

Dear LTC,

I am really confused about the entire process of this rezoning application. I am missing the part where **preserve and protect** is the guiding principle, and where emphasis is on transparency. The public gets to see applicant's demands and planner's reports without any ability to really question the applicant or the planner. The public gets to submit comments and questions, but it appears that nobody reads them, absorbs any of the important data, shows ignorance of larger framework and concepts or bothers to provide feedback. Decisions are made without proper discussion. We appreciate that the planner can't be knowledgeable in all areas surrounding development, in which case independent experts should be consulted – at developer's cost – to avoid the current *ex-cathedra* announcements made by planner, chair or trustees.

This is undemocratic: the process is completely one sided, with the public largely restricted to the sidelines. As we have pointed out, the CMS rezoning proposal ignores large parts of our OCP and land-use bylaws. The OCP is already a compromise document and as such, any attempt to move the dial should be rejected. The OCP is the will of islanders and seemingly the only way for the public to have real input in planning. Therefore, any applicants must be in compliance with the OCP. The planner's role is to make sure applications fit the OCP, not - as appears to be the current approach - to twist the OCP to fit an applicant's wishes.

Today's LTC agenda includes a water management plan that is clearly incomplete and, as stated, the planners have not had the time to study and comment in detail. Why did this make it on the agenda at all?

1. As I have pointed out numerous times, studying recharge completely misses the point of assessing water usage and availability and aquifer stress. Only an extended drawdown study during the dry season can deliver that essential information on aquifer health.
2. This type of long-term drawdown study was required before the GALI proposal could be advanced; the study also looked at neighbouring wells. Why not here? Why is the LTC not applying the same rules to all applicants?
3. Why do proponents and staff completely ignore the fact that the aquifer in question is at the highest level of stress and possibly oversubscribed already.
4. I really object to the inclusion of point 8.7.7 on daily visitor use on 35 participants and a once a year exception to the limit that is open-ended. My calculation given the sustainable yield of the well and realistic water use per person/day, the well will be oversubscribed at 14 people on site during the summer months.
5. How can the LTC possibly make a decision on proposed bylaw 257 or on the applicant's request to expand the number days exceeding the allowable limit six times a year, without been given any data on water demand (or wastewater treatment)?

Today's agenda also includes some rewording on shoehorning CM's application into Community Facility and Utilities. The proposed text squeezes 'CM Spiritual Education Retreat' between 'Community Housing 1' and 'Utility Service', *i.e.* designed for uses such as seniors' and community housing and halls, schools, libraries, health and emergency services. If this crass and nonsensical juxtaposition does not raise any alarms, what will? Where is any reference to **Community** in the CMS proposal? The proposal belongs into the commercial section. Plain and simple.

Curiously, neither planner nor the trustees ever refer to the big picture, like a whole Islands Trust approach to planning and carrying capacity of the islands. This applies to population, natural environment and biodiversity, especially in light of climate crisis, sea level rise, drought, water supply and wildfire.

Tom Mommsen, [REDACTED] Galiano Island
March 7, 2022

Sent to Chair, Galiano Trustees and Planner via email.