

Questions to Parks Canada regarding Phase 2 of SIERP

The Sidney Island Deer Management Society has several questions for Parks Canada regarding Phase 2 of SIERP

1) On June 10/24 you advised that we would be contacted in the event PC decided to use a helicopter over private land. It is now October. May we have an update on this issue?

2) May we please see the applications from PC to the BC Director of Wildlife for the required exemptions regarding eradication in Phase 2 under the BC Wildlife Act. As you know, the Director's procedure in issuing the permits for phase 2 is being investigated by the BC Ombudsperson. We take the position that no permits should be issued until after the Ombudsperson has completed his investigation.

3) May we please have an update regarding the request made on September 19 to remove the statement that "fallow deer are symbols of European Colonization here and around the world?" We note the PC website is now up with those words still included. That website and other internal ministry documents now stress that eradication of fallow deer supports FN's aboriginal rights over Sidney Island. But the references to Sidney Island do not make any distinction between Canada's obligations to FN on the land where the park is situated and privately owned land. This seems contrary to both the federal and provincial governments' clear public statements that privately owned land is not on the table. The Strata Corporation has never agreed that FN's have any property rights over its land. We also note the License Agreement does not mention the word "reconciliation" once and this was not part of the basis on which SIERP was sold to the owners. (See: **Project Complexity and Risk Assessment** document) Certainly strata owners who oppose eradication of the deer on strata land are not doing so in order protect symbols of European Colonialism.

4) The License Agreement (6.3.2 Schedule D) requires that the hunt be monitored by the BCSPCA. The use of "Judas" animals and "corralling" are considered inhumane by the BCSPCA. But these techniques are still in the Coastal Conservation work plan. Further the Chief of the Kiwi Field Crew advises NO ONE will be allowed to observe the hunt including the BCSPCA. Given this, how is PC going to fulfill its primary obligation not only to ensure these animals will be killed humanely but that they are seen to be killed humanely? We have reports that animals are already coming into contact with fencing. How can PC or Coast Conservation monitor 35km of fencing 24 hours a day while working at corralling and killing the deer in a particular area? Inappropriate monitoring is a breach of the Licence Agreement. Appropriate monitoring can only be achieved with "eyes on the hunt at all times". Can PC please provide a detailed plan for how that will be achieved.

5) In the **Project Complexity and Risk Assessment (PCRA)** document which has been approved by Treasury Board, it is asserted by PC bureaucrats that there is a large degree of support by Sidney Islanders. It also suggests that the results of the **Detailed Impact Assessment (DIA)** indicated community support. Both statements do not reflect the truth and are self-serving

statements by the bureaucrat's responsible for the project. This could possibly result in misleading senior levels of government. May we have assurances that the PCRA will be reviewed to reflect the reality that more than half of Sidney Island owners did not approve this project (we accept there was a 52% to 48% legal vote in support) and that the vast majority of comments under the DIA were opposed to the project?

6) Those citizens opposed to this project, including owners of private land on Sidney Island, have been referred to as "known agitators" by PC staff and are being "monitored." This attitude reflects an unacceptable bullying culture within PC. Let's not forget that private owners have a legitimate interest regarding the status of their land. To call them "known agitators" who require monitoring smacks of inappropriate overreach. Is this type of labelling by public servants allowed under their rules of conduct? Please ask your contacts in PC to cease and desist.

7) In the **Work Contract** between Parks Canada and Coastal Conservation (March 22,2022,) Coastal Conservation is required to do a risk assessment regarding the likely success or failure of SIERP. May we please have a copy of that Risk Assessment.