

From: David Maude
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2021 5:28 PM
To: Islands2050
Subject: FW: Islands Trust Future Thoughts.pdf
Attachments: Islands Trust Future Thoughts.pdf; ATT00001.txt

-----Original Message-----

From: Shaw Webmail [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2021 1:26 PM
To: Jeanine Dodds; David Maude
Cc: information
Subject: Islands Trust Future Thoughts.pdf

Sorry, sent file in Apple pages format. Here it is in .pdf format.
Bud Rosenberg

Islands Trust

After listening to Islands Trust (IT) Zoom meeting and attending Local Area IT gatherings concerning proposed long term planning document (Bylaw 183) strikes me that a new approach to the document is in order. IT committee members and provincial MLA's have have been inundated with complaints, concerns, constructive criticism and even veiled threats about the document put forth for first reading in early July. To repeat the same consultive process and then distilling it into an all encompassing document will likely be met with the same stand-off between residents of the Gulf Islands, IT Committee members and all 'stakeholders' in the the defined area. It is a reminder of Albert Einstein's quote, "The definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result."

The Gulf Islands is a diverse area with differing needs and expectations. Each area has two local IT members. In the case of Mayne Island, our past and present members have spent a number of years putting an existing Community Plan document in place. It addresses a number of the issues raised in Bylaw 183. A number of the islands are far behind us and, as we are told by our Local Trust members, don't have any community plans. It seems too, that IT is delving into areas that senior provincial and federal governments have jurisprudence. One simple example in the proposed Bylaw 183 attempts to deny freighters and tankers access to the protected waters of the Gulf Islands Trust Area. Part of this area includes Boundary Pass and Haro Straits. This is the primary seaway to the Port of Vancouver. How much real influence do you think IT will have preventing marine traffic from using Boundary Pass?

So here is a plan that may be an improvement going forward:

1. Identify the core planning issues that need to be addressed such as sustainability, indigenous rights, agriculture, forestry, climate change, fresh water resources etc. This has been done but there may be other core issues to be raised.

2. Long term planning documents should be coached in a suggestive voice rather than the authoritarian voice used in Bylaw 183. They should be weighted as a 'how to' document for local trust areas to plan and produce community planning documents and bylaws germane to their respective areas. For example the IT Long Term Planning Document could say:

"Each Local Trust Area requires a Community Plan."

The IT bylaw would say:

- .1 Local Trust Areas will submit a local community plan for approval by June 30, 2022 (TBD).

Resources would be available to help Local Trust Areas to complete a Community Plan consistent in format and content with the IT Long Term Planning Document core issues.

After the approval of the Local Trust Area's Community Plan resources, if needed, would be available to produce meaningful bylaws to enforce the Community Plan in the respective Local Trust areas.

The net result is that Local Trust Areas would have their approved Community Plan and the bylaws to enforce the plan.

To call a planning document a bylaw is a misnomer and is going to be met with push back. The bylaw aspect should be at the local trust area level. This puts the onus of meaningful bylaw generation at the local trust level. The IT should be putting forth a bylaw insisting that all local trust areas must complete their approved community plans by a date to be determined. Local areas not complying with the bylaw would be subject to having an imposed community plan or losing local area status.

3. One of the reasons the proposed bylaw was so upsetting was the 'dock issue'. A dock represents a \$100K investment on the part of the waterfront property owner. We were told that current approved docks would be 'grandfathered'. Nowhere in the proposed bylaw is that stated. Also, grandfathered docks are subject to ten year term licence renewals. What happens when docks reach licence renewal? Our dock took almost a year before approval. Current licencing can take more three years. This is licence denial by ignorance; 'ignorance' used non-pejoratively in this case. Dock owners deserve better treatment than the current licencing delays and long term licencing issues once approved. The dock issue needs sensible review and left as a bylaw issue to local areas consistent with local bylaws.

This not an exhaustive list of matters related to the proposed planning document. It is, I think, a reasonable attempt to address the subject at hand. My plan represents an attempt to renew the Long Term Planning Document as a procedural and an instruction document for the future rather than an authoritarian document. It would take a sizable effort by the existing Trust members and support staff. The long term effect would be to stop the constant bickering.

In closing, it is my understanding the proposed document was drafted in consultation with "consultants" at considerable expense. The popular definition of a consultant is an expert from out of town. This may work for private businesses but is unwelcome and unnecessary for public entities such as the Islands Trust Area.

Sincerely,
Eldon (Bud) Rosenberg
Mayne Island