

From: Lawrence Mayer [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, June 25, 2021 8:31 PM
To: josie.osborne.MLA@leg.bc.ca; George.heyman.MLA@leg.bc.ca;
lana.popham.mla@leg.bc.ca; IRR.Minister@gov.bc.ca;
murray.rankin.MLA@leg.bc.ca; doug.caul@gov.bc.ca;
FLNR.Minister@gov.bc.ca; adam.olsen.MLA@leg.bc.ca;
douglas.routley.MLA@leg.bc.ca; adam.walker.MLA@leg.bc.ca;
nicholas.simons.MLA@bc.leg.ca; jordan.sturdy.MLA@leg.bc.ca;
directorsgi@crd.bc.ca; Paul Brent; Lee Middleton;
john.horgan.MLA@leg.bc.ca; MAH.minister@gov.bc.ca;
MAH.DMO@gov.bc.ca; ENV.Minister@gov.bc.ca; DM.ENV@gov.bc.ca;
AGR.Minister@gov.bc.ca; Islands2050; Trustees; information; Executive
Admin; Peter Luckham; Russ Hotsenpiller; gholman@crd.bc.ca; Sue Ellen
Fast; Michael Kaile; Laura Busheikin; David Critchley; Scott Colbourne; Kees
Langereis; Dan Rogers; Tahirih Rockafella; Jane Wolverton; Kate-Louise
Stamford; Alex Allen; Grant Scott; Peter Johnston; Timothy Peterson; Peter
Luckham; Jeanine Dodds; David Maude; Benjamin McConchie; Deb Morrison;
Laura Patrick; grove@islandstrust.bc.ca; Cameron Thorn; Steve Wright; Doug
Fenton; Donald Clarke; Linda Adams
Subject: RE: Island Trust Policy Statement Review - Request for Postponement of First
Reading

Dear Premier Horgan, Ministers, Trustees, and IT staff,

I am writing to express my concern about the Islands Trust draft Policy Statement, scheduled to have its first reading on July 8, 2021.

My wife , Dr. Anne Wallis and I are new homeowners on S. Pender. We purchased the property last fall and, as we live on the island greater than 50% of the time, we consider it our home. Since moving to the island, we have tried to raise our understanding of local community issues and have listened in and participated in local Island Trust meetings.

I read with interest the letter posted by Wayne Quinn regarding various aspects of the proposed amendments to the Island Trust Policy Statement as well as the process whereby these changes are being introduced, discussed and decided on. I am a retired University professor and Biotech entrepreneur and what the business side of my career taught me was the importance of clarity of process and policies being proposed via carefully structured legal documentation and governance (i.e. acting in the best interest of ALL stakeholders and not simply the personal inclinations of those in the position of decision making). This is a delicate balance given the diverse range of issues facing the Island's future, the need to make progress and the heightened sensitivity to being good stewards of our environment, First Nations partners and residents of the Islands. I first would thank the Trustees for their volunteer efforts as I can imagine there are many countless hours of effort and criticism, a job they take on because of their commitment to the Islands.

Two high level considerations brought significant concern to me regarding the lack of public engagement in the face of the COVID-19 pandemic. As a new member of the Island community, I demur to others more knowledgeable, however I would categorize the level of public engagement and information exchange as ad hoc at best. People are dealing with so much over the past 18 months to stay sane and financially viable, why the need to push this through with so little public

engagement? The list of public input recently provided was rather concerning as it appeared a significant number arose from essentially “someone I spoke with on the ferry”. This is not a process of proper due diligence for the interest of all residents (e.g. the survey should have been mailed to all Island residents). I was quite concerned about the comments Wayne made regarding how the interactions with First Nations is being handled, but I cannot make any personal comment due to my lack of knowledge other than to say if what he claims has been undertaken is true, it is a serious breach of trust for the Island residents as well as First Nations since I am not aware of any legal basis for the Islands Trust unilaterally representing either party on this topic.

The second key point I would like to raise regarding the policy amendment is the lack of definition for a plethora of new policies on what will be allowed or disallowed. 20 years in a successful Biotech Company taught me the devil is in the detail: policies on what is allowed or not allowed regarding everything from housing, buildings, docks, tree removal/pruning, etc. must have every item defined quantitatively: if no tree can be removed, does that mean a 5 inch high cedar sprout cannot be removed without a permit? The main concern here is that without clear, quantifiable agreed-to definitions on all policies, all decisions will be rendered to the interpretation of the current Trustees, essentially and Island Autocracy. That should be avoided as in the very least the guidelines and quantitative limits for all allowed/not allowed policies should be clear for all stakeholders. Again, I do not want to implicate what I agree or disagree with regarding specific policies but rather to question the ability of Island residents to understand what the ENFORCEABLE policies are based on given the lack of clear and quantifiable definitions. This should not be left to “we’ll deal with it when it arises” as things will most certainly grind to a halt, which is again not in the interest of the Island residents.

Please consider delaying the first reading of the Revised Policy Statement until both public engagement (which should be possible very soon) and proper definition of policies can be addressed.

Sincere Regards,

Lawrence Mayer, Ph. D.

Founder and Chief Scientific Office , Celator Pharmaceuticals, Vancouver, BC (Retired)

Current Address: [REDACTED], South Pender Island