From: Wm Phillips [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 8:32 AM
To: Islands2050
Subject: Island 2050 — Policy Concerns.

Trust Council:
Please add my input into the public record and take note.

I have a number of concerns regarding the proposal. In outline with no order of precedence:

- Islands Trust wishes to implement a change in its original charter. It is an extant body and, as such, seeks to amend what is, in effect, the constitution guiding its actions and defining its power.
    - Such a major change ought to be subject to:
        - Provincial approval (which it is) and;
        - final plebiscite approval by the citizenry as these proposals impact the mandate of the Trust's beyond its current electoral term.
- Proposals are ill-defined, often vague and subject to expansion by activist Trust councils and/or policy expansion.
- Costs not stipulated.
- Costs not constrained.
- Changes proposed are agenda-driven, not resident-needs driven.
- The proposal appears to allow for a good deal of scope-creep. This is already manifest in the desire to manage private docks and impose blanket regulations (
- Proposals related to tree management on private property are burdensome in terms of:
    - Cost – which will impose a further burden especially on the elderly and otherwise financially constrained
        - Responsible management of trees on private property should not entail costs or application processes
    - Tree management on private property ought not be saddled by excessive regulation or special-interest group meddling
    - Bureaucratic burden, efficiency will mean delay, cost, uncertainty
    - Are a barrier to reasonable free choice by private property owners
    - Will increase fire risk due to un-managed unhealthy trees, those too close to structures, and otherwise owner-perceived ill-suited growth.
    - Untended forest and limiting of burning will accumulate on the ground further increasing fire risk
- Expansion of social, governmental and fiscal power/oversight/intrusion well beyond anything supported by residents.
- Proposals that inherently even if innocently pander to special-interests and collectivist values at the potential expense of private/individual/family resident needs.
- Housing – no substantive, transparent plan to allow for innovative and affordable housing.
- Farms – possibly injurious oversight that may impede current or future farm development beyond previous scope.
- Proposals on this scale at a time when the citizenry is constrained by necessary Covid restrictions and precautions seem opportunistic.
    - Residents that may be technologically challenged are deprived for other reasons are further disadvantaged by processes that are largely virtual.
- Overreach – i.e., prohibitions regarding commercial shipping that are well out of the purview or legislative power of the Islands Trust. Also other intrusions into marine activities that are the responsibility and purview of senior levels of government.

And so forth… .

 Wm Phillips <> [redacted] Δ Pender Island, Full-time resident.