

Summary of the public consultation process on options to consider the Sunshine Coast Regional District's Chapman Lake expansion proposal in Tetrahedron Park

Overview

The 1997 Tetrahedron Park Management Plan recognizes the historic importance of the Chapman Lake watershed for community water supply in the Sunshine Coast, and emphasizes the ongoing use of the watershed for domestic water purposes. The Tetrahedron Park Management Plan also makes a commitment to full public consultation regarding any options to re-designate the park to allow enhancements to the community water supply infrastructure.

To this end, BC Parks launched a 30-day public engagement process in May 2018 to seek public input on the options available to enable the SCRD's application for expanded infrastructure and drawdown at Chapman Lake.

Options Presented

Three re-designation options were presented to the public at the open houses and on the website. In addition, the public was invited to bring forward new ideas and considerations for addressing the Chapman Lake water supply issue.

The three options presented were:

- 1) re-designate the entire Tetrahedron Park from a Class A park to a Protected Area; or
- 2) re-designate a portion of Tetrahedron Park to a Protected Area, and maintain Class A park status on the rest of the park; or,
- 3) re-designate the entire Tetrahedron Park as a Conservancy.

A fourth consideration, referred to as "option 4" came at the behest of the public, many of whom expressed a desire for no change to Tetrahedron Park's boundary or designation, and wanted to maintain the existing Class A designation. The public put forward this option, recognizing that this "status quo" option would prohibit the Province from considering the SCRD's application to allow further draw-down from Chapman Lake as a solution to the region's water supply issue.

Public Engagement Process

Two open houses were hosted, one on May 2 in Sechelt and one on May 24 in Roberts Creek. The second open house was added after an over-capacity turn-out at the first open

house indicated the high level of interest in the communities. The second open house was located in Roberts Creek to provide a larger venue, and to ensure there was easy access to all residents of the lower Sunshine Coast.

The open houses used a mixed format beginning with a general open house with displays and information around the room and staff available for one-on-one discussion, followed by a “town hall-style” question and answer period with a panel. An external consultant facilitated the question process; the public submitted their questions in writing, the facilitator read the questions out loud for all to hear, and a panelist provided a response.

A BC Parks webpage was created using the Boundary Adjustment web format to provide information about the Tetrahedron re-designation options and to seek public input through a comment form. A Public Information Paper was distributed and posted on the website.

The public comment period that began on May 2 was extended to June 8, 2018 due to the high level of interest. Public comments were received at the open houses, by mail and email, and via the BC Parks website.

BC Parks hired facilitators Transpectives Consulting Inc. to work with BC Parks staff in an advisory role, to assist in the preparation of public engagement materials, and to facilitate the open houses. The consultants and BC Parks staff also met with the Tetrahedron Advisory Committee (TAC) in advance of the public engagement process.

Summary of Public Engagement

Approximately 200 individuals attended the first open house on May 2 and approximately 100 individuals attended the second open house on May 24. Approximately 35 – 40 questions were submitted to the panel at each open house.

Roughly 550 submissions were made by the public during the consultation period; the majority of submissions were submitted online through the BC Parks website. Several individuals submitted comments more than once during the consultation process, including at open houses, online, and through letters and emails.

In addition, approximately 40 letters were sent to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change Strategy and/or to BC Parks staff and executive.

With few exceptions, the input from the public was detailed, respectful, and highly engaged in finding a resolution.

There was significant local media interest, with local news outlets providing coverage of the public consultation process from April through June 2018.

Analysis and Results

Results from the public engagement were analyzed and themed by Transpectives Consulting. Due to the submission process, the results were not summarized quantitatively (as some individuals submitted multiple times). For this reason, and as a means of capturing the depth and breadth of commentary, an emphasis on qualitative data analysis has formed the basis of the findings in this report.

Qualitatively, the findings reveal that the majority of respondents identified a preference for maintaining the Class A park designation (option 4). Of these respondents, approximately one-third were not local residents and did not reside on the Sunshine Coast.

The next significant group of comments consisted of local residents who wanted to re-designate specific areas of the park, but maintain a Class A designation throughout the remaining area (option 2).

A significant number of respondents sought a re-frame of the options presented to focus on other underlying causes and issues associated with water supply and demand, and a number of alternative solutions were submitted (see Themes 1 and 6 outlined below).

Finally a small number of respondents thought re-designating the park as a conservancy (option 3) was the most viable solution.

Themes from the Public Comments

This section summarizes the general themes that emerged through a detailed review of the public submissions and comments. The themes are summarized in the order from those most frequently mentioned to those least mentioned in the submissions.

Theme 1 – Root Causes of Water Supply and Demand Issues Not Addressed:

The public's perceived tension between two undesirable outcomes – the serious implications of a potential drinking water crisis versus impacts to the Class A park - was raised by a significant number of respondents with a request to re-examine the root causes of the problem. The respondents felt that none of the options presented by BC Parks addressed the root problems related to community water supply, and so these respondents preferred to maintain the status quo.

Theme 2 – Precedent Setting Park Boundary Change:

Many respondents expressed concern that future provincial governments would view proposed changes to park boundaries as precedent, or license, to change the boundaries of other protected areas.

Theme 3 - Impact Assessment:

Several respondents noted that the environmental impact assessment seemed to be inadequate (i.e. impact assessments conducted by the SCRD in 2007, 2013, and 2016 were critiqued for their validity and applicability). Participants also took issue with additional environmental impact assessment on the project taking place after a legislative decision, when a park use permit is being considered.

Theme 4 –Co-Management:

Some respondents recommended that co-management of the park with Shíshálh Nation would be helpful.

Theme 5 – Concerns with the Public Engagement Process:

A number of respondents were dissatisfied with how both BC Parks and the SCRD engaged with the public on the issue. With regards to the SCRD, the public noted a perceived lack of accountability and transparency, as well as concerns with decision-making related to the Chapman project. With regards to BC Parks, commentary focused on concerns around the public engagement processes. [Note: sometimes in the commentary there was confusion over the respective jurisdictions. For this reason the public’s online and open-house commentary was sometimes critical of both SCRD and BC Parks, and sometimes misattributed their functions and/or roles in this issue].

Key critiques of the SCRD:

- SCRD officials should have been co-presenters at the first open house; [Note: SCRD did participate in open house #2 with an information table, but did not co-present];
- The Alternative Approval Process (2016) for the Chapman Lake expansion project was not a true representation of community support and input;
- The only water studies available were outdated;
- There are a lack of incentives for residents to conserve water;
- There was an “off-loading of responsibility” for resolution of the water supply issue onto BC Parks.

Key critiques of BC Parks:

- Maintaining status quo was not presented as an option;

- Confusion and anxiety surrounding use of the word “deletion” in describing park boundary changes;
- Concern there was misinterpretation of the Tetrahedron Park Management Plan (i.e. Confusion over meaning of “enhancement of community water supply”);
- Insufficient notice/advertising in advance of the first open house;
- Inconsistency between the content of the online and print versions of the comment forms;
- Misleading instructions on the website (i.e. Readers wanting to view the options were inadvertently led to the park management plan rather than the public information paper);
- Concerns that the online form’s question regarding “level/frequency-of-use” of the park implied that this variable might be used to weigh certain stakeholder commentary over others;
- Concerns regarding insufficient consultation with first nations.

Theme 6 – Alternate Options:

A number of participants presented other options and ideas than those presented by BC Parks, including:

- The SCRDR should offer incentivized water conservation strategies that would decrease the need for drawdown of Chapman Lake and avoid the need for any changes to the park.
- Some respondents pointed to the town of Gibsons and its Eco-Assets Strategy and Municipal Natural Assets Initiative as examples of sustainable solutions to local water shortage issues.
- Re-designating Tetrahedron Park from a Class A park to a Protected Area could be a temporary solution, with designation reverting to Class A park status once the infrastructure enhancement work has been completed.
- In addition to the alternate options, some respondents recommended the additional process step of hiring an independent consultant to conduct the impact assessment.

Conclusion

The public consultation provided opportunities for meaningful engagement with the public on the issue. Facilitator John Radford noted that the process enabled diverse stakeholders to engage with the issue and surface diverse opinions. The sequential open houses improved the public’s awareness and understanding of the nuances surrounding the issue. The public comments demonstrate the respondents’ comprehension of the complexities of the issue, and the high degree of engagement from the public indicates a community that is engaged in decisions about Tetrahedron Park and their community water supply.

Appendix 1: Questions and Answers from the Open Houses

Questions and Answers about the Public Consultation Process	
Question	Answer
<i>Is this supposed to be public consultation? It seems like a pre-determined outcome. Do you really want input?</i>	<p>BC Parks commenced a 30-day public consultation process with an open house in Sechelt on May 2 and a second open house in Roberts Creek on May 24. The public comment deadline was extended to June 8, 2018.</p> <p>Public input was accepted on-line through the BC Parks website, by email and by mail. BC Parks welcomed all input on the options presented and any other options or interests the public brought forward through the consultation process.</p>
<i>Why is there not a public referendum on this matter?</i>	<p>BC Parks conducted a full public consultation process from May 2 through to June 8 which included mail in and online comment forms, letters to the Minister and two open house events held in the local communities of Sechelt and Robert's Creek; the public had ample opportunity to provide input into the process and have their concerns considered.</p>
<i>Why have we been given such short notice for this important meeting?</i>	<p>BC Parks heard the concerns of the public with respect to notification for the May 2 open house, and made efforts to ensure advertising was posted well in advance of the May 24 open house. Notification for both events was covered in local and Vancouver media as well as on the BC Parks and BC Government websites.</p>
<i>Why is there no meeting scheduled for Vancouver?</i>	<p>BC Parks holds public meetings in the communities nearest the parks involved in the process in order to better understand the needs and concerns of the communities most likely to be affected by the decision. The public and all other stakeholders are welcome to submit comments through the BC Parks website.</p>
<i>Request to hold meetings after 6:30 pm so working people (and commuters) can attend.</i>	<p>The May 24 open house was held from 7:00 to 9:00 PM, in order to accommodate later schedules on the Sunshine Coast.</p>
<i>Request to hold meetings in a larger venue.</i>	<p>The second open house was located at the Roberts Creek Community Hall with capacity for more than 200 people. In the end, approximately 100 people attended the second open house.</p>
<i>What is the process for those of us who do not want to see anything removed from the park?</i>	<p>The public can record comments on a comment form at the public open house, or submit a comment form on</p>

Questions and Answers about the Public Consultation Process	
Question	Answer
	the BC Parks website. All comments will be presented to the Minister.
<i>Why is there no checkbox on this form that allows the public to select that they support no change to the park designation?</i>	The comment form was re-designed for the second open house.
<i>How is an event process like this (info board and presentation format) supposed to provide effective voice to over 100 people in the room?</i>	BC Parks designed the open house to facilitate a respectful and timely dialogue with a large number of participants. While some people are comfortable expressing themselves at a microphone, others find this type of forum intimidating and tend not to voice their opinions in that setting. Several attendees approached BC Parks staff and expressed their appreciation for the way the event was organized and facilitated.
<i>How do we know that you are not hand picking the questions when you gather them all up?</i>	BC Parks staff attempted to answer every question that was submitted during the open houses, or referred those that couldn't be answered to the SCRCD for follow up.
<i>The Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD) Directors representing 2/3 of the Chapman supply users are opposed to the proposed plan and options. Why does BC Parks think there is still support for this?</i>	The SCRCD applied for an amendment to their current Park Use Permit in Tetrahedron Park, which triggered this process. The SCRCD is acting on direction from the board to proceed with the Chapman Lake project, and has not communicated to BC Parks any desire to withdraw that permit application.
<i>Have any panel members spent a few days in the park?</i>	The regional planner has spent time hiking and skiing in Tetrahedron Park, including overnight in the public cabins. Both the regional planner and the provincial planner spent time touring the community water supply infrastructure at Chapman and Edwards lakes. Other regional staff are also familiar with many areas and aspects of the park.
<i>In July 2016, an Alternative Approval Process (AAP) was held. Despite a rigorous campaign urging residents to vote against the \$5 million Chapman Lake Expansion Project, only 5% of eligible voters cast a vote. The other 95% of us either support the project (or have no opinion). Will this AAP be taken into consideration for implementing the Tetrahedron Park Management Plan?</i>	The final report and recommendations presented to the Minister will include a synopsis of the all the material gathered and comments received during the public consultation process as well as an evaluation of the necessity of the Chapman Lake expansion project in meeting the SCRCD's water needs.

Questions and Answers about Environmental Impacts	
Question	Answer
<p><i>What current and up-to-date research has been done to discover what environmental impacts there are related to the SCRD’s proposal to draw down Chapman Lake? Shouldn’t this inform any recommendations to the Minister?</i></p>	<p>An Environmental Impact Assessment has been completed and is available on the SCRD website. Yes, this information will inform the Minister’s decision.</p>
<p><i>The Tetrahedron Park Plan states: “Where regional water supply improvements are proposed within the park, an impact assessment and comprehensive public consultation process will be developed.” Has an impact assessment been done? If yes, by whom? Can we read it? If not, when will it be done?</i></p>	<p>An Environmental Impact Assessment on the Chapman Lake water supply expansion proposal was completed by AECOM in 2016. The report is available on the SCRD website.</p>
<p><i>The Chapman Lake drawdown will damage the wetlands around the lake especially when dynamiting the drawdown channel. This will benefit a relatively few private households. Does BC Parks have a mandate to consider the benefit to the larger public?</i></p>	<p>BC Parks considers social interests and environmental impacts when making decisions on boundary adjustments and re-designations.</p>
<p><i>Will any BC Parks environmental assessment include downstream impacts of drawdown?</i></p>	<p>Yes, the impact assessment considers the results of drawdown including downstream effects.</p>
<p><i>Will this project be addressed under the Federal Fisheries Act? The Act has a section prohibiting the harmful alteration or damaging and destroying fish habitat.</i></p>	<p>The project would be subject to the federal <i>Fisheries Act</i> and would go through a review process to determine if it would cause the “harmful alteration, disruption or destruction” of fish habitat under the federal <i>Fisheries Act</i> (HADD). If a review concluded it would cause a HADD, it would require authorization from DFO before the work could proceed.</p>
<p><i>The Environmental Impact Assessment for the Chapman Lake drawdown was done by the SCRD. The same company was used to produce the Environmental Assessment as was used to construct the \$5 million trenching project. Does this not strike BC Parks as a glaring conflict of interest? And shouldn’t you get an independent Environment Assessment?</i></p>	<p>The Environmental Impact Assessment was completed by qualified professionals. BC Parks has no concerns with the quality or professionalism of the impact assessment report.</p>

Questions and Answers about Re-designation Options	
Question	Answer
<i>Why is the option of leaving the Park “as it is” not being considered?</i>	BC Parks is implementing direction from the Park Management Plan to explore re-designation options that would enable the improvements to the community water supply infrastructure and is seeking public input on those options. The Minister may decide not to recommend any of the re-designation options to the Legislature, maintaining Class A park status. BC Parks welcomes any and all input from the public on the options, including the preference not to pursue any of the options.
<i>What are the specific differences between what is allowed in parks or conservancy areas?</i>	Please refer to the material posted on the BC Parks website that compares the park and conservancy designation.
<i>How many acres of land would be removed or declassified? Be specific. How much of the park will be affected by the expansion? Why not make a minimum area around Chapman Lake a protected area and leave the rest a Class A park.</i>	Different versions of the “protected area” option could be applied to re-designate different portions of the park, from re-designating all 6000 hectares, to the minimum area required to implement the requested water supply infrastructure improvements. This is the type of input we are seeking from the public through the public consultation process.
<i>Can you speak to recreation, wildlife, and other uses or protections under the new designations?</i>	Natural, cultural and recreational values would be managed the same way under a new designation as they currently are under Class A park status. The only change is that improvements or enhancements to the water supply infrastructure could be considered.
<i>Would the re-designation allow for road and dam building?</i>	The re-designation would not allow for construction of a road. It would allow for the activities and conditions specified in the Order in Council to establish the protected area. The OIC would ensure that adequate authorities exist to issue a park use permit to authorize the installation of permanent piping for additional drawdown of Chapman Lake during drought conditions.
<i>Based on the questions and comments you are seeing tonight, do you have a sense of the direction we prefer?</i>	BC Parks is aware there is a strong interest in maintaining Class A park status among many people in the community. BC Parks will consider all input received during the public consultation process.
<i>What is the risk of doing nothing? What is the risk of drawing down the lake?</i>	Maintaining Class A status would prevent the consideration of a park use permit for improvements to the community water supply infrastructure. An Environmental Impact Assessment has been completed and is available on the SCRD website which examines the risk associated with drawing down the lake.

Questions and Answers about Park Management and Policy Direction	
Question	Answer
<i>Does the Minister consider whether or not the SCRDR has adequately considered all options for meeting the water needs of the Sunshine Coast in a diversified way, and also of the costs and benefits?</i>	Yes, the Minister will consider whether the SCRDR has explored and implemented alternatives to a satisfactory extent when considering whether to re-designate Tetrahedron Park.
<i>Who has the legal authority to cancel a Class A park and what is the process?</i>	The Minister could recommend cancelling the park and changing the designation to a different status of protected area. If Cabinet supported the Minister's recommendation, the decision would be made by the Legislature. The intent would be to ensure there is no net loss of protected area.
<i>Why declassify or adjust the boundaries of such a valuable asset to the Sunshine Coast for water that can only be used at Stage 4 in an emergency?</i>	If the park boundary is adjusted and a park use permit is issued to allow for additional drawdown of Chapman Lake, BC Parks would apply permit conditions. This could include restricting the use of any additional water capacity to emergency use during droughts, and other conditions in order to reduce future dependence on Chapman Lake water.
<i>Can the park be returned to its original designation after permanent water issues are addressed? (reservoir, etc.)</i>	If desired, government could cancel the protected area and re-designate the entire area as Class A park when all aspects of the project have been completed.
<i>What are the procedural differences between Class A and conservancy when a request has been made for alternate use such as logging, mining or private for profit uses, or even public water infrastructure changes?</i>	Logging and mining are not permitted in a Class A park or conservancy. Commercial use in a park or conservancy must be consistent with the <i>Park Act</i> and may only be authorized by a park use permit.
<i>Please explain the difference in the procedures to make changes to a protected area, conservancy, and park.</i>	If a conservancy or a park is established through an Act of the Legislature it can only be changed through an Act of the Legislature. Most are established through an Act of the Legislature, as is the case with Tetrahedron. Some parks or conservancies <i>may be</i> established through an Order in Council, and could therefore be changed through an Order in Council. Protected Areas are established by Order in Council and can be changed by Order in Council. Orders in Council can be enacted by Cabinet without going to the Legislature.
<i>If the watershed is to be maintained shouldn't the entire watershed be in a</i>	The current park boundary was established during land use planning in the mid-1990s. There is no intention to expand the boundary of the existing park.

Questions and Answers about Park Management and Policy Direction	
Question	Answer
<i>park? Logging is occurring in the Chapman Lake watershed right now.</i>	
<i>Is BC Parks advocating for more parks on the Sunshine Coast given how little park is there?</i>	BC Parks does not advocate for establishing new parks. Most new protected areas involving Crown lands are considered through land use planning processes. When private lands are available for sale, BC Parks may try to acquire key properties for protection, including additions to existing parks, subject to budget availability.
<i>If park status is changed are there safeguards in place to keep water public and ensure water supply is not privatized?</i>	If the park status were changed to authorize the additional water supply infrastructure at Chapman Lake, the permit would be issued to the Sunshine Coast Regional District which is a public government body.
<i>When the park was designated a Class A park did it in fact include a negotiation that the SCRD be allowed access to provide for population growth?</i>	The community water supply infrastructure was in place prior to the designation of Tetrahedron Park. Government was clear at the time of designation that the continued supply of safe, clean drinking water to the residents of the Sunshine Coast was of critical importance. As stated in the management plan, <i>“Government, upon park designation, made a commitment to allow for continued management and enhancement of the Chapman/Gray Creek watersheds as future community water supply sources for the Sunshine Coast residents.”</i> (p. 12) The management plan also included a specific management objective <i>“To ensure there is an appropriate mechanism for authorizing existing and future watershed enhancement and infrastructure development that may be required by SCRD for future population growth on the Sunshine Coast.”</i> (p. 16)
<i>Is BC Parks not mandated to protect Tetrahedron Park until the SCRD demonstrates a full long-term comprehensive water management plan?</i>	BC Parks’ mandate of protecting Tetrahedron Park is guided by the <i>Park Act</i> and by the Park Management Plan which includes many objectives and strategies to protect park values. The Park Management Plan also directs BC Parks to seek input from the public on re-designation options that would enable improvements to the community water supply infrastructure.
<i>The Management Plan states that Tetrahedron Park was created for 3 reasons:</i> <i>1. Maintain and enhance water quality and community watersheds.</i>	Management plans attempt to strike a balance between many competing interests and values. Not all management objectives address all park purposes. The Chapman Lake expansion project was recognized in the management plan as something that would require the

Questions and Answers about Park Management and Policy Direction	
Question	Answer
<p>2. <i>Preserve its wilderness characteristics.</i></p> <p>3. <i>Offer limited backcountry recreation.</i></p> <p><i>Explain how trenching Chapman Lake and drawing it down 25 feet can enhance water quality and preserve wilderness characteristics.</i></p>	<p>park designation to be changed from Class A status if infrastructure improvements were to be permitted.</p>
<p><i>Does this boundary adjustment application line up with the Minister of Environment and Climate Change Strategy’s mandate to uphold ecological integrity in our parks? Would further drawdown of the lake degrade the ecological and recreational values of the park?</i></p>	<p>When making decisions with respect to protected areas, BC Parks is guided by legislation, policy, and other direction, including park management plans. In the case of Tetrahedron Park, the area was established in part for the purpose of providing and protecting the community water supply for the Sunshine Coast. The management plan for the park provides direction on how the Ministry may consider requests for future community water supply enhancement and expansion.</p>
<p><i>Given the changes in the environment and the climate since the management plan was created, how can outdated plans such as this one be adapted to reflect the impacts we anticipate from climate change and the increased foot print of human activities?</i></p>	<p>Knowledge about climate change and the anticipated impacts to the environment is increasing and is becoming a more significant factor in park management decisions. Although climate change impacts were not considered at the time the Tetrahedron Park management plan was developed, it is a valid consideration today. In addition to this, the impact assessment of the Chapman Lake expansion project did assess the effects of climate change on precipitation and the draw-down and recharge of the lake.</p>

Questions and Answers about the Park Use Permit	
Question	Answer
<p><i>If the project is approved, will the construction crews be flown in and out each day, further disturbing wildlife, or will they be camping in the cabins?</i></p>	<p>Details of how the construction would be undertaken would be considered when issuing a park use permit. Factors such as impacts to park values, including wildlife, cultural and recreation activities, would be fully considered, with strategies to minimize any impacts including from flights.</p>
<p><i>Given the many steps in the process of re-designating the park, (First Nations consultation, decision by the Minister goes to Cabinet, and then to the Legislature, etc.) is it possible the SCRD would not get the permissions they want until 2020 or beyond?</i></p>	<p>A park use permit cannot be issued unless or until the park designation has been changed from Class A status. Cancelling the Class A status would require an Act of the Legislature, followed by completion of the park use permit adjudication process.</p>

Questions and Answers about the Park Use Permit	
Question	Answer
<i>Many of us want modifications to Chapman Lake soon! When will the Minister make the decision?</i>	BC Parks staff will prepare a report for the Minister providing information about the options to re-designate the park, and the results of the public consultation and First Nations consultation processes. The Minister may then make a decision on whether or not to bring forward a recommendation to Cabinet.
<i>What would BC Parks' response be if it becomes apparent that damage is occurring to the surrounding area of the lake due to increased drawdown and lowering of surrounding water table if Tetrahedron remains a Class A park, or if option 1, 2 or 3 is in place?</i>	A park use permit would include provisions and conditions for how the activities could be undertaken. A park use permit would also include impact monitoring with requirements to address any impacts.
<i>Given an expressed objective of the park is to maintain the ecology as well as its wilderness values, how will BC Parks direct the SCR D to maintain this, should a small 30 acre area be reclassified temporarily?</i>	A park use permit would include provisions and conditions for how the activities could be undertaken. A park use permit would also include impact monitoring with requirements to address any impacts.
<i>The SCR D originally said the drawdown of Chapman Lake would only occur once water supply conditions reached Stage 4. It later changed to say the drawdown would be implemented to avoid Stage 4 water restrictions. Has this been clearly communicated to BC Parks?</i>	BC Parks can include provisions in a park use permit that would restrict the drawdown of additional water to only occur after Stage 4 water restrictions have been declared.
<i>The park management plan indicates that water is to be available for growth on the Sunshine Coast. This is inconsistent with your statement that drawdown will only be available when conditions reach Stage 4. Can you explain this discrepancy?</i>	The management plan does not indicate any difference between the various water level stages. It states that re-designation options would be explored to ensure the continued supply of water for the community. The park use permit will specify when the additional drawdown may occur (i.e. when the SCR D has instituted Stage 4 water restrictions).
<i>"Class A" status means that any commercial activity must support and/or enhance the purposes for which the park was established to be given a Park Use Permit. The purpose of Tetrahedron Park is to protect the public's most important water source area. The Chapman project cannot meet this standard for issuing a park use permit, hence the effort to change the Class A</i>	The park management plan included a specific management objective <i>"To ensure there is an appropriate mechanism for authorizing existing and future watershed enhancement and infrastructure development that may be required by SCR D for future population growth on the Sunshine Coast."</i> (p. 16) BC Parks is exploring re-designation options that would enable consideration of a park use permit to be issued.

Questions and Answers about the Park Use Permit	
Question	Answer
<i>status. But why would we agree to degrading our water source area?</i>	

Appendix 2: Sampling of Commentary

Comments in this section reflect the themes outlined above, corresponding to date and type of event (i.e. open house, online comments, letters, etc.). These samples were selected for their quality and nuanced understanding of the issues.

Open House #1 (May 2, 2018)

“It’s time our local government and staff of the SCRD realized our Coast is growing at a rapid pace. We need clear headed planning in our resource management—be visionary, start the planning process NOW. Shake out the cobwebs, listen to the experts and realize our Sunshine Coast has been DISCOVERED!! We all need water and infrastructure to manage and maintain this precious resource. Hands off Tetrahedron Park!” *(theme: re-frame)*

“This current proposal may ruin the Park and still be inadequate in 10-20 years, in part due to climate change and in part to continued population growth.” *(theme: re-frame)*

“We do NOT have a water shortage problem but a water COLLECTION problem. We need to SAVE water during the months that we have a SURPLUS.” *(theme: re-frame; alternatives)*

“This problem has been brought on by SCRD mismanagement in view of excessive development. Little or nothing has been done to conserve water. As usual, we hope to push our costs on to the environment and future generations.” *(themes: re-frame; handling)*

“Not Park’s job to fix SCRD’s poor decision-making on water supply!” *(themes: re-frame; handling)*

“This is not a solution! It makes protection subject to changing political whims of government of the day, and not good enough! It will allow gutting of the Park’s ecosystem. This could also permit roads and other sources of increased detrimental impacts on the ecosystems of the Park.” *(themes: re-frame; handling; impact; precedent)*

“Get a proper Environmental Assessment rather than the SCRD A.P. done by the company benefitting from the work.” *(theme: impact)*

“This will authorize ‘death by a thousand cuts’ of our Park, depending on ever changing values of changing Provincial Governments.” *(theme: precedent)*

“[Option 3] is the best of the worst designations. It respects first nations traditional uses.” *(themes: re-frame; co-management)*

“I have friends who do not support any redesignation options and want to keep the Class A status, but they live above the highway and get their water from a well—they do not rely on regional water. I fear I will be losing a few friends over this issue.” *(themes: re-frame; impact; handling)*

Open House #2 (May 24, 2018)

“We who understand and have closely followed the processes and the failures of long-term vision and planning for water supply on the Sunshine Coast over the last 10 or more years speak for the many who have not attended meetings or other public processes and for our children and grandchildren—LEAVE THIS PARK ALONE!!” *(theme: re-frame)*

“There is much to change in the big picture on how we use water—Climate Change is here & we can’t carry on with business as usual.” *(theme: re-frame)*

“I strongly encourage BC Parks, the SCRD, and all parties involved to explore the possibility of rainwater storage, or any other more sustainable solutions. Draining Chapman Lake an additional 5m will substantially affect the water table, and it does not appear that the effects of this to the ecosystem have been properly understood.” *(themes: re-frame; impact; handling; alternatives)*

“I moved to the coast in 1990 and the main issue was water supply. The SCRD has had plenty of notice about water shortage and have been inactive in pursuing alternate sources...The SCRD has pulled a fast one on this community in its alternate process to get the \$5 million. There is no community support for this project. There has been constant input from the community to find or build alternate sources.” *(theme: re-frame; handling; alternatives)*

“These are not ‘improvements.’ Don’t call them that. I worked as a communications mgr for the BC government. I know how the illusion of public consultation works. Try supposedly [to] listen, then go ahead and do what you were going to do anyway. Show TRUE LEADERSHIP. Save the Park. Build a reservoir elsewhere.” *(themes: re-frame; handling; alternatives)*

“After attending both forums I realized that a considerable number of people not wanting any changes to the Park A status do not know: (1) that Chapman Lake already has a dam and a draw down channel (as well as a small dam on Edwards) i.e. it is not as ‘natural’ as some believe; (2) that alternative supplies of water (e.g. new reservoir, Clohom Lk.) cannot be operational by 2019; (3) the channel proposed will simply draw down the lake a little farther. Of course it should be done slowly and monitored for issues such as increased turbidity.” *(theme: impact; handling; alternatives)*

“It has just now struck me that the people who lobbied for and got park status in 1995 (with the written commitment that the Park Act would be amended to ensure enhancement and management of our primary water source) are the very same people who are now going back on their word and against any such improvement of our water system.” *(theme: handling)*

“Not knowing the aspects of BC Parks’ authority—BC Parks is doing their job by proposing options which may not be in the public’s interest.” *(theme: handling)*

Online Comments

“It’s a slippery slope...more potable water equals more development equals more demands on the park” *(themes: re-frame; impact; handling)*

“None of the options presented includes the analysis of Biodiversity loss and ecosystem services and functions that should be the basis for decision making as it takes a much more holistic view of what keeps ecosystems vital and hence water supply viable.” *(themes: re-frame; impact)*

“Chapman Lake was designated as a source for our drinking water on the Sunshine Coast many years ago and was not intended to serve the growing population that exists today. Nor was climate change the huge factor that it is now. The SCRDC has to take our water problems seriously and invest in a new water supply for the population or put a moratorium on development.” *(theme: re-frame; handling)*

“We believe that a Conservancy is an inappropriate designation for this area unless it is being proposed by the Shíshálh and Squamish Nations. A Conservancy ‘explicitly recognizes the importance of these areas to First Nations for social, ceremonial and cultural uses.’ To use this designation as a way to expand the industrial use and impacts on the area weakens the intention in which the conservancy designation was created.” *(themes: co-management; impact)*

“I’m not a user of this Park. I am however in full support of the Western (Canada) Wilderness Committee and Joe Foy has issued an ‘action alert’ in order to protect this Park from being re-designated from its original status.” *(themes: re-frame; impact; handling)*

“The watershed is like a big sponge and drawing it down will have long term effects (on) the wildlife, flora and fauna that rely on the park. I hope BC Parks staff will speak for the wildlife...I attended the open house in Roberts Creek. I worry about how often the word ‘mitigate’ was used by BC Parks staff panel at the open house with very little detail about how/when/why that mitigation will occur. Clearly the ‘mitigation’ can only occur after the fact, after a problem occurs. Mitigation is a reactive response. I hope BC Parks staff will be proactive instead.” *(themes: re-frame; impact; handling)*

“To be honest, I am horrified that BC Parks is even considering this change. Surely BC Parks needs to act on behalf of all British Columbians and on behalf of those who understand and appreciate the value of parks, rather than the short-sighted few who are thinking only of their immediate needs.” *(theme: re-frame; handling)*

“My preference is that it remain Class A park but a permit be given to the Sunshine Coast District to move forward with proposed changes. Also that there is something stated that our water source not be made available to be used as a pawn with changes in government. I would also like the process of reapplication in future to not be easy (like this process). Easy makes people uncreative and lazy. Water is something that we should all take time to think through.” *(themes: re-frame; impact; handling)*

“I agree with option 2. If possible, stipulate that development must be linked to drinking water only. No other permits should be tolerated.” *(theme: impact)*

“Without this work our salmon will die. I agree and support all options. Thank you for your work and presentations to the community. I hope your decisions are not influenced by the large amount of misinformation that has been sent out by some groups.” *(theme: impact, handling)*

“Option 2: PLUS The government should cancel the protected area and re-designate the entire area to a Class A park status when all aspects of the project have been completed.” *(theme: impact; handling)*

“I saw no information in the plan about the needs of nature and what impact such a drawdown would have on the animals and ecosystems of the area. I also saw no alternatives described about possible water sources outside of the protected areas. I liked the idea of First Nations involvement and consultation.” *(themes: re-frame; impact; co-management; alternatives)*

“I agree that traditional use by Sechelt and Squamish people as described in the Conservancy sounds like a reasonable option. It is hard to understand the practical concrete effects that might be allowed by activities in the park under a Conservancy or Protected area and whether these actions would permit damage to the park environment.” *(theme: co-management)*

“I believe that the Conservancy designation is generally associated with an LRMP process and understand that this is tailored to first nations cultural and resource harvesting, involving a high level of consultation between first nations and the province. As there has been no LRMP for the Sunshine Coast, it may not be appropriate for the Chapman watershed. And time required may be an issue. However is the Sechelt Nations feels this is the preferred option, I would be supportive.” *(themes: impact; co-management)*

“I strongly support Option 2. The voices of conservationists are very loud and I appreciate their passion; however, reasonable voices can be lost in this process.” *(theme: handling)*

“Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. Tet Provincial Park is a special place for locals. ☺” *(theme: handling)*

“I am VERY disappointed that in agreeing with one of your options that this draw down expansion will only be allowed for use during drought conditions. Currently the Sunshine Coast is experiencing a dire water shortage. Yet this draw down option is the closest option we have to actually getting water sooner than waiting for budgets or funding to approve other alternatives.” *(theme: re-frame; handling)*

“I’d really like to know who’s interest is actually at the heart of this re-designation? Cynical perhaps but I’ve been taught well over the years to be that way when governments are involved.” *(themes: handling)*

“Let’s get a move on! Regardless of running low [on] drinking water, if we have a major structural fire over the summer months and run our system dry, we could lose a lot more than

the ability to take a shower! This is a deadly serious issue, #1 priority for the Sunshine Coast right now.” (theme: handling)

“When will your staff forward your report and recommendations to The Minister? And I trust you will share this report with the public? Please confirm my assumption about transparency.”
(*theme: handling*)

I don't think this is the right question [park re-designation options]. The correct question is how do I feel about living in a community that is highly conscious of conservation, and yet is suffering every year from a water shortage.

Letters

“...the SCRD owes you as Minister, the BC Park branch and the public an explanation as to why it has not pursued alternative source development and water conservation initiatives over the years since Tetrahedron Park was established (1995) and granted Class A status (2010). These explanations have not been forthcoming, despite requests to the SCRD and a public backlash over the proposed removal or declassification of land from the provincial park” (*themes: re-frame; handling; alternatives*).

“What we need for the Sunshine Coast, desperately, is an effective regional water governance structure, fully engaging and co-led by our First Nations. The town of Gibsons’ Eco-Assets Strategy and contribution to the Municipal Natural Assets Initiative would provide a perfect framework for such a collaborative group to prioritize the integration of traditional Indigenous values and practices around water stewardship; and also to navigate how to responsibly manage water from a Class A provincial park with limited engineered intervention. It is almost as though the Tetrahedron Provincial Park Management Plan’s objective to ‘ensure there is an appropriate mechanism for authorizing existing and future watershed enhancement and infrastructure development that may be required by SCRD for future population growth on the Sunshine Coast’, with the protections of a Class A park, are a custom fit for a natural assets approach to infrastructure.” (*themes: co-management; re-frame; impact; handling*).

“As one of the people asked by BC Parks to draft the management plan, I must voice strong disagreement about the interpretation which the current BC Parks staff have presented about re-designation. We put language in the plan that recognized the possible need in future to look at enhancing the water system, but not at the price of diminishing the quality of the source water or the natural values of the park, and not without first asking the public whether they want change rather than simply telling us here are three options to reclassify the park. The SCRD has still not yet developed any of the options which they have identified as alternate water sources but want to create a \$5, 000, 000 ‘temporary’ trenching project in the park. BC Parks must first insist on a thorough environmental assessment by an independent specialist, create a more robust public process, and resist Park status change until satisfied that the SCRD has explored its water supply options outside the park” (*themes: re-frame; impact; handling; alternatives*).

“Many people don’t understand the serious nature and scope of the situation we’re in and the amount of work, especially in the last 3 years, that has been committed to by both the SCR D and BC Parks to find solutions to the challenges we face....This is not the time to do nothing to provide for that secure source of water” (*theme: handling*).

“I wish to voice my **support** for the Chapman Creek Drawdown Project. I consider myself part of the *silent majority* on this topic. I discussed the plan with SCR D and any reservoir structure would not be sited, the land acquired, zoned, structure constructed and functional in under 10 years...pessimistically longer! I consider myself ‘environmentally-minded’ and believe each project should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. This case refers to one of a number of lakes, in an area where the population is steadily growing and climate change is making our needs and supply more erratic. I believe the cost is worth the benefit of having the water when it will really be needed.” (*theme: handling*)