

From: Daniel Rogers [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2026 12:18 PM
To: Islands2050
Subject: Submissions re: Trust Policy Statement
Attachments: January 29th Islands Trust.docx

See attached .

January 29th, 2026

R e: Draft Islands Trust Policy Statement

Good day Islands Trust - Staff and Trustees. These brief submissions about the current draft of the TPS follow up on my completion of the survey recently.

I want to start by congratulating the Trustees and the Trust generally for the progress made on getting a new Trust Policy Statement approved and adopted. I heartily approve of the objective of getting it approved before the end of this current Trust Council and wish you luck and good discussions to get to that stage. I am keenly aware of the challenging circumstances under which these proceedings are held... balancing the views of community (both those who support the Trust and those who decidedly do not), Indigenous Groups and of course the varied views of staff and Trustees.

As a former Trustee, I was deeply involved in previous unsuccessful attempts to get this important document completed and thus I commend the Trust on its current work.

Generally, I found the draft comprehensive, very readable and an excellent draft to achieve the ends (finally) of renewing the mandate of the trust. For those who have been around since the beginning of those attempts, congratulations and to those who undertook this work this term, great work.

I have a few specific comments about the draft but do note that it succinctly combines a lot of the work and ideas done previously. I see many of the principles that have come up in debate embodied in the draft.

Specific Comments by Section

1.3

I admire the work in this section and wholeheartedly support it. This is a bit of a picky point but I find the language "... does not serve as an endpoint" to be awkward. I know of course what you are driving at but would suggest that there is a more eloquent way to express the thought that the TPS is just a step on the journey of reconciliation as the relationships and the process is iterative and evolving.

January 29th Islands Trust.docx

3.1.1

I again fully support the intent of this section but suggest the wording is too vague. I suggest it should say something like “all appropriate Indigenous Governing Bodies” to both ensure that it covers all Indigenous governing bodies that have a right to be engaged but only appropriate ones i.e. those within the definition in the Appendix.

3.3.6

I again fully support this provision however I have concerns about the drafting by listing specific types of marine shoreline and near shore areas. I am concerned that if something wasn't in the list it might be considered as not caught - i.e. cliffs, beaches etc. – so would suggest language something like “including but not limited to...”.

3.4.20

I was surprised that there is nothing about Ferries in this section. All islands are ferry dependent and advocacy around Ferries has been a key function of the Trust over the years. Granted it is not usually a land use planning issue but adequate ferry service can assist in climate change mitigation and other factors as it cuts down the need for private boats. Perhaps Trust Council determined to stay away from this as part of the TPS.

3.5.20 and 3.5.25

I am very supportive of these policies as far as they go however I believe that some impacts on foreshore development are lost in these policies. Besides all the issues laid out in this section, docks and foreshore structures can detract from the visual and natural beauty of an island. We have areas of the Trust where docks proliferate side by side, one after another. I appreciate not everyone agrees with this point and certainly for some docks are an essential access point. I appreciate however that Islands in the San Juans don't allow private docks and all they entail. It provides a completely different visual and ecosystem experience.

I would urge that some further provisions about the proliferation of shoreline structures be discouraged, docks for multiple users be encouraged in a directive policy.

Thank you for considering my comments and best of luck in your deliberations

Dan Rogers

Keats Island