

**From:** MARY BETH RONDEAU [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 12, 2022 3:05 PM  
**To:** kneill; Sue Ellen Fast; Laura Patrick; Peter Luckham; Dan Rogers; Islands2050  
**Subject:** Islands Trust ISL Ph 3 PE - Comments

Hello Kirsty cc Islands2050, Executive Committee,  
Thank you for your presentation today at Executive Committee.

About myself, I am a retired architect and worked at Vancouver and Surrey for 25 years in regulation of design guidelines. I never get involved with things like this but my Pender neighbour kept pestering because of my background in municipal government - so here we are.

I am now involved with the various groups that are opposing the proposed amendments to the Trust Policy as well as many more of the policies and directives of the Islands Trust. I think this can be summarized in one statement where - the community is not listened to because the Preserve and Protect mandate is put above us in importance.

Firstly I would like to mention that there is a great deal of trepidation for those who have had undesirable experiences with public consultation and the Trust in general to date. I have personally observed this at several informal public meetings and LTCs here on Pender. It is taking an enormous leap of faith for so many of this community after these difficult experiences to now join this process. But hopefully they will make this leap and take part.

#### **List of Interested and Affected Parties/Focus Groups**

Thank you for your comment that all input can be embraced (paraphrasing - sorry if this looks like "misinformation"). Regardless of whether a group is called We Love the Islands Trust or We Don't Love It, I can't see a reason why it should be excluded from the list of interested parties - please clarify if groups are excluded from the list. We will be looking for the regulatory reason why this was done. Then, if I understand, the selection of which groups will be chosen for the 8 focus groups will be done according to well established IAP2 practices. We would request that this rationale also be made public so we can understand. And regardless of who gets chosen, groups may well prepare and submit a brief of what they would have said. I hope these submissions will be an important part of the public input.

By the way, calling the media dialogue of the community groups "misinformation" and "misinterpretation" is really injurious to us - is there any way to avoid that terminology? There is always a minority at the extreme ends of any consultation process but from my view of these groups who get attributed as misinformation - they are genuinely trying to understand this complex world of regulation and governance and I would ask for your help and support with that. I often used the phrase "broad shoulders and thick skin" for the important role of interacting with the community. I have complete respect for people like yourself who actually geek out on this type of work.

#### **Schedule**

Spring Break: How is the March spring break being incorporated into the schedule? I still remember community feedback where I worked Vancouver and Surrey, a loud and unhappy response from communities when a compressed notification period was put into holiday periods. After that, all holidays were blocked out similar the December holiday shown as 2 weeks in the ISL schedule on p47 of the agenda package. Having said that, given we are partly vacation communities, the pop ups and direct engagement proposed over the spring break may actually be an advantage. So this comment relates to the survey and virtual events etc. Specifically, Trustee Patrick's helpful comment to focus on meaningful consultation as more important than saying has to be done on time. It looks to me like that schedule should be extended into April sooner than later. We would be grateful.

Incorporating the Governance and Management Review: Needless to say, the community is most interested in this initiative and believes it relates to the proposed amendments to the Policy Statement. Hopefully this report will be open to the public as part of the agenda package for the March 8-10 Trust Council meeting so that we can study it and integrate anything applicable into our comments. If not, it appears clear to me that we will not be able to integrate commentary with the current schedule and this would most certainly be perceived as an incomplete PE.

### **Monitoring and Evaluation**

Thank you again for mentioning the importance of transparency on reporting back to the community on how the input is incorporated. This section in your document is very short and looks like it needs more development. This was well articulated in the RFP and is of fundamental importance to the community I am working with to make the leap and engage as mentioned above.

**Concerns with Covid:** I observe a small amount of chatter on this in our groups. My own opinion would tend to agree with CAO Hotsenpiller that Covid can also be an opportunity. The virtual format has been helpful in many ways to our island geography. But acknowledging we will need to stay resilient if new changes occur.

### **Who We Are**

It was interesting discussion point brought up by Trustee Luckham (I believe). When first drafted to work on this, I was confused that there wasn't a comprehensive document exploring who we are on the islands. Things like: if we had an ideal wish what would that be (a vibrant market of specialty island products, a place to bring up my family in nature etc). And: what are your favourite images (mine would be multi-generational families going for walks on our rural roads during the various holidays). This was the starting point for all the citywide updates to city plans, OCP rewrites, etc that observed during my career. Conversely, we are being told that the coastal Douglas-fir zone that we live in is endangered, tiny and we need to put it under a glass bowl to save the planet (we have citizen study groups that show this is not correct science). So the image of a dying forest outside our windows (which is pretty clear that it is thriving) is not the starting point for normal community discourse. Can we start from this since it was missed in the original consultation? Will your engagement incorporate this?

Lastly, it was said in the meeting that all input to this process should be to Islands2050 email. Hmm... that's difficult given the community trust issues with the Trust. Could we also copy ISL somehow? The ISL document suggests there will be a website set up for participants "feedback and commenting"? Or will all submissions, correspondence (even questions like this) become public under the correspondence tab? Or a new tab for Phase 3? Please let us know.

We look forward to working with you and your team and appreciate your time.

Mary Beth Rondeau

North Pender Island