

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 1, 2026 1:52 PM  
**To:** Islands2050  
**Subject:** Changes to the Islands Trust Policy Statement

I've been reviewing the proposed changes to the Islands Trust Policy Statement, and I find it quite alarming! Changes of this magnitude should be decided by island residents in the form of a referendum as a part of this year's election cycle. I have spoken to a fairly large group of Galiano residents and have yet to find a single person in favour of what's being proposed. It seems that the current Islands Trust council has decided to demote the original Policy Statement mandate to a second tier and to focus on reconciliation as the primary objective for the Trust Council.

Specifically:

1. It is proposed to co-manage all trust affairs with the indigenous. About 18 months ago this model was proposed by the NDP for all Crown lands but was quickly rescinded when there was an enormous public backlash. It was clear that the NDP had not considered the many ramifications of such a move and I believe the IT is in a similar position.
2. They propose that all Islands Trust policies are consistent with UNDRIP. Again, this is what the Province attempted through the DRIPA legislation and that has resulting in a number of alarming court decisions. The Province now proposes to modify their DRIPA legislation and the Conservatives promise to scrape it. I don't believe anyone understands what the practical ramifications are of making all your policies consistent with UNDRIP.
3. It is proposed to implement many of the policies of the now on-hold changes to the Provincial Heritage act that covers cultural preservation sites etc. These Provincial act changes provoked a huge backlash from many sectors including the UBCM which represents all cities and municipalities in BC.

It seems that many of the proposed policies are a no-go at the Provincial level, but the Islands Trust believes we should adopt them without a referendum. One can only believe that the Islands Trust Council realized that such changes would be broadly defeated if the citizens impacted are asked to vote on it. In a democracy, an unacceptable reason not to have a referendum.

Warm regards,

Bob Campbell PEng