

**From:** Mairead Boland <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 28, 2022 11:13 AM  
**To:** SouthInfo <[SouthInfo@islandstrust.bc.ca](mailto:SouthInfo@islandstrust.bc.ca)>  
**Cc:** Benjamin McConchie <[bemcconchie@islandstrust.bc.ca](mailto:bemcconchie@islandstrust.bc.ca)>; Laura Patrick <[lpatrick@islandstrust.bc.ca](mailto:lpatrick@islandstrust.bc.ca)>  
**Subject:** North Pender. July 28th. CIM

**Comment at the July 28<sup>th</sup> 2022 North Pender CIM. Mairead Boland**

Nobody on these islands would deny that water should be a concern to everybody. I am from Saturna.

The various IT Water projects/plans state explicitly that they will be deployed on all the islands so I am questioning them here – in advance of them becoming a fait accompli on Saturna and elsewhere.

**In the context of cisterns being required on North Pender (and the water DPA on Galiano).**

My questions are – what happened to **“being guided at all times by the best available science and data?”**

When will the flaws and uncertainties in the GW water reports be addressed?

When will my questions be answered?

In spite of stating repeatedly that you would adhere to the best science and data in all your actions you have ignored the technical reports you commissioned (from GW Solutions at a cost of upwards from \$80K). Why I ask myself? – perhaps because you thought you knew the answers already.

Despite not addressing the flaws and uncertainties in the reports you are galloping ahead on Pender **(cisterns for all regardless)** and on Galiano **(DPA for the entire island to protect perfectly adequate, but now deemed “critical recharge areas”)**.

I have repeatedly asked specific and detailed questions about the GW Solutions reports – in particular the 3<sup>rd</sup> one – on water availability. The data and the results are at the least difficult to comprehend – and may be flawed.

I was told in mid March that in May (in answer to my emails) there would be a workshop, FAQ and that GW Solutions were being asked to refine their water use estimates. I have heard nothing. A week or so ago I was told that these same questions raised in a Saturna LTC in May would be answered in an October 20<sup>th</sup> LTC.

So – why do you persist in deploying regulations on water without refining and answering questions about the GW Solutions reports you commissioned?

**PS** – 2 large plastic cisterns (circa 18000 liters) are roughly equivalent to approximately 5 tons of CO2. How many of these are unnecessary?

**PPS** The presentation on water made by staff in September 2021 (to Pender and Galiano) contained screenshots (IN DRAFT) with a legend indicating up to 50% use of recharge water before an area was deemed to be stressed. This 50% use of water recharge is the figure that is more commonly used to designate an area to be water stressed – and was apparently expected to be appropriate in the islands and in these reports.

In the final GW Solutions reports provided to the Trust the cutoff was dropped to 5% in order to allow **any** areas to be regarded as water stressed. This may be justified....but it has never been discussed or explained despite questions from multiple people.

The Province (in a peer review of the reports, as requested by the Regional Planning Committee) recommends zeroing in on areas that are demonstrated to be water stressed and making plans to mitigate in those areas. Funnily enough they also refer to a greater than 50% use of recharge as a danger level.

Thank you.