just water quality. Next policy could be called stream corridor and watershed protection. May not want to combine these now.
- If we are dealing with streams this way what about other topics. Are we going to use science based approach to deal with groundwater or floodplain, for example. Break down into water, land and air, for example. Are we opening this to public prioritization?
- Look at the issue on a watershed basis, as an integrated planning tool. May take sting out because we are focusing on the big picture rather than specific issues.
- Under watershed- break it out into various issues.
- 4e Water quality is more than liquid management for example.
- Use a watershed approach dealing with aquatic resources as they are related to a particular use. By not having watershed approach GMP may be vulnerable.

Theme - Surface water and watershed protection (policies 4D and 4F)

- Summarize key points from Stormwater Guidebook and Plan project: objectives, outcomes, and applications.
- Jurisdictional role of RDN – the board would like to see this kept tight. Is this a responsibility for RDN or is this the responsibility of senior agencies?
- Clear language re. Not solely local government’s jurisdiction but their decisions impact commonly held resource and these must be considered. What can be done to avoid or mitigate the impacts.
- RDN’s role is not entirely clear re. Stormwater management. One of the components of the RDN Stormwater mgmt plan will be ISWMP for prioritized watersheds, but not as part of this draft plan.
- Local governments have some responsibility for stormwater but not watersheds because that is the responsibility of many agencies.
- Watershed based community planning – using that boundary and being considerate of the various ecosystems within that boundary. Vs Watershed planning which focuses on the aquatic resources and hydrology.
- Putting RD in box of watershed planning is incorrect.
- Direct link between land use decisions and impact to the water balance equation and drainage impacts to adjacent properties. How do we fit together?
- Not clear is who has responsibility for what. Sounds like RDN is trying to accept responsibility for all of this. Needs to be explanation re. Who is responsible for what, at the very least what the RD is responsible for.
- Local governments responsibilities may change in the next months, years.
- Legal accountability, Legal ability, and public accountability – needs to be incorporated into what our responsibilities are.

Theme - Ground water protection (policy 4D)

- Followed this approach in Area F and were challenged that this was not enough. Undertook study to determine vulnerability of aquifer and based zoning bylaw on this info.
- Concern with DPA is that there is no standard to measure the initiatives against with provincial standards.

- Conservation of water should be addressed here. It could be included in 4e related to water quality and quantity and that water conservation is a goal.
- Groundwater management and conservation – may be a better title.
- How far does the RD want to go with groundwater management? Protection may be more appropriate here. Land use decisions should be made recognizing impact on groundwater.
- Well head protection tool kit. Water management section, MWLAP website; good language and principles in this document.
- RD's willingness and ability to undertake groundwater protection/mgmt/ conservation.
- Groundwater may be broader than environmental issue but infrastructural issue.

Theme - Coastal zone protection (policy 4E)

- Coastal shoreline stewardship document. Will include BMPs for activity around coastal area.
- Shell fish closures are part of coastal zone
- Tied to economics – tourism.

Theme - Solid waste management (new)

- Need to be aware servicing doesn't enable development. Servicing doesn't control density.
- Need to be aware that policies in one section don't conflict with other sections or duplicate them.
- Move focus of program to service providers and producers.
- Are the impacts of infrastructure on growth addressed in the GMP?
- Zero waste – refers to reducing the separation between waste and economy. 'Product stewardship'
- Need to prevent retailers, producers from using excess packaging. This broader issue should be included here in reference to public education.
- 54% of waste diversion, but still need to eliminate waste
- Liquid waste uses pollution prevention or source control as related to zero waste concept.
- Air, water and solid waste prevention
- Product stewardship useful concept. How do we incorporate this concept.
- Illegal dumping – how do we deal with this issue?
- Alternative water treatment facilities – uses less water. No regulations exist for alternative systems.
- Surface disposal to onsite waste management has many facets to it and could be environmentally detrimental.
- Need to be aware of statements that require specific solutions.
- Problem areas in the region re. On site sewage disposal. Nodal area sewage disposal options

Theme - Air quality (Guideline 4b)

- Policies don't deal with growth strategy and elements of growth. Change in direction from previous policy. Needs to relate to what RDN can do, re. Growth and settlement patterns.
- Air quality might fit under efficient use of resources.
- Where does the RDN stand corporately on these issues and specific areas eg liquid waste strategy?
- Whistler example.
- Urban design related to transportation.
- Air quality relates to economic development strategy.
- Landfill using emissions credit program and investigating the viability of energy generation.

Theme - Inter-governmental Coordination (new)

- Area where we should get aggressive. If we want to have huge impact we need to know how far the public wants to go.
- Cross reference to other areas where there are agreements similar to MOU.
- Comox round table – watershed stewardship centre to provide info. Intergovernmental 'place.'
- Key section where First Nations should be included. Douglas Treaty enables First Nation to influence land use decisions.
- To develop and use other mechanisms between all levels of government to protect ESAs.
- Move this policy up front – big picture policy.
- Take to the public some indication that there is new thinking. Build and improve and take to the public.
- Encourage RDN to avoid duplication of regulation and effort and processes.

APPENDIX C

Growth Management Plan Review -Environmental Protection Workshop September 27, 2001

Workshop Agenda

Attendee List

Workshop Notes - Results of Worksheets

**REGIONAL DISTRICT OF NANAIMO - GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW
 WORKSHOP ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION POLICIES
 SEPTEMBER 27, 2001 6:30-9:00 PM
 Coast Bastion Inn, Nanaimo**

OBJECTIVES of the session:

- Provide an overview of the RDN's Growth Management Plan (GMP), its Goal 4 - "Environmental Protection", and the GMP Review Project.
- Seek your views on the role of the Regional District of Nanaimo in environmental protection.
- Obtain your opinions and ideas on the policies in Goal 4.

AGENDA - REVISED

6:30-6:45 PM	1. Welcome and introductions: a) Around the table b) Review the objectives of the Workshop
6:45-7:15 PM	2. Overviews: a) The Growth Management Plan b) Goal 4 "Environmental Protection" c) The RDN's Environmentally Sensitive Areas Atlas: its role in community and growth management planning d) The GMP Review Project
7:15-7:45 PM	3. Assessing the RDN's role in environmental protection: should the RDN be more or less active in environmental protection?
7:45-8:00 PM	Break
8:00-8:45 PM	4. Reviewing the environmental protection policies in Goal 4: a) Are they OK they way they are, or do they need changes? b) Do they cover all the topic areas? Are there things missing?
8:45-9:00 PM	5. General discussion - what are your specific environmental interests or concerns in the RDN?
9:00 PM	6. Wrap up

Notes to assist your review:

- A copy of "Goal 4: Environmental Protection" from the Growth Management Plan is included in this package. Goal 4 and its accompanying policies are the main, but not the sole, component of the Plan that addresses environmental matters. Other goals affect, and achieve, environmental priorities; e.g., Goal 5 regarding the reduction of automobile dependence, and Goal 1 and 2 regarding efforts to control sprawl. To peruse these other goals, you can view the entire Plan under the Growth Management section of the RDN's website www.rdn.bc.ca.
- Under Goal 4, the policy statements in **bold** are considered the "must do's" of the Plan. The accompanying text under each policy statement is intended for explanation but is not mandatory on the RDN or its electoral areas and municipalities. Also, the "Environmental Protection Guidelines" at the end of Goal 4 are considered to be suggestions rather than guiding policies.

Growth Management Plan Review -Environmental Protection Workshop
 September 27, 2001
ATTENDEES

INVITEE	ORGANIZATION
Mrs. A. Antonelli	Arrowsmith Ecological Association
Mr. Jock Gourlay	Cedar Community Enhancement Society
Mrs. Sheila Gourlay	Cedar Community Enhancement Society
Mr. Tom Hutton	Cedar Planning Group
Ms. Greta Taylor	Deep Bay Planning Association
Mr. Trevor Wicks	Errington Residents Association
Dr. John Hall	Fairwinds Community Association
Mr. Thomas McArthur	French Creek Residents Association
Ms. Susanna Michaelis	Green Communities Nanaimo
Mr. Tony Dorling	MIST (Mid Island Stewardship Trust)
Mr. Guy Monty	Nanaimo Field Naturalists
Mr. Wayne Harling	Nanaimo Fish & Game Protective Society
Bill Evans	Nanoose Property Owners & Ratepayers Association
Mr. Ron Maine	Oceanside Development & Construction Association
Ms. Helen Sims	Oceanside Development & Construction Association
Mr. Allan Rupprecht	Parksville Residents Association
Ms. Carol Cornish	Parksville Streamkeepers
Mr. Frank Horner	Qualicum Beach Residents Association
Ms. Faye Smith Rosenblatt	Qualicum Beach Streamkeepers
Mr. John Wright	United Fisherman and Allied Workers Union Local 23
Mr. Bill Benoit	Vancouver Island Real Estate Board
Neil Connelly	Regional District of Nanaimo, Director of Planning
Christina Thomas	Regional District of Nanaimo, Senior Planner
Brigid Reynolds	Regional District of Nanaimo, Planner
Harriet Rueggeberg	Lanarc Consultants Ltd.

**REGIONAL DISTRICT OF NANAIMO - GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW
WORKSHOP ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION POLICIES September 27, 2001**

Responses are indicated in italics.

WORKSHEET 1: Assessing the RDN's Role in Environmental Protection

22 RESPONSES (from 21 workshop participants + 1 additional faxed response)

7. Should the Regional District be more active* in environmental protection?

- 18 YES
- 3 Somewhat
- 0 Neutral - existing level of activity is fine
- 1** NO - existing level of activity is already too strong
- 1 no answer

*One response asked: Politically? Raise money through taxes? Specifically by doing what? what is leadership role of RDN?

** The respondent rephrased this response to "existing level of activity is ineffective and will probably continue to be".

8. If you answered "yes" or "somewhat" to question #2, in what areas should the Regional District be more active (effective) than it is now? Please rank the following if you can - starting with "1" as most important.

Ranked ¹ as 1,2 or 3*	Area	Reasons/comments/ideas
16	Protection of terrestrial environmentally sensitive areas (ESAs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Has to be protected, but very cumbersome with so many jurisdictions.</i> • <i>Regulate and control aggregate extraction.</i> • <i>Protect against pesticides; protect water sources, wildlife, erosion.</i> • <i>Wildlife protection; health re. pesticides. Needs cooperation of municipalities.</i>
22	Protection of streams and aquatic habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Need to define/separate responsibilities with MOE and DFO.</i> • <i>Has to be protected, but very cumbersome with so many jurisdictions.</i> • <i>Support detailed mapping, assessment and evaluation of erosion and water quality.</i> • <i>Protect fish and wildlife.</i> • <i>Education of landowners.</i> • <i>Hamstrung by no \$\$\$. Someone has to show leadership; MWLAP, SRM and DFO not demonstrated much leadership.</i>
11	Stormwater management (surface water quality and quantity)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>View as "precipitation" as a resource, not a "waste material".</i> • <i>Need to define/separate responsibilities with MOE and DFO.</i> • <i>(Re. surface water quality) Publish standards; are there any?</i> • <i>Identify areas at risk of flooding/erosion.</i> • <i>Vital for stream health.</i> • <i>Affects/impacts fisheries.</i>

¹ NOTE: Ranks should not be given undue significance. Many participants commented that it was difficult to rank these topics - that many (if not all) are of equal priority. Several ranked all or several topics as "1".]

Ranked ¹ as 1,2 or 3*	Area	Reasons/comments/ideas
7	Air quality: reduction of greenhouse gas emissions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>RDN, municipalities do not have expertise; federal and provincial area of jurisdiction.</i> • <i>Should be provincial standards.</i> • <i>Protect from global warming and health aspects.</i> • <i>Door-to-door education, e.g., on wood burning. More monitoring reports.</i> • <i>This is our greatest local health/environmental issue and global concern. {Stress} monitoring across the regional district and not just Labieux Rd (especially downtown).</i> • <i>..and reduction in pollution. We all breathe the air.</i>
5	Coordination with other levels of government (federal, provincial, municipal, First Nations)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Very necessary - communication essential.</i> • <i>Need this to get cooperation.</i> • <i>Emphasis on local government.</i> • <i>So many jurisdictions are involved in "protecting" the environment but little coordination is evident.</i>
12	Groundwater management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Should be provincial standards.</i> • <i>Detailed mapping (thickness, area) of all significant aquifers.</i> • <i>Very important to protect drinking water.</i> • <i>Inventory first - maps.</i> • <i>Vital for future drinking water sources and prevention of low flows in streams.</i>
11	Coastal and shoreline protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Nanaimo River Estuary should have logging removed.</i> • <i>Protection was abandoned when neighborhood complained about "traffic on their street".</i> • <i>Identify areas of erosion.</i> • <i>To protect land from erosion.</i> • <i>Ties into #1-3, 6-8, 10.</i> • <i>Vital for stream health</i>
8	Liquid waste (sewage) management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Village nodes in rural areas don't have community sewers.</i> • <i>Should be provincial standards.</i> • <i>Monitor and improve.</i> • <i>This must be brought up to date with better sewage treatment plants and not entering the ocean untreated.</i> • <i>More use of solar aquatics.</i> • <i>Vital for stream health.</i>
5	Solid waste (garbage, recycling) management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Should be provincial standards.</i> • <i>Natural service.</i>
4	Public education on environmental stewardship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Critical to success of protecting environment.</i> • <i>More education the better.</i> • <i>Varied media: encourage discussion, use TV, public workshops on specifics.</i> • <i>Need to include economic considerations; i.e., economic health <u>depends</u> on eco-system health.</i> • <i>Individuals and households cause a lot of damage thru pesticide use, excessive car use, "cleaning out" streams, removing natural vegetation, etc. We need more "eyes on the stream" and inform people on their role in environmental protection. We can't depend on government. Everyone is responsible for protecting <u>their</u> environment.</i>

Other areas? (WRITTEN COMMENTS)

- *Holistic plan needed to encompass ALR, FLR and RDN.*
- *Watershed management. All aspects of land and water management need to be a higher priority.*
- *Watershed mapping to tie all ESAs together.*
- *Protect watershed (catchment) as a unit.*
- *Stress ecosystem approach.*
- *Ecological approach sounds like way to go.*
- *Water quality testing: frequency and number of locales; standards.*
- *Protection of wildlife habitat very crucial.*
- *Protect wildlife habitat.*
- *Noise? (x2)*
- *Be proactive in eliminating cosmetic use of pesticides. CRD (Victoria) and other districts are developing these bylaws.*
- *Bylaws have to be workable.*
- *Water must be #1 concern with the large majority. Air quality a close second. Polluting effects of urban life must be treated as a major concern - waste disposal and effects. Obviously cooperation and education are vital. All these topics are interconnected.*
- *The RDN has not been in the least effective so far, for whatever reason, jurisdictional mostly. Probably the other levels of government are unwilling to really consider environment over economics and as the senior governments are most powerful here, the RDN could not be any more useful to habitat protection than they have been.*
- *Need clear, meaningful consultation process to mitigate citizens' sense of powerlessness.*
- *Ecosystem: if we protect these 5 {ESAs, streams and aquatic habitat, stormwater management, air quality, groundwater, coastal} then the others will have to be properly handled, otherwise these 5 will not be protected.*
- *The RDN needs to get outside of this box! You cannot separate and prioritize the component parts of a balanced system. Every part you move affects every other part of the environment. The areas we've checked are all watershed issues, not separate water issues, it's one large fluid body of water; storm, stream, ground, sewage, shoreline, wetlands, it's all the same single body of water.*

Points/comments from the workshop discussion:

- *wildlife protection*
- *pesticide use*
- *site specific and difficult to have provincial legislation*
- *MEM does poor job of aggregate extraction*
- *lots of legislation and protection for fish and fish habitat but little for wildlife*
- *fragmented environmental regulation - need to use ecosystem approach (1,2, 4, 6, 7)*
- *watershed or catchment based planning*
- *can't separate environmental issues because they get impacted piece by piece*
- *stormwater and liquid waste should be considered a resource*
- *lack of coordination between different levels of government*
- *data collection needs to be improved; e.g., aquifers, erosion areas.*
- *enforceable watershed agreements between local governments and land owners*
- *Protection of streams and aquatic habitat - agencies are not doing a good enough job in protecting the resource*
- *Stormwater management - need to identify potential sources of contamination particularly for recharge areas*
- *Liquid waste (sewage) management - measure pollutants in absolute values rather than diluted rate; e.g., ppb.*
- *RDN active in what way? Does this mean 'effective' in a particular area?*
- *What is the RDN prepared to do to become more active? Not just active but more effective.*
- *RDN should take a more active role in achieving the highest standards in all areas*
- *Implementation of existing bylaws is necessary.*
- *Incentives for protection.*
- *Property rights vs. environmental protection*
- *Monitoring of air quality – why only one station?*

If you answered "no" to question #2, in what areas should the Regional District be less active? Please rank the following if you can - starting with "1" as most important.

Reasons/comments/ideas

- Protection of terrestrial environmentally sensitive areas (ESAs) _____
- Protection of streams and aquatic habitat _____
- Stormwater management (surface water quality and quantity) _____
- Air quality: reduction of greenhouse gas emissions _____
- Coordination with other levels of government (federal, provincial, municipal, First Nations) _____
- Groundwater management _____
- Coastal and shoreline protection _____
- Liquid waste (sewage) management _____
- Solid waste (garbage, recycling) management _____
- Public education on environmental stewardship _____
- Other areas? _____

**REGIONAL DISTRICT OF NANAIMO - GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW
WORKSHOP ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION POLICIES September 27, 2001**

Written responses and comments from the workshop discussion are indicated in italics.

WORKSHEET 2: Gauging Support for Environmental Protection Policies

22 RESPONSES (Note that participants did not necessarily respond on all policies; numbers may not total 21.)

1 STRONGLY AGREE - keep in GMP as is 2 AGREE SOMEWHAT - minor change required 3 UNSURE - need more discussion 4 DISAGREE SOMEWHAT - major change needed 5 STRONGLY DISAGREE - get rid of it

Theme	CURRENT POLICY	Level of Agreement					Comments/Ideas for revisions
		High				Low	
GOAL	4. The Growth Management Plan calls for coordinated efforts to protect and restore the environment.	1 17	2 3	3 1	4	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Co-ordinated efforts between who? It should include governments, First Nations, Public, Industry (critical since they are largest landowners.</i> • <i>Co-ordinated & imaginative & innovative.</i> • <i>This must be done at all costs. There will be no environment to protect down the road.</i> • <i>To whom? By whom? When? How?</i> • <i>This should be a "given."</i> • <i>When do we exceed the carrying capacity?</i> • <i>Protection tends to be fragmented. What type of population can we sustain without negatively impact the ESAs.</i> • <i>No mention of sustainability, focus is on development.</i> • <i>A good goal but how is it implemented? Current procedure is time consuming, costly, can't get answers easily. Landowner has to have a say in decision.</i>
Open space and ESAs	4A: A program of open space protection will be developed by local, regional and senior governments, including implementation of the Regional Parks System Plan.	1 13	2 5	3 1	4	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Should include a target for percentage protection in each defined area; e.g., 100% ESA protection.</i> • <i>Parks don't mean environmental protection!</i> • <i>Must have open spaces for recreational purposes – wildlife protection.</i> • <i>Clearing of local parks and seed for grass (problematic).</i> • <i>A good idea but how is land to be acquired? Will density rights be transferred? How are you going to acquire land in the whole of the RDN when development can occur only in nodes?</i>
Land use decision making	4B. The RDN and local jurisdictions will base development and open space protection decisions on the ecological character of the land.	1 14	2 4	3 1	4	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Parks don't mean environmental protection!</i> • <i>We need definitions of ecological character – maps would be useful here.</i> • <i>Again, are density rights to be transferred?</i>
Trails, greenways, corridors	4C. A system of interconnected trails, greenways, and natural corridors capable of sustaining or enhancing	1 15	2 3	3 2	4	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Corridors are as important as greenways – large mammals & birds need <u>wider</u> spaces to be interconnected.</i> • <i>Very important.</i> • <i>Good effort so far – keep it up.</i>

Theme	CURRENT <u>POLICY</u>	Level of Agreement					Comments/Ideas for revisions
		High				Low	
	native plant and animal species will be established regionally.						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good luck! The establishment of trailways may be one of the major problems with wildlife habitat. • Will this result in down zoning parcels thereby destroying value of landowners? Will land be expropriated?
Surface and ground water	4D. Measures to protect the supply and quality of surface and groundwater will be developed and implemented in each jurisdiction.	1 17	2 2	3 1	4	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection of water resources must include protection of uplands, ESAs. • Should be "in each watershed"? • Too little – too late perhaps. Impossible without FLR & ALR covering regulations. • This is extremely important, in fact of the utmost importance. • Education of the public is critical. The RDN must exhibit some good faith here. • No enough detail on what you are doing and how it will be implemented.
Coastal zone	4E. Development of remaining natural segments of the coastal zone will be discouraged.	1 11	2 2	3 3	4 2	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change "be discouraged" to "not be allowed". • Need strong implementation of strong legislation. • This must be discouraged most strongly; coastal areas must be vigorously protected. • I'm all for it, but can you achieve it? • Will this result in down zoning and property being devalued? Forcing 1 landowner to plant native grasses in any area that was destroyed years ago and adjacent lot have regular lawns does nothing in the long run.
Aquatic features	4F. Floodplains and other aquatic features will be protected or restored to a natural condition.	1 16	2	3 4	4	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FLR & ALR co-operation essential. • This is of utmost importance. • Here again it sounds good but how will you restore a badly damaged stream with development on its banks protected by grandfathering. • At who's expense? This was attempted where I submitted an application for a marine protected area at Madrona. Nothing has happened so the political will is not there.

Theme	CURRENT <u>GUIDELINE</u>	Level of Agreement					Comments/Ideas for revisions
		High				Low	
Environmental reviews	4.1 Environmental reviews should be required for all projects with potential to negatively affect ecologically significant areas, the coastal zone or environmental quality.	1 20	2 1	3	4	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too bad the City of Nanaimo doesn't seem to be accepting this guideline with respect to the Jingle Pot Marsh. • In <u>all</u> areas. • Environmental reviews should take into account all features that exist over a 12-month period not just 2 or 10 days. This does not give a true picture. • I agree, but this can be a costly requirement – can it be administered fairly? • Practice tells me that the big environmental picture is not addressed. Development permits tend to focus on small lots, penalising individual owners.

Theme	CURRENT GUIDELINE	Level of Agreement					Comments/Ideas for revisions
		High				Low	
Air quality	4.2 Enacting measures to reduce automobile travel and to minimize emission pollutants from industry and other sources should protect air quality.	1 13	2 1	3 2	4 2	5 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This statement is too general. It doesn't state what the RDN <u>will do</u>. E.g., the RDN will enact measures..... Given that Feb/April/May/June/Oct are all rated "fair" for either ground level ozone or PM2.5 particulates (pg.25 annual report) - which mean "measurable effects on humans", "can be harmful to human health" - it seems that the problem is <u>significant</u> (especially as Labieux Rd. does not indicate air quality where there is industry and more transportation such as downtown; mills, vehicles, ships. planes, etc.) Focus attention on improved air quality and reduced car use! Please look into measuring & public reporting of air quality in all urban & village zones. This is a Federal matter. This is beyond the RDN's competence except for specific sites like French Creek sewage plant and the Cedar dump. A good goal but reality is, this is a rural area. Rural nodes do not provide significant employment or services so people have to travel, so how is this achieved? Air quality indicators (in 2000 report)– may be inaccurate because of the duration the data was gathered. The location of the station does not reflect the picture downtown for example.
Native plants	4.3 Emphasize the use of native plant species for all new public area landscaping and restoration work.	1 12	2 4	3 2	4 2	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do this, but without ravaging the wilderness. Here again we need to educate people on what are "native plants" and where can they be appropriately used.

Are there additional policies or guidelines that you would like to recommend for consideration as the Growth Management Plan is updated?

- All areas have a carrying capacity for population and land use. We need to examine the big picture of human impact on the environment.
- A move toward an ecosystem approach (based on catchment areas) as a basis for regulating and administering environmental protection.
- Natural corridors should not be connected/used as human trails.
- We should be cautious about "philosophical motherhood" statements without the specifics of action, responsibility, time frames, quantified measures, etc. The "concept" is excellent, but needs detail.
- All there are (1), however, "keep in GMP as is" is not a relative statement. "Keep in GMP" could be with some changes. The key to all this is "How much effort is the RDN prepared to exert to achieve all these policies." Goals are only of use when efforts are made to achieve them. Priority should be on implementation of existing policies.
- Air quality (inversion, ozone, particulates) to be monitored regularly in all seasons and in all residential nodes – rural as well as urban.
- Wood burning stoves should be shut down in some atmospheric conditions.
- Public transit should be regular & frequent in rural residential areas (which are the biggest users of the automobile).
- Encourage bike paths, footpaths along roads & natural areas.

- *Encourage selective cutting of trees.*
- *Enforce emission quality standards in industry (i.e., pulp).*
- *Industrial pollution, i.e., rockpits.*
- *Why should FLR be exempt from RDN standards? What agency has responsibility for protecting streams in FLR?*
- *Who and how do we make a limit on the growth of any area – i.e. A cruise ship is very popular – more & more people want to get on it – until there are too many people & the ship sinks. There must be a limit on the number of people allowed in our area – otherwise the water – sewage – transportation – traffic will be impacted to the point where life becomes unbearable.*
- *All planning should be ecosystem based. Watershed based. Sustainable economy, population.*
- *It is important that the RDN respect the concerns of municipalities and address these issues with action, not just words.*
- *Policies enacting legislative protection for wildlife and wildlife habitat.*
- *Again, we hope you will realise that you can not compartmentalise aspects of the environment. All water issues are connected by the same body of water, storm, ground, tap, sewage, shoreline, wetland. It's all the same water flowing through them all. One water, even though we interact with it in numerous places, numerous ways, it is still just one large fluid body of water. Environmental protection awareness, education and laws can only be effective when they operate with this knowledge, it's one body of water.*
- *This Growth Management Plan is too detailed. Should be a philosophical guidance document, allowing OCPs to define the details. GMP goals are contradictory (i.e., protecting environment while encouraging farming). Revised OCPs also contradict GMP. GMP does not respect individual owner rights. Public cannot expect individuals to bear the cost of down zoning, or encumbering their land without compensation.*

Do you have any comments on other goals that relate to the environmental protection goal (e.g., Goal 1 - strong urban containment; Goal 5 - Improved mobility; Goal 6 - vibrant and sustainable economy)? Any suggestions for improvement to other areas of the GMP to ensure consistency with your views on environmental protection?

- *Goal 1 needs to have a more active role; i.e., not only containing urban sprawl but better designing communities in order to minimize transportation needs and hence, improve the environment.*
- *"Vibrant and Sustainable Economy" - encourage industry and business that has minimal or no negative impact on the environment. Discourage those that compromise a healthy environment.*
- *"Improved mobility" - Under (GMP 2000 report) "Live closer to where you work or where you can obtain goods and services (pg.29). Facilitate development that mixes living, working, recreation and alternative transportation.*
- *I think we need an American style Environmental Protect Act that will allow every citizen to react to violations.*
- *I recognize that the GMP is not a fixed document but is subject to periodic review. However, intermediate changes to suit personal agendas (e.g. moving of U.C.B. to permit expansion of Woodgrove Mall; not stopping the misuse of ALR land at the intersection of Hwy 4 & 4A) should not be permitted.*
- *Your guideline about education is of major importance – more door-to-door and school classroom and local conferences, (film, TV, web) not just printed material.*
- *In order to fully protect watercourses & streams etc., entry to private property should be mandatory. No good trying to protect a section of a stream or watercourse if a private landowner is polluting a stream or watercourse on that property.*
- *What are the economic/personnel resources required for each goal or policy implementation? Does the RDN have the resources to implement any of the goals?*
- *Agencies responsible for enforcement of environmental regulations, bylaws, should not be allowed to police their own activities; I.E., City of Nanaimo policing it's own developments!*

- *The M.O.U. should be scrapped! Provincial and Federal agencies must take responsibility for their own areas of expertise.*
- *Other goals contradict these goals of environmental protection; e.g. nodes and urban containment boundaries can limit the ability to protect ESAs. These boundaries should be more flexible and/or revised on a regular basis.*
- *Urban containment in GMP should be philosophical instead of rigid. Each project should be assessed on its own merits. E.G., possibility developing a parcel that is currently outside the UCB would solve the existing pollution problems (e.g., hundred of septic fields along the waterfront and no way to pay for the required infrastructure or a place for the treatment plant). Reality is, someone has to pay for environmental protection. If the cost is too high, development will move to another location taking jobs as well as environmental protection with it. We do not have a vibrant and sustainable economy and a more positive approach to development and business would assist in achieving the goals of the GMP.*
- *We were very disappointed to see the inaccurate and rosy picture portrayed in the 2000 Annual Report. E.g.:*
 1. *P. 19, not including private water suppliers gives a very skewed picture of state of drinking water in the RDN. Whisky Creek, Little Qualicum and others have had numerous boil water orders.*
 2. *P. 28, "100% of water courses in A.E. "F" protected by Development Permit Areas. To date there is yet no zoning bylaws in Area F, under which D.P.A. could exist. This is a totally false statement it would seem. Even if there was zoning, ALR/FLR lands, which comprise the majority of lands in Area F, are exempt from D.P.A.*
 3. *I understand the "Englishman River Official Community Plan" referred to on P. 24 has not existed for years, it was rolled into Areas G.F. & E.*
- *Protection measures (development permit areas) in 20% of land base are more stringent than in other 80% (ALR, FLR). There needs to be a more coordinated approach over the protection of the whole land base.*
- *Using parks, as indicator of environmental protection is inaccurate. Human disturbance can have a major impact to environment. Two questions are being asked here.*
- *Meeting reports would be appreciated.*