



Revised September 12  
Attachments added

Revision 2 - September 15  
Attachment added - Page 12

## AGENDA RESILIENT SAANICH TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

September 15, 6:30– 8:30 PM  
Held virtually via MS Teams

---

In light of the Saanich Communicable Disease Plan related safety measures, this meeting will be held virtually via MS Teams. Details on how to join the meeting can be found on the committee webpage – [Resilient Saanich Schedule, Minutes & Agendas](#). Please note that individuals participating by phone are identified by their phone number, which can be viewed on screen by all attendees of the meeting.

---

1. **Territorial Acknowledgement** Coun. Mersereau
2. **Call to order & agenda** Chair T.Stevens
  - Approval of agenda
3. **Adoption of Minutes** Page 2
  - August 30, 2022
4. **Receipt of Correspondence**
  - Correspondence will be attached once available
5. **Presentation on Private Land Stewardship Options (20 min.)**
  - Lead: Darren Copley, Environmental Education
6. **Stewardship Working Group Summary (30 min.)** (Page 6)
  - Lead: Chris Lowe
7. **Biodiversity Working Group – Next Draft of Environmental Policy Filter (30 min.)** (Page 12)
  - Lead: Brian Wilkes

\* New page 12 added R2
8. **Update from Council Liaison (and Memo) (15 min)** (Page 19)
  - Lead: Councillor Rebecca Mersereau
9. **Update on Secretariat Position (10 min)**
  - Lead: Eva Riccius
10. **Update on Diamond Head Story Map / Staff Update (10 min.)**
  - Lead: Eva Riccius
11. **Update on Technical Experts Mapping (10 min.)**
  - Lead: Tory Stevens

**MINUTES**  
**RESILIENT SAANICH TECHNICAL COMMITTEE**

Via Microsoft Teams  
August 30, 2022

Present: Tory Stevens (Chair); Councillor Rebecca Mersereau; Kevin Brown; Tim Ennis; Purnima Govindarajulu; Stewart Guy; Chris Lowe; Brian Wilkes; Bev Windjack; Jeremy Gye

Staff: Eva Riccius, Senior Manager of Parks; Thomas Munson, Senior Environmental Planner; Megan MacDonald, Senior Committee Clerk

---

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:34 p.m.

**TERRITORIAL ACKNOWLEDGEMENT & DIVERSITY, EQUITY AND INCLUSION STATEMENT**

Councillor Mersereau read the Territorial Acknowledgement and the Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Statement.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**MOVED by B. Wilkes and Seconded by B. Windjack: “That the Agenda for the August 30, 2022, Resilient Saanich Technical Committee meeting be approved.”**

The following was noted by the Chair:

- The presentation on Private Land Stewardship Options will be postponed until September 15 as the presenter is not able to attend the meeting.
- Coordinating the expert for State of Biodiversity Report was added to the agenda.

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED**

**ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

**MOVED by C. Lowe and Seconded by T. Ennis: “That the minutes of the June 28, 2022 Resilient Saanich Technical Committee meeting be adopted as amended.”**

The following business arising from the June 28, 2022, minutes was noted to be discussed in future:

- Page 2 includes a motion to hold a workshop with external experts. A fulsome discussion will need to take place to determine the scope of this recommendation.
- The Milestone 3 workplan was amended to add a line item for completing the gap analysis on the Environmental Policy Framework. It is important to update the document and share the latest version with members of the committee.
- The committee made a motion to hire a Secretariat, an update on this topic will be provided at the September 15 meeting.

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED**

## **PRESENTATION ON PRIVATE LAND STEWARDSHIP OPTIONS**

This topic was postponed to the September 15, 2022 meeting.

## **UPDATE ON COUNCIL RESPONSE TO RESILIENT SAANICH TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MILESTONE 2 REPORT**

The Milestone 2 report was considered by Council on August 22, 2022. Councillor R. Mersereau provided an update on the discussion, the following was noted:

- Council made a Motion to receive the report for information; and to direct Planning staff to consider the draft Principles and Goals for the Environmental Policy Framework in the proposed Official Community Plan Update.
- Concerns were expressed about First Nations involvement, a lack of ecological values of private lands and stewardship. The Chair, the Council Liaison and the consultant were able to address these concerns, leading to a unanimous vote of approval.
- The draft Principles and Goals will be posted publicly on the website soon.
- There are several items in the Terms of Reference that are out of date. Staff will be bringing forward a memo to ensure that clarification is provided on these items.

## **UPDATE ON FIRST NATIONS RELATIONS**

The Draft Principals and Goals have been provided to the W̱SÁNEĆ Leadership Council (WLC). The Chair has not yet gotten feedback. Staff have also reached out to the Songhees Nation and the Esquimalt First Nation, with no response yet. The draft Principals and Goals are at a place where amendments can still happen if comments or suggestions are received.

## **UPDATE ON URBAN FOREST STRATEGY**

Diamond Head Consulting has been contracted to review and update the Urban Forest Strategy (UFS). The following updates were noted:

- The public will be engaged using a story map, which is a GIS mapping system where people can note areas of significant trees, areas of concern and other comments.
- DHC is currently working on a State of Urban Forest Report using recent LiDAR data and internal resources. The draft report will be provided in September/October. RSTC will have an opportunity to provide comment on the draft, along with the community and stakeholders. Revisions will be made prior to Council consideration.
- Council will receive the report for consideration in the Spring of 2023.
- The Urban Forest Strategy Review webpage and social media will be updated regularly.

The following was noted during discussion with the committee:

- There is interest in statistics on permeable surfaces, this data may be included in the LiDAR data which was recently obtained. This was identified as a key indicator for backyard biodiversity, and a request to include this information has been given to DHC.
- It would be beneficial to track statistics related to the Tree Bylaw; such as how many trees have been planted on private land. Metrics to track success would be ideal.
- Committee members appreciate having the opportunity to provide input on the subject prior to public engagement.
- Space to plant trees is important. Considerations should be made to implement a guideline for a minimum soil volume or a minimum space for trees during development.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY FILTER WORKING GROUP**

A working group for the Environmental Policy evaluation matrix was formed at the previous meeting. B. Wilkes provided information about the draft evaluation matrix; the following was noted:

- This matrix will be helpful to determine if new and existing policies comply with the principals of the Environmental Policy Framework (EPF).
- The matrix is based on a sum of scores, the higher the score - the better compliance with the EPF. Lower score policies and programs may need more work to ensure they align with the goals and objectives set out in the EPF.
- Feedback is required from the committee to ensure this matrix achieves the goal.

The following was noted during discussion with the committee:

- Once the committee provides feedback and the draft matrix is finalized, the working group will do a trial run with existing and/or proposed policies.
- Principal 1 may require further definition of biodiversity, hopefully this can be achieved with the State of Biodiversity Report.
- Principal 9 emphasizes a one-way flow of ideas, a tweaking of wording could encourage more community driven initiatives and supporting engaged residents in doing so.
- Testing the matrix will help to identify any blind spots or areas to be improved.
- This filter helps to refine thinking, not all policies or programs need to reach the highest possible score of 27. There will always be exceptions, this helps clarify what is best.
- This is a useful tool for staff to gauge success of policies prior to Council consideration.
- Members of the committee were invited to provide further feedback and written comments to the working group within the next week for incorporation in the document.

## **COORDINATING EXPERT INPUT FOR STATE OF BIODIVERSITY REPORT**

There is interest in gathering feedback from experts on the technical mapping tool, which will inform the State of Biodiversity Report. The following was noted during discussion:

- An invitation to provide comments on the map could be sent to experts to provide feedback; areas of high ecological value may otherwise be missed.
- It would be beneficial to understand where Saanich would like to go with land use planning long term to fully, having a staff presentation would be helpful.
- There may be benefit in putting out a call for expertise to network contacts rather than compiling a list where some may be excluded or missed.
- The timeframe is short, having professionals advise within the timeline will be difficult.
- There should be a continuous tracking mechanism for the State of Biodiversity Report.
- More opportunities for expert opinions will exist following the release of the report.
- An adaptive management approach will be taken for the Biodiversity Strategy where actions are taken to reach goals, progress will be monitored, areas for improvement will be identified and the procedure will be adapted for best results in the future.
- More information for the experts on how to use the map, as well as what information we are looking for would be beneficial.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

On a motion from Brian, the meeting adjourned at 8:36 p.m.

**NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting is scheduled for September 15, 2022 at 6:30 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tory Stevens, Chair

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Committee Secretary

DRAFT

## **DRAFT (v2) Briefing note from the Stewardship Working Group to the RSTC 2022-09-15**

This document has been compiled from submissions from Bev Windjack, Kevin Brown, Carolyn Richman, Ted Lea and others. Any missed contributor names are unintentional and we are happy to give credit where due.

### **Background**

The Resilient Saanich Technical Committee (RSTC) was mandated to assess opportunities for enhanced environmental stewardship in Saanich following the rescinding of the Environmental Development Permit Area in 2018.

This document summarizes the RSTC Stewardship Working Group's (WG) current assessment of existing and potential stewardship opportunities, along with recommendations to take forward to the consultant preparing the Biodiversity Conservation Strategy.

Stewardship can be defined and characterized in a number of ways. In the context of this document, we have defined stewardship as the efforts taken to protect, maintain, enhance and restore biodiversity and associated ecosystem functions to ensure a healthy environment for future generations.

More broadly, stewardship:

- often refers to voluntary and unpaid participation, but may be encouraged through subsidies or incentives, or require certain activities through regulations.
- can be on public or private property.
- participation is typically oriented toward environment and community, rather than self driven by a variety of personal motivations for participating.
- can range from individual actions to ecologically - oriented larger group projects, often placed-based rather than issue based, and can vary in complexity and scale.
- actions can be direct (removing trash, removing invasive plants, planting trees, establishing pollinator meadows etc.) or indirect (environmental education) – which do not directly “improve” the environment.
- community action can include physical labor, applying specialized skills for planning and organizing restoration efforts, citizen science-related data collection and dissemination.
- programs can originate as government-led or community-led. Government-led implies active engagement with or participation by the community. Community-led activities may have strong motivations but lack capacity and need logistical support from government.

To succeed, the Stewardship WG recommends that enhanced stewardship efforts in Saanich must:

- be proactively coordinated by a robustly resourced staff team on both public and private lands
- have clearly articulated objectives
- target areas at risk of imminent loss, biodiversity hotspots and public and private land hosting ecosystems and species at risk

**Commented [TS1]:** What is an example of "stewardship" that is driven by personal motivations?

**Commented [CL2R1]:** Pulled from Kevin's input, so perhaps he can elucidate

- have quantitative targets and metrics to evaluate stewardship success over time and space
- consider all spatial scales, from targeted initiatives (e.g. Bowker Creek) to district- and region-wide efforts (e.g. hub/spoke corridor protection and enhancement).
- build on existing stewardship and citizen science programs (e.g. Naturescape, iNaturalist) and consider enhancing them with incentives for developers and residents
- be supported by strong partnerships with rejuvenated environmental and stewardship community groups
- develop ongoing community enthusiasm to protect biodiversity and the environment through education, outreach and incentives
- have strong community association support
- educate developers about the value and benefits of biodiversity and environmental protection and incentivize their participation
- be fulsomely applied on public park land to ensure Saanich is leading by example
- prioritize native species and natural ecosystem functions, but recognize that non-native species and urban impacted ecosystem functions are unavoidable, but still have stewardship/biodiversity value
- educate landscaping companies on the value of using native plants

Further details about these recommendations are provided below.

### Voluntary Stewardship vs Regulation

The Stewardship WG recognizes the value of voluntary and enthusiastic stewardship. However, there are some situations where Saanich should consider a replacement for the Environmental Development Permit Area as development is the greatest driver for biodiversity loss in the region. The balance between voluntary and regulation in the context of continued development is a significant elephant in the biodiversity strategy room.

Likely areas for environmental development protection should be identified in the Biodiversity Conservation Strategy with full rationale and should not be limited to sensitive ecosystems. Factors such as the need to protect, enhance and restore hub/spoke biodiversity corridors should be considered.

In addition, there are a few existing bylaws which are sometimes inadvertently punitive to homeowners or are too restrictive. In addition, bylaws may discourage voluntary stewardship. Examples from the Tree Protection Bylaw include:

- 1) The 2-1 or 3-1 tree replacement requirements are not feasible on many sites. However, staff have indicated that it is becoming increasingly challenging to find alternative areas to plant trees to compensate for loss during development, so resolving this conundrum will be challenging
- 2) Residents who maintain a sufficient tree canopy (NB: "sufficient" would need to be defined) should not be penalized for the loss of one or two trees, but all residents should be encouraged/incentivized to replant if possible.

**Commented [CL3]:** Comment from Kevin Brown - I'm actively looking for research that addresses what is an appropriate balance between voluntary env stewardship and appropriate regulation. I have one paper considering that in the context of tree protection. Might be worth floating the general question to Env Law Centre at U Vic.

**Commented [CL4]:** Comment from Kevin Brown – Section should be bolstered a bit to answer the following questions - What are the advantages/disadvantages of voluntary stewardship versus regulation for protecting/enhancing Saanich's natural environment? How do the approaches complement each other?

**Commented [cj15]:** Do we have any citation to support this statement??

**Commented [CL6]:** Comment from Kevin Brown – do some bylaws actually discourage stewardship? Or should stewardship supplant regulation? Are there any other bylaws where this may apply?

**Commented [CL7]:** Comment from Kevin Brown - There is a direct conflict between the amount of impermeable surface Saanich allows on lots and the space available for trees.

**Commented [CL8]:** Comment from Kevin Brown - Tree numbers are a component of canopy and in theory easier to keep track of from Park's perspective (not that they have!) - but the two metrics aren't well correlated - depends on species mix, age, etc. Relative canopy cover can be easily and cheaply measured on a single lot basis.

## **Objectives, Targets and Metrics**

Stewardship objectives will vary based on the scale and spatial coverage of any given stewardship program, but should all have the underlying objective of stewardship as defined above (*i.e., to protect, maintain, enhance and restore biodiversity and associated ecosystem functions to ensure a healthy environment for future generations*). Any enhanced stewardship programs that Saanich advocates for or promotes must have clear rationale and defined objectives. Without an understanding of why a program exists and what it intends to achieve, building enthusiastic and informed participant support will not be possible.

Examples of enhanced stewardship objectives include:

- 1) restoration of sensitive ecosystems
- 2) maintenance and enhancement of tree canopy
- 3) maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity hub/spoke corridors
- 4) enhancement of backyard biodiversity
- 5) maintenance and restoration of native species
- 6) maintenance and restoration of urban watersheds
- 7) maintenance and restoration of the marine foreshore

While the list of objectives above is certainly not exhaustive, it does cover many of the broad biodiversity conservation concerns identified by the RSTC to date.

All stewardship programs must also have clearly defined targets, but developing targets will be challenging for some. For example, sensitive ecosystem restoration targets would likely be different for public versus private lands. In parks, the target may be to restore sensitive ecosystems to natural state, but on private lands this is likely impossible. However, residents should be encouraged and incentivized to restore sensitive ecosystems on their properties where possible, but a more realistic private land target could be to simply enhance backyard biodiversity in support of the maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity hub/spoke corridors. Examples of targets include, but should not be limited to:

- 1) Increasing tree canopy by 5% per year
- 2) Daylighting 100m of creek per year
- 3) Eliminating 100% of invasive species from parks
- 4) Soil retention on property, neighborhood, and district scales
- 5) 70% of native species in your backyard

Enhanced stewardship programs should also include quantitative metrics, and like objectives and targets, metrics will vary by program. Without metrics, the ability to assess success of efforts over time and space will not be possible. Suggested stewardship metrics include, but should not be limited to:

- 1) Tree canopy and/or native species coverage area
- 2) Change in seral stage (e.g. to assess success of reducing lawn and enhancing (ideally) native shrub coverage under urban tree canopy)
- 3) Number of rare and endangered species present
- 4) Number of properties participating in Naturescape, Green Shores, or similar programs
- 5) Length of creek daylighted
- 6) Number of volunteers students participating in invasive species removal programs

**Commented [CL9]:** Comment from Kevin Brown: This (what is biodiversity and natural in an urbanizing landscape) and the balance between voluntary and regulation in the context of continued development are the elephants in our biodiversity strategy room.



- 7) Area of invasive species removal
- 8) Area of impermeable surfaces

Accurate and regularly updated ecosystem and biodiversity mapping will be critical for the development and tracking of many metrics. It does not appear that Saanich has a sufficient GIS staffing complement or budget to regularly update mapping and track metrics.

### **Existing Stewardship Programs**

There are many excellent stewardship programs already in place in Saanich or that have been developed elsewhere, and could be implemented in Saanich. Overall, there is strong RSTC support for the Naturescape and Green Shores programs, and the Stewardship WG would also like to highlight the Habitat Acquisition Trust's Good Neighbours program and the Swan Lake Christmas Hill Nature Sanctuary model. The Stewardship WG, Saanich staff, and other contributors have compiled lists of other programs that will be provided to the consultant developing the Biodiversity Conservation Strategy for consideration.

The Stewardship WG feels there are a few broad gaps or issues with existing programs that should be addressed to achieve enhanced stewardship success including:

- 1) Lack of a municipal level stewardship plan. This plan will likely be part of the Biodiversity Conservation Strategy and should ensure efforts and stewardship target locations are prioritized, actions are not duplicated, and common objectives are achieved across municipal boundaries. This plan should also consider all spatial scales, from targeted initiatives (e.g. Bowker Creek) to district-and region-wide efforts (e.g. hub/spoke corridor protection and enhancement). The plan, for example, should consider whether the new private property stewardship coordinator should target their efforts to residents who live within areas targeted for hub/spoke biodiversity corridor restoration. Should existing volunteer efforts be redirected to specific prioritized sensitive ecosystem areas rather than general invasive species removal in parks? Saanich is also currently developing stormwater and other environmental management plans, and it is unclear whether stewardship and/or biodiversity are being considered. Are there areas in which stewardship should be prioritized to benefit stormwater management?
- 2) Lack of proactive promotion, outreach and coordination for Naturescape, Green Shores (or similar) and citizen science (e.g. iNaturalist) programs. Saanich would also likely benefit from increased staff capacity to provide 1-on-1 advice to residents on biodiversity enhancement and stewardship opportunities on a site-by-site basis. Saanich already has arborists that do site visits to advise on tree removal and the district would benefit from a similar, if not enhanced and more advisory, level of service for environmental stewardship. This gap will hopefully be filled, in part, by the hiring of a new private property stewardship coordinator. Alternatively, Saanich could collaborate with, or contract, external organizations such as Habitat Acquisition Trust, to administer these programs. Citizen science and open data programs should also be considered.
- 3) Lack of subsidies or incentives to participate in private property stewardship. . Examples of potential subsidies or incentives include:
  - a. Subsidized native plant supplies

**Commented [CL10]:** Comment from Kevin Brown: There may be the rare person that voluntarily removes an existing permeable surface or chooses not to install it (possibly at greater cost). I sense the municipality may have to meaningfully regulate the amount of impermeable surface on any given lot as part of building and development permits. That assumes Saanich has asked (and will get from DHC) to estimate the amount and distribution (public vs private land) of impermeable surfaces. (I've asked a few times without a good answer). Meaningfully restricting impermeable surface area will conflict with Saanich's desire to densify.

**Commented [CL11]:** The Stewardship WG will be reviewing the other submissions and will compile a summary for submission to the consultant along with this brief.

- b. Reductions in property taxes based on percentage of native species or tree canopy restoration/coverage and/or reductions in impermeable surfaces. The Stewardship WG acknowledges that changes to property taxes are complicated to implement and would require substantive bylaw consultation, development and revision.
- c. Enhanced public acknowledgement of residents who successfully achieve Naturescape, Green Shores or similar program objectives in newsletters, media and elsewhere
- d. Certification for residents who go above and beyond in stewardship efforts (e.g. <https://backyardhabitats.org/>)

**Commented [CL12]:** Comment from Kevin Brown: Owners of single family homes (are already seen by some as wealthy and privileged. Those people may see such public financial incentives as a subsidy to those who don't "need" it.

### **Stewardship During Development and Landscaping**

There is currently a lack of consideration for stewardship and biodiversity protection opportunities when private property development or updated landscaping takes place. Many developers, landscapers and landowners do not understand the value of ecosystem and biodiversity protection or that development does not have to have adverse impacts.

It is therefore recommended that Saanich implement a workshop or create a video that all development applicants (professional and otherwise) must attend/watch prior to submitting an application. This workshop/video would inform applicants of Saanich's rationale and objectives for biodiversity enhancement and protection, the value of doing so, and provide examples of successful projects that have enhanced and restored biodiversity.

**Commented [CL13]:** Comment from Kevin Brown – would this be a meaningful requirement, or just another box to check to meet the letter of the (by)law

There is also a lack of incentives for developers to protect and enhance biodiversity in their projects. The Stewardship WG has two ideas for how developers could be incentivized:

- 1) A Developer Environmental Steward certification program could be developed. Saanich would then encourage property owners to work with certified developers. Staff effort would be required to determine certification criteria and administrate the program. Certification criteria could include previous success at implementing projects that achieve stewardship objectives, with the more successful projects a developer has, the higher their certification is (e.g. gold, silver, bronze developers).
- 2) A LEED-like certification consisting of biodiversity and ecosystem service attributes could be developed and applied at a property level. The Township of Esquimalt's Green Building Checklist has some criteria that Saanich could adapt.

**Commented [CL14]:** Comment from Kevin Brown: What are the consequences for developers who voluntarily choose to not be certified or choose not to follow a green building checklist? Would their application not be approved?

There are seemingly contradictory development bylaw requirements from an environmental perspective. Some of what Saanich asks developers to do is contradictory and not supportive of effective biodiversity enhancement.

**Commented [CL15]:** Bev to provide more insight here

Finally, many landscapers would benefit from enhanced education on the benefits of the use of native species. Such education could tie into the above mentioned environmental steward certification or LEED-like certification programs.

### **Barriers to Enthusiastic Participation**

Enthusiastic participation in stewardship will be fostered by addressing many of the gaps and issues noted above. However, there are a few other barriers to enthusiastic stewardship participation that the Stewardship WG would like to note.

One of the criticisms Saanich faced during the EDPA review was that residents were not enthused about private property stewardship when biodiversity and ecosystems services were not completely intact in adjacent Saanich Parks. Ideally Saanich would find capacity through enhanced volunteer support and/or new staff to undertake enhanced biodiversity and ecosystem service restoration in all parks and on non-park public lands. [This would demonstrate that Saanich is leading-by-example.](#)

### **Native vs Non-native Species**

While the RSTC prefers restoration of native species and natural ecosystem services, it is not feasible to do so in all instances. Therefore stewardship efforts must recognize the biodiversity value of non-native species, and encourage and incentivize stewardship regardless of whether full native restoration is possible. Restoration of native species on private property should be acknowledged and celebrated.

### **Staffing and Coordination**

Proactive coordination and promotion will be required to achieve enhanced stewardship in Saanich. Saanich staff already coordinate stewardship, but with a primary focus on parks. These efforts seem well resourced from a volunteer perspective, but because existing staff are already at capacity, they do not have the ability to most efficiently utilize all volunteer resources. Saanich parks staff also cannot keep up with the removal of invasive species in parks, let alone fulsomely enhance and restore biodiversity across all parks, or even at all on non-park public lands. Finally, Saanich does not have a stewardship coordinator for private or non-park public land. Programs such as Naturescape, Green Shores and citizen science programs (e.g. iNaturalist) will never achieve their full potential without much more proactive coordination and promotion. There are also many unrealized biodiversity enhancement opportunities on Saanich right-of-ways and boulevards that could be restored and maintained by existing volunteer groups (e.g. pulling together), community associations, or neighboring homeowners. Additional staff is the most economically efficient way to address stewardship by harnessing the enthusiasm and energy of the public.

As such, the RSTC believes Saanich needs significantly more staff capacity to maintain and restore biodiversity in parks and non-park public land, and proactively develop, encourage, and incentivize stewardship programs on both public and private lands.

At a minimum, the RSTC has already recommended that Saanich develop a business case for the 2023 budget planning cycle for hiring a private and non-park public land stewardship coordinator. This coordinator should proactively promote programs such as Naturescape and Green Shores, and should consider options to subsidize and/or incentivize voluntary stewardship on private lands.

Unfortunately, this single staff hire will likely not be enough to ensure success of enhanced stewardship at a district scale, and on both public and private lands. Additional parks, planning, and GIS staff should be considered. Further rationale for new staff was provided in previous sections.

**Commented [CL16]:** Comment from Kevin Brown: Would people who made this complaint suddenly change their attitudes and practices even if Saanich Parks suddenly reverted to their pre-settlement condition? Parks surrounded by housing developments are bombarded with invasive species - some property owners adjacent to poorly-monitored public land will use it as a dumping ground for their yard waste.

As noted above, stewardship covers a broad range of potential activities and varied scales. Not everyone is a homeowner with their own garden. Not sure how to say it, but I think its important to stress that stewardship is partly a mindset and there are many potential opportunities for anyone to help out - they need to know that and be able to do manageable things locally. Not just pulling invasive plants, but maybe picking up trash along their favorite stretch of trail or monitoring stream quality, etc.

RSTC Briefing Note

September 12, 2022

From: Policy Filters WG

Recommendation: RSTC endorse the revised version of the policy filters document.

Background:

A draft policy filters document was discussed at the August 30, 2022 RSTC meeting. Comments on the document were noted at that time, and a request for additional comments to be sent by September 6.

The document has been revised taking the comments into account.

- Additional language was added at Principle 1 from comments by Eva
- Further language was added at Principle 5 from comments by Rebecca.
- Rebecca made a comment about adding staff leadership at principle 4. However, thinking about this, we are talking about adopting new policy and program, and staff don't do that, council does. That's why council is in the evaluation matrix, and not council and staff.
- Additional language was added at Principle 9 from comments by Kevin
- Additional language was added that 'softens' the evaluation approach, suggesting a simple method and a numerical method. They seem similar; however, the numerical approach may make it clearer how criteria were weighed in the policy evaluation.

## Environmental Policy Framework policy filter

As part of the Resilient Saanich Program, Council requested a policy and program evaluation matrix, or “Policy Filter”, for reviewing new and existing programs and policies against Goal 2 of the Environmental Policy Framework (EPF)

**Goal 2. Develop and implement complimentary and coordinated policies, strategies, regulations, and incentives grounded in and consistent with the Environmental Policy Framework guiding principles.**

This overarching goal is essential to promote the culture of environmental stewardship and resilience within Saanich staff and the public. The principles will assist in evaluating existing policy and provide guidance for the development of future policy.

Some of the actions that could result from this goal are:

- Assess existing regulatory, management and administrative tools to identify gaps and inconsistencies.
- Develop a strategic approach that encourages effective use of limited resources.

Increase community understanding of policies, plans, programs, bylaws and partnerships encompassed by the Resilient Saanich Environmental Policy Framework.

The following table uses the latest version of the principles in the EPF. To be useful as a policy filter, a means of evaluating new policies or programs is needed to determine how closely they fulfil the intent of the principles. The RSTC suggests two possible approaches to evaluation approaches. The one chosen may depend on the nature of the policy or program.

A simple approach is to use the proposed criteria in the table to determine if a policy has a high, medium or low relevance to each principle. A neutral category is added for policies or programs that have no relevance to a principle, and there is a category for evaluating if a policy or program might work against a principle. The final evaluation of a policy or program would be to weigh the determinations for all the principles to draw a conclusion about how, overall, close a policy or program comes to fulfilling the intent of the principles and achievement of Goal 2.

A more numerical approach is the use of a scoring scale for adding numerical scores to the criteria in the table for each principle. In this approach, scores are added and the sum of scores gives a numerical means to evaluate how close a policy is to complying with the principle. If a proposed policy or program scores high, it complies closely with the principles in the EPF, and will contribute to a more Resilient Saanich. In the example below, a scoring scale of zero to three is used, but any scale is usable. In this example, policies and program initiatives that score 27 are in full compliance with the principles, and can be adopted as consistent with the Environmental Policy Framework. Policies and program initiatives that score in the low to mid-range could be re-examined to see where they could be enhanced before adoption. Policies and program initiatives that score low may need to go back to the generating department for a re-think on how it can conform more closely to these principles. Policies and program initiatives that score in the negative are probably not adoptable because they will not advance, and may work against, achievement of a Resilient Saanich.

It is also possible that some policies and programs may score medium or low when put through this policy filter, but they may still be adopted if they respond to some other emerging needs. The process of evaluating against this policy framework makes the decision-making transparent, and clearly shows the tradeoffs that were made.

No.	Principle from EPF	Scoring Matrix				
		High (3)	Medium (2)	Low (1)	Neutral (0)	Opposes (negative 1 to 3)
1	<b>Recognize the intrinsic value of nature</b>	Actively promotes, protects and enhances biodiversity conservation with incentives	Indirectly supports biodiversity conservation with strong mitigation measures	Implements some mitigation or offset measures	Neither promotes or negates biodiversity	Actively leads to loss of habitat and biodiversity
2	<b>Learn from and appropriately apply Indigenous knowledge, perspectives, and practices</b>	Relevant nations involved in policy development from start to finish	Relevant nations engaged and support in principle	Relevant nations contacted but active support unclear/not clearly articulated	No engagement	One or more nations actively against this policy

No.	Principle from EPF	Scoring Matrix				
		High (3)	Medium (2)	Low (1)	Neutral (0)	Opposes (negative 1 to 3)
	to better protect lands, water, plants and animals <sup>1</sup>					
3	Use <b>best available management and decision-making tools</b> in support of the future environment. <sup>2</sup>	Not all the criteria below will apply to all policies. To score at this level policy should meet all <u>relevant</u> criteria below 1.Previous policy has been assessed prior to new policy. 2.Capacity for monitoring and modifying policy built into the policy. 3.Literature/research on management/decision support tools cited within policy. 4.Precautionary principle articulated in the policy.	To score at this level, policy meets at least 60% of all relevant criteria articulated in the “high” cell	To score at this level, policy meets at least 30% of all relevant criteria articulated in the “high” cell	To score at this level, policy meets none of the relevant criteria articulated in the “high” cell	The policy does not review past policies, published literature, nor does it apply the precautionary principle or available evidence.

<sup>1</sup> Indigenous knowledge can offer in-depth understanding of the environment. Indigenous knowledge, cultures and traditional practices are recognized for their contribution to environmental and social sustainability.

<sup>2</sup> Evidence-based decision-making and being precautionary in the absence of evidence can both support good decisions. Adaptive management is the continuous evolution of practices based on careful observation. Learn from the past and plan for the future.

No.	Principle from EPF	Scoring Matrix				
		High (3)	Medium (2)	Low (1)	Neutral (0)	Opposes (negative 1 to 3)
		5.Evidence for need and efficacy of policy cited within the policy or supporting documentation.				
4	<b>Lead by example</b> through innovation and improving on best practices to create a Resilient Saanich;	Council leads or sets the example for Saanich. The outcomes that are to be achieved are clear. Timelines are clear. Specific best practices are listed and committed to. Not done before.	Council indicates it wants to lead, but does not. Outcomes clear but timelines vague, Or vice versa; best practices vague Has been don a few times.	Council has an opportunity to lead, but does not. Outcomes and timelines vague. Best practices not specified. Done frequently.	Council fails to lead. No outcomes or timelines. Best practices not specified. Done routinely.	Not learning from and repeating past mistakes.
5	<b>Look beyond our borders</b> to achieve results at a bioregional scale. <sup>3</sup>	Policy has been discussed with neighbouring jurisdictions and has positive effect and impact <sup>4</sup> , or policy is adapted from other jurisdictions. Policy has positive impact on resilience at bioregional scale.	Policy may have an impact on other local jurisdiction and at a bioregional scale.	Policy may have impact on local jurisdictions but not at bioregional scale.	Policy has no relation to what adjacent jurisdiction are doing	Policy works against the direction other jurisdictions are going, or negates improvement on a bioregional scale

<sup>3</sup> Essentially, southern Vancouver Island and Gulf Islands.

<sup>4</sup> Neighbouring jurisdictions means local governments that share a border with Saanich, or the CRD



No.	Principle from EPF	Scoring Matrix				
		High (3)	Medium (2)	Low (1)	Neutral (0)	Opposes (negative 1 to 3)
6	<b>Address climate adaptation and mitigation</b> in all that we do;	Meets or exceeds full implementation of provisions of Saanich Climate Plan	Partly addresses adaptation and mitigation in Saanich Climate Plan	Addresses mitigation but not adaptation or vice versa.	Does not address the provisions of the Saanich Climate Plan	Will result in a net increase in GHG emissions
7	<b>Collaborate with diverse interests</b> to achieve outcomes that realize multiple values and benefits;	Policy developed in collaboration with relevant community organizations, ENGOs, developers, service clubs, advisory committees, school districts, health authorities and special interest groups, etc.	Consultation and collaboration has taken place with most of the appropriate and relevant groups affected by the policy.	Consultation and collaboration has taken place with only a few groups or special interests.	Policy was developed without external consultation or collaboration	Policy was developed with values and benefits in conflict with, or ignoring all, input provided at the consultation stages  OR  Policy was developed solely with special interest groups directly affected by said policy
8	<b>Safeguard diversity, equity and inclusivity:</b> Create safe and welcoming public services and spaces for everyone including	Policy outcome is proactively welcoming to people of any 1) age, 2) gender, 3) ethnicity, 4) physical ability or 5) socio-economic class	Policy outcome does not exclude, people of any 1) age, 2) gender, 3) ethnicity, 4) physical ability or 5) socio-economic class	Considers some diversity measures, but not all	Policy was developed without consideration for diversity, equity and inclusivity	Policy excludes at least 1 of the groups of people.  OR  Policy outcome is only in support of special interest groups directly affected by said policy

No.	Principle from EPF	Scoring Matrix				
		High (3)	Medium (2)	Low (1)	Neutral (0)	Opposes (negative 1 to 3)
	open environmental data for public oversight and research.					
9	<b>Enhance community capacity and knowledge</b> – Create a passionate, informed and skilled community that can help to create a more resilient Saanich	Policy includes ongoing outreach, education and dedicated staff support to provide rationale, assist with or guide implementation, promote and encourage desired outcomes, and provide clear timelines, AND includes incentives to participate  AND  education and outreach is proactively targeted to areas of the community from which the most environmental benefit is to be gained	Policy includes sporadic outreach, education and staff support, but is targeted to areas of most benefit. Public input not consistently sought.	Policy only includes outreach, education, and staff support upon initial policy implementation  OR  education and outreach are NOT targeted to areas of the community from which the most environmental benefit is to be gained  OR  no dedicated staff	Policy is solely implemented by Saanich staff without public participation, but rationale, outcomes are available, and the policy was developed with public consultation and buy-in	Policy rationale or outcomes are not shared with the public  OR  Policy was developed without public consultation and buy-in

No.	Principle from EPF	Scoring Matrix				
		High (3)	Medium (2)	Low (1)	Neutral (0)	Opposes (negative 1 to 3)
	AND Education and outreach is provided at general public events AND Policy encourages input from the community					

# Memo

**To:** The Resilient Saanich Technical Committee  
**From:** Rebecca Mersereau, Council Liaison to the RSTC  
**Date:** 8/9/2022  
**Subject:** Summary of referral motions from Council to the RSTC

---

## PURPOSE

To highlight referral motions from Saanich Council passed over the course of the Committee's term, to inform remaining Resilient Saanich work.

## DISCUSSION

Since the RSTC was constituted in August 2020, Council has passed three referral motions directing the Committee to consider specific topics of interest as it undertakes its work. With one possible exception these have come forward to the Committee as correspondence in the past. I am bringing them forward now to ensure they are top-of-mind for Committee members as you embark on the final and critical phase of the Resilient Saanich initiative, and also to help 'tie up loose ends' as I transition away from the Council liaison role.

Nov 23, 2020 - "That Council request that the Resilient Saanich Technical Committee take into consideration threats and opportunities related to pollinator habitat as they undertake their work."

March 1, 2021 - "The matter of Natural Areas Management challenges and opportunities be referred to the Environment and Natural Areas Advisory Committee, the Parks, Trails and Recreation Advisory Committee and the Resilient Saanich Technical Committee for consideration."

December 6, 2021 - "That Council direct staff, consultants and the Resilient Saanich Technical Committee to implement an intersectional equity lens in the update of the Urban Forest Strategy, the development of the Biodiversity Strategy and the Environmental Policy Framework."

Prepared by



---

Rebecca Mersereau  
Council Liaison to the Resilient Saanich  
Technical Committee