

From: TRISH FAUROT [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 5, 2026 2:53 PM
To: Laura Patrick
Cc: Jamie Harris; Timothy Peterson; Executive Admin; Islands2050; SSInfo; HMA Minister
Subject: More commentary against the proposed Islands Trust amendments

To all concerned,
I am sending a part of Peter Lamb's opinion piece regarding the proposed Trust amendments. Peter's credentials include being a former Islands Trust trustee, environmental education teacher, bc government prize winning developer of environmental education curriculum for BC government, Masters of Science in Environmental Education.

"To preserve" takes a lot more smarts when it comes to adding people to the mix than what the proposed new Trust Policy Statement addresses and allows. First and foremost, it must start by defining 'preserve'. Everything else regarding expanding the island's "amenities", however they're defined, has to fit under the "preserve" umbrella. Without this context and clarity, it's all just wishful blah-blah.

If they goal is to change the Trust Act by swapping "conserve" for "preserve", then they have to chance "protect", too, to "manage". The Minister's letter about not stretching the meaning of "unique amenities" alludes to this, by mentioning carrying capacity of the ecosystems. It's rare, indeed, for a government representative invoke carrying capacity, and cheers for that. Still, he's working on the "conserve" model, despite drawing a hard line about changing "unique amenities" in the Act. He needed to lean on "preserve", used accurately. Maybe he will, in the future. I'll forward this to him and his deputies.

However the Minister worded his reply, the B.C. government is not going to back down on the "preserve and protect" bit, we can be quite sure. But by all means, Islands Trustees, if you're intent on muddling 'preserve' with 'conserve', then have a go at getting the Act changed to read "to conserve and manage." Then you can make "amenities" mean all of those other things and more.

The horse, as I see it, needs to go in front of the cart. The horse is the "preserve" part. The cart is all the human stuff that needs to fit into that wheeled carry-all, plus the roads they require, houses, shops, services, etc.

So let's stop arguing about "unique amenities" and focus on the crystal clarity of the Islands Trust Act as it's written, why the words "preserve and protect" were chosen and must be operable, else changes will keep being proposed out of context and on inaccurate, unworkable premises."

I once again implore you to leave the Islands Trust Mandate alone.

Sincerely,
Patricia Faurot,
[REDACTED]

Saltspring Island, BC
V8K1J5