From: Irene Wotton [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, August 26, 2026 11:30 AM
To: northinfo <northinfo@islandstrust.bc.ca>
Subject: Gambier OCP

The recent questionnaire has been an improvement over the earlier OCP Targeted Review questionnaires that were badly worded and actually didn't work at all well and sometimes not at all, but there are still some improvements that could be made and I have some additional comments on the process thus far.

On the layout and technical side of the questionnaire, numbering the questions/statements would be a simple addition that would make it easier for people who are reading the document to quickly note down if they need look up the Trust explanations or do other searches in order to inform themselves to prepare and enter their response. A number reference is faster and easier to note down and use than to look for the question when switching between documents.
For the mechanics of the questionnaire and moving around within it, the buttons at the bottom of the questionnaire pages are: "Previous page" on all but the first page and and having "Previous page on the first page of the questionaire would be useful if someone wants to go back and refer to the maps or introduction to the coastline material. From page 2 onward there is "Previous page", "Next page", and "Save & continue later" except on the last page where there are only 2 choices "Previous page" or "Submit" There is no button for "Save and continue later". That means that anyone wanting to check out the Trust page or other sources of information, or have to leave the questionnaire before reviewing and sending, could lose the whole form. "Save and continue later" should be on all the pages starting with page 1 through to the final page of the questionnaire.

As for the maps, Trustee Stamford mentioned at the recent New Brighton meeting that mapping is available on the Trust website. I entered the search terms of eel grass Gambier Island and what was offered was a map of Gambier with a blue line all around the entire shore of Gambier. This map was proffered at the beginning of this process and that map it is absolutely not correct. Eel grass does not occur all around Gambier's coastline. Eel grass requires sheltered shallow water with a sandy bottom. That map needs to be removed as it is misleading. The end result was two 40 foot docks were installed to serve about 11 properties and that just does not work for property owners as a 40 foot dock would provide moorage for perhaps 4 boats but won't accommodate water taxi pick ups and drop offs as well. Without each property being provided with a dedicated space, property owners would arrive to find no moorage or even unloading space for their boat. The end result was these community docks end up being used only when people are looking to purchase property and again when work starts and contractors need to tie their boats up. To provide basic moorage for 20 foot boats and space for a water taxi would require 300 plus feet of lineal moorage space - not 80 feet. The end result of this poor decision is that all the property owners of this subdivision in our area applied for and have a private dock and the

community docks are sitting and deteriorating unused but still having an impact on the sea bed.

As for the material around shoreline protection, my insites are specifically around the area we live on Gambier. It has been a long time since we have done a shoreline tour around the whole island which is the best way to view and make decisions on how the shoreline is changing and developing so without having the time to inform myself more around newer developments around the island, my responses will be about the areas that I am familiar with and the information and interaction thus far.

Eel grass: the Conservancy has had a couple of eel grass planting events with volunteer help. Are they doing any follow up studies to see how the replanting is working? This information, while not a Trust project, should be shared with the Trust and the residents of Gambier until some proper studies can be done. While there are pockets of suitable locations for eel grass, the entire shoreline of Gambier is NOT suitable for eel grass, only some areas as most of Gambier's shoreline is steep, deep and rocky. Unfortunately, for all the talk about eel grass and its importance, no local studies and mapping have been done and the pockets of suitable seabed in my area have long been destroyed by lack of action which comes out of lack of studies. One cove has been lost due to an uninformed Trustee decision some years ago. Another was made during a subdivision where it was decided private docks would not be permitted so group or community docks were installed. Another potential eel grass location in our area is used by boats seeking anchorage. We know that anchoring of boats and mooring buoys can be devastating to eel grass beds. A simple improvement can be made by installing mooring buoys with the proper tackle that does not allow the chain of the mooring buoy to scour the bottom and damage the eel grass. A project to install eel grass friendly mooring buoys could help bring eel grass back in areas where boaters have been anchoring. Signage to inform boaters that anchoring is NOT permitted in this area and they must use one of the provided mooring buoys might help eel grass survive in areas of sea bed that are popular anchorages for boaters. Local knowledge can help guide this work.

15 meter set back: I do not support the one plan for all zones approach that has been taken with this OCP review and the various targeted add ons. Gambier has had, from the earliest days of the Trust and the first OCP in the 1970s, 2 residential development zones: Rural residential which is supposed to be an average of 10 acres or greater and about 93% of Gambier's privately owned property and where 1/3 of the population is located and most of these properties are water access only - we do not have connecting roads. New Brighton and the south west peninsula where there is foot passenger ferry service, Hydro power, fibre optic wifi, public dock, and connecting roads is where SR is the predominant zoning and makes up about 7% of the privately owned land on Gambier and where about 2/3 of the population is located. It is two different worlds which is part of the uniqueness of Gambier but there has been little to no recognition or differentiation between these 2 residential zones throughout this review process that I have seen, heard or read yet there is a vast difference in needs and how we live on Gambier as compared to the south west peninsula

of the island. Water access only areas are not being given consideration. I understand what Trustee Bernado said about not wanting every island with different zoning BUT if we are trying to protect the uniqueness of any given place, we have to accept that in order to do that, recognition of special and unique features of an island require relaxations and/or unique zoning. The larger lots on Gambier are important in terms of retention of forest, protection of wildlife and keeping the historical look of the mostly forested and wild island. The value of maintaining the RR zoning was recognized in the 1990s OCP review and maintained for those very reasons. Unfortunately some developers have argued for and were granted smaller lots and higher density to the detriment of Gambier's waterfront and upland in some locations. There are few valid reasons to reduce the lot size below 10 acres in the RR zone but developers try to get relaxations and this should not be permitted to happen.

A survey for a road across Gambier was done in 1963. The Social credit provincial government planned to eliminate the Blackball Ferry run between Horseshoe Bay and Langdale, replacing it instead with a ferry from elsewhere in the Sea to Sky corridor, probably around Britannia area, over to the north east area of Gambier, probably Douglas Bay. A ferry would connect the Sea to Sky corridor area with Gambier, the road would connect to New Brighton and a 2nd ferry would connect users to Langdale would then drive to New Brighton and catch a second ferry to Langdale. The road survey was completed and registered but the ferry plans faded away. Why anyone would think the capital and maintenance costs of 4 ferry terminals and 2 separate ferries were a better idea than 2 ferry terminals and one ferry is beyond rational thought, especially given the rugged terrain of Gambier Island. The population of Gambier was too small then and is still too small to support a car ferry and the devastation to Gambier to put in roads and the resulting traffic across the island and the impact the parking and traffic would have on New Brighton is beyond comprehension. And that road would still not connect most of the various far flung communities around the island. The result is that developers of new subdivisions must align their roads with the 1963 road survey so as to connect up the hypothetical survey should the road that was surveyed ever be continued beyond West Bay Landing development. This added cost to the developers who had to fit this road into their subdivision plans to meet up with the hypothetical cross island road was passed on to the buyers of those lots. Thus we have a connection from the head of West Bay through the Sir Thomas J. Lipton park to the West Bay Landing subdivision on the east side of West Bay and over the hill into West Bay where, if the surveyed road were to continue it would remove a massive swath of trees on the north west side of Centre Bay but still not connect to any other communities as they are located around the shoreline of Gambier over rugged terrain. And the Sir Thomas J Lipton park is not supposed to be open to vehicular traffic except emergency vehicles although some residents abuse this regulation so they can drive around but they also claim to be water access only, which their properties are not if the road is open through the park. The government has made the developers cover the cost of this poorly conceived road plan and it now is at a dead end at private property. At a million dollars a mile, the government won't find any other developers, and the Crown Land is now going to be used by the Squamish Nation and they don't want roads, especially one

of this size - they are more interested in keeping the forest intact. Other new subdivisions in Long Bay, Halkett Bay, Brigade Bay and Douglas Bay have no official connecting roads to New Brighton or to the rest of the island. Even if the existing road surveyed in the 1960s were to continue, most other stand alone properties and newer subdivisions would still be remote and water access only due to the distances to connect them to the main road and the rugged terrain of Gambier. Gambier Island water access only property owners need to keep their private docks and add community docks to provide boating and recreational options to non water front property owners where there are already roads. Without thorough local studies, however, we have no proof that larger dock complexes don't do more damage that smaller private docks. Studies from other places recognize that the larger the dock complex the greater the damages to the shoreline and sea bed.

Public access: Historically in the experience of most current residents and visitors, Gambier is a fairly wild, very steep and rugged and heavily forested island. This has value to islanders and the general public for camping and hiking. The church camps located on Gambier and others in Howe Sound also use Gambier for wilderness hiking and camping experiences. Gambier also offers residents of Metro Vancouver an easily accessed wilderness gem as ferry foot passengers to New Brighton for hikes and camping. Water taxis take hikers and campers to Halkett Bay Marine Park and other drop off points. Adding roads won't improve the Gambier experience for property owners or day hikers - once the wilderness is chewed up by roads, a big chunk of the peacefulness and uniqueness of our water access only properties and the island will be lost. The Trust's mandate is to preserve and protect so the Trust needs to ask residents about the importance of docks to their life on Gambier. The alternative of having only community docks needs to be proven to be the more environmentally friendly option before restrictions are put on private docks in the water access only areas of Gambier.

Gambier had been brutally logged in the late 1800s and into the mid 1900s. While it may not have been a total clear cut, the trees not taken would have been due to the steep cliffs where it was too difficult to log. In my three quarters of a century on Gambier I have watched the forest recover as bare bluffs have slowly been recloaked by the forest so few rock bluffs now punctuate the trees but we also know the first growth forest trees were taller and stronger. We now know that current logging practices degrade the soil and mycorrhizal fungal networks within the soil that allow trees to share water with each other including vulnerable young saplings during dry periods, as well as sharing nutrients, and communicating with each other when animals or insect infestations threaten trees. The trees also communicate through their mycorrhizal fungal networks to warn neighbouring trees to arm up against these attacks by pests. While trees cannot move away, within a healthy forest, they do have defenses. Without the mycorrhizal fungal network, these trees will not be able to support themselves and each other as effectively. When the forest is heavily logged, the remaining and new trees lose this network as well as the shade and protection from wind the mature trees had provided and the mycorrhizal fungal networks that had allowed the forest to thrive is destroyed. This research is still ongoing. As a result the forest we see on Gambier now, some of which is approaching 100 years of growth,

looks good but the trees are not as large and robust as the forests of a century ago pre logging and now it is threatened with climate change partially due to existing logging practices throughout BC which destroy the carbon storage capacity as well as the mycorrhizal fungal networks that help to build a resilient forest - the logging actually releases centuries of stored carbon further exacerbating the level of climate change. Maybe the one good thing about the logging of Gambier is that single species replanting wasn't used when Gambier was logged so the forest has reseeded itself and grown back with its full range of tree and plant species. What grows on Gambier best is what is suited to the many micro climates and varied terrain around the island. For the long term forest health of this relatively small island, logging and new roads should be discouraged. It takes more than a century for a forest to rebuild all of its connections and reach its fullest majesty that was stripped from the hillsides decades earlier. Properties of all sizes should minimize tree removal. If you don't want a treed property then why buy on an island that is heavily forested? I do appreciate that people want views and some sunshine as well but clearing lots just for sunshine and views is counter productive - it is the forest that cools us in summer weather. To build community docks, connecting roads are required between properties and trees must be removed to build roads and parking at each house and sufficient parking for each vehicle at each jetty to the docks. This is an unnecessary strike against Gambier's forests in the water access only areas as opposed to allowing private docks and foot paths as many properties currently have and we are close enough to our dock and jetty that we use wheel barrows and hand trucks - we don't have nor need vehicles. Large dock complexes have a larger footprint than private docks so the choice is to have smaller less damaging docks and foot paths as compared to roads (more damaging to the forest) and larger dock complexes (more damaging to that specific area of water and seabed). Private docks equal one small footprint on the water sea bed and community docks, where roads do not already exist, equals a large footprint in the forest in terms of tree removal and also a large concentrated footprint on the water and seabed. Due to the SR zoning and how the south west peninsula has developed, community docks are needed to give upland owners access to a dock for boating and swimming. Community docks make some sense in a new subdivision where roads are required for fire breaks and needed for access to each property. Some of the newer subdivisions are also on very steep terrain, making it impossible to get supplies from the dock to the property without a vehicle or a funicular. These locations might be best suited to community docks but any expectations to have existing stand alone properties share docks is only going to add to tree removal, add vehicles to those properties, replace 2 or 3 private docks with a larger dock, and require the complex and costly subdivision and subsequent sale of the land to create the necessary common property for the road, shared parking at the head of the jetty, the jetty itself, and the dock along with the shared financial requirements for capital costs for building, installation, maintenance and insurance insurance. Two property owners in our area built their houses on neighbouring lots and built and shared a dock about 15 years ago. About 3-5 years ago the owners moved to individual jetties and docks - it might be interesting to know why.

Building on Gambier with its water access only properties, is already an expensive, challenging task whether the property owner is doing some or most of the work or contractors are hired. I appreciate some of the protections that the bylaws provide but an island like Gambier also offers a unique experience for people to create their dream location while respecting the topography of the land and its vegetation as well. For some it is a simple cabin for secure storage and to get out of the rain and for others it is a city sized house with all the mod cons. When do regulations become too onerous? When people have bought a property with the knowledge there is a place to build on their lot and it fits within the present bylaws, then 1 or more of those bylaws change before the owners of the property have their studies done, their plans drawn up, their money amassed, and their permits obtained - that is a problem and a very expensive one for the property owner. There is a range of set backs from the shoreline within the Trust islands and Gambier has lots of houses that have been standing for many decades that are within the 15 meter set back and therefore are non conforming. When some of these houses were built there were no set backs or other bylaws. Apparently the Trust is not planning to change the current 15 meter set back to 30 meters but some property owners have misunderstood this due to the language used. When they finally get some information, it is a lot of reading, much of it in planning language so the confusion and misunderstanding is the result. At the New Brighton meeting Trustee Stamford stated that the 15 meter set back is NOT changing then went on to try and explain that it is the next 15 meters, which currently has no set back restrictions but if this draft OCP passes as written, the 2nd 15 meters will require approval if the DPA is within this zone. With so few opportunities to be informed about the process over the past 2-3 years, and not understanding all the acronyms, DPA and measurements have interpreted into where structures can go and may not go at all, and also what might be permitted via application for a relaxation. our lot is 13 acres of uphill slope of 45 to 60 degrees with boulders the size of cars.

To build at the 30 meter setback on our lot would require a lot of expense, a lot of tree removal, a lot of blasting, and a funicular at huge additional cost for us to get our supplies up to the house. Larger lots do not necessarily mean one or more good building sites. Our lot is brutally steep and rugged and while some building sites might be found with great views, the cost of forest destruction is much greater to build at 30 meters rather than at 15 meters. Building on Gambier, particularly in the water access only areas, is very different from building on most city lots or most of the small lots of the south west peninsula. Each lot provides its own challenges to find a safe location for a dock, finding water and a suitable area for septic, and finding an accessible house site. Given the rugged conditions and steep slopes, the greater number of regulations will increase tree and understory removal and damage the soil at great cost to the land owner and at a huge loss to our forest and the productivity of the soil, and also add to sequestered carbon in the soil being released. The much needed mycorrhizal fungal networks that make for the great forests in these areas will be set back yet again. We have an opportunity here to allow the mostly 2nd growth forests to flourish on Gambier through allowing discreet building at 15 meters set back allowing for views and sunshine and still keeping the forest intact. I support the this to save the incursions into our forests that are still recovering from the logging. Trustee Stamford has stated that the 15 meter set back hasn't been changed but

then 1 of our Trustees has said that it is better to have consistencey between the various islands within the Trust and 30 feet is being considered. But does this consistency respect the unique situations of each island? Keats Island is nothing like Gambier Island - all of the islands have their own unique qualities. Loosing those will be a forever change - we need to embrace and support our water access only communities instead of restricting them to a level that makes the property impractical. We need to recognize and protect Rural Residential zoned areas with 10+ acres of land and those unique and heavily forested areas and allow them to continue to develop.

It is only recently that some property owners have grasped this detail around shoreline development. Ignorance/lack of awareness and lack of ability to participate creates distrust in the process. The Trust has not educated and engaged the public adequately in this process. At the New Brighton meeting Trustee Stamford was saying how difficult it is to reach the other communities on Gambier and that they have no public space to meet like the Gambier community centre. Has she actually spoken with people in these areas to see if there is a space of some sort where their community can come together with Trust staff and Trustees to have a meeting? If not, that is what each of these communities need in order to understand what has been going on in talks with First Nations and the changes being put forward for Gambier's OCP. Not all property owners have boats to run half way around the island to New Brighton and New Brighton doesn't have enough moorage to host a meeting for residents coming from all over the island by boat, even if people are doing boat sharing rides. The last meeting I was at I was with another property owner and we got the last moorage space at the dock. Whether it is a craft fair, farmer's market or Trust meeting, if people do not have transportation and moorage to New Brighton and back, they cannot attend. We have given up on going into New Brighton because of the lack of open dock spaces for visitors. New Brighton is as remote for us as is a water access only community anywhere else on the island. Early in the OCP review process when Trustee Stamford said she didn't know how to connect with people in the water access only areas, she was invited to meet in our area. She didn't respond. I think that with a little effort, opportunities can be found to meet with each group in or near their own location, also giving Trustees and planners a bit more insight into these areas that I suspect they have never visited and bringing these meetings to the people for a better consultation process. But this can only happen if the Trust is willing to accept these offers and make a list of what they might need including power to for computers, and recording equipment. We know the turn outs to the few meetings open to the public have not been high and the public is discouraged with the lack of accessibility.

With regards to the shoreline and archeological values, I know of one midden but suspect that it is no longer viable given its location. There are few, if any remnants of First Nations occupation and use on Gambier in the areas that I am most familiar with. Even a resident on the island who wrote a paper on Indigenous peoples and Gambier for an anthropology degree, didn't find a great deal of material and that was decades ago. I see no reason why property owners should pay for archeological surveys before obtaining a permit for a dock or structure on the land and if the work of assessing and inventorying had been done over

the past few years we would have mapping and an inventory to work with to make this process easier for everyone. If you haven't been in the forests of Gambier, then you don't know how difficult the terrain is and the likelihood of finding archeological items amongst the boulders, large clumps of sword ferns, prickly salmon berry shrubs, leaf mulch and deadfall trees is difficult. Where there is an understory, much of it is dense, and the salal closer to the shoreline is impenetrable. There are also rocky points with little growth but how does one have to search to know if artifacts are on or in the ground without cutting out all of the salal and sword ferns? Digging isn't an option. How can a search determine whether or not there are archeological items when dense, wirey salal bushes are impenetrable - without destroying this part of the understory? In Europe and in the UK where archeological items are found regularly when people are planting their summer flowers and ploughing their fields, any items found by property owners or by treasure hunters, has to be regulated by the government. If it is something that can be repatriated, the government will attempt to connect the items with the rightful owner, otherwise the find is assessed and if valuable or of historic interest, it is offered to museums. If the museums don't want it or cannot afford the item the property owner or the treasure hunter may keep or sell the find - the treasure hunter was required to seek permission before entering the property owner's land so they will have determined how this would be handled. In Europe the Roman ruins that are found during renovations in both public buildings and private homes, are recorded and remain in place in the owner's house or business, sealed behind a poly carbonate panel and discretely illuminated for the owners and their guests to see. Loose artifacts that are valuable would go to a museum while foundations, walls, and other historic parts of buildings usually remain in place. All of this is just an every day part of living there. I know if any aboriginal artifacts are found anywhere in BC, they will go to the Nation that made them. So why should property owners pay for archeological studies of their land and foreshore when it is First Nations who want their artifacts, if any items were left and have survived, since it seems predetermined any found items must be returned to their Nation? They can apply for grants for this work and it should also be carried out in a timely manner so as to not compromise the property owners' plans for their site. Had studies been undertaken and mapping inventories started when these talks started, we would already have a good idea of the likelihood of finds and the most likely locations on Gambier. The property owner, when work is underway, will still be beholden to the government and Aboriginal community to report any finds, as is the situation in the UK and Europe - King Richard III's bones were found when excavators were building a car park less than a decade ago - a huge find and completely accidental - no one knew where Richard III had been buried. The bones were removed and the car park project continued. The government and First Nations can decide who will pay for this but it should not be another financial burden on the property owners. As for marine habitat studies, this again is being dumped on the property owner when these studies accurate mapping should have been done prior to the consultation period so everyone can understand the challenges and decisions that need to be made.

As for the issue of docks damaging the marine environment, the larger the dock, the greater the potential damage and studies should be done for our local area - we should not be

relying on studies done elsewhere, many of which are from the east coast and in estuaries. Latitude, water temperatures, tidal rise and fall, composition of sea bed and so many other factors will affect eel grasses and kelp - both essential to supporting other species and in serious decline world wide. Well designed, long term studies on the impacts of not only private docks but also larger community docks, breakwaters, and mooring buoys should have been undertaken prior to this review process then we would have maps and a better understanding of what was here at the start and the impact of development and the increase in private docks which have proliferated since the start of the study. Washington State has noted significant losses of marine plants, fish and bivalves due to increasing coastal settlement. We should also have carried out studies on light permeable deckings which were designed for and seem work to some degree in lower latitudes. Whether or not they work well at our latitude has yet to be determined in actual practice but logic says no because the openings are not large enough to allow sufficient light penetration except when the sun is directly overhead. The thickness of the fibreglass panels and angle of expanded metal decking prevents any light hitting the decking at an angle from penetrating very far or for very long. Maximum light penetration of open work decking takes place mainly when the light is directly overhead, which is for a short time. Docks need flotation and that is usually in the form of rotationally molded plastic tanks or billets of styrofoam wrapped and heat welded in heavy poly wrap. There has to be sufficient floatation for the necessary height and stability of the dock for the full length of the dock and floatation is usually at least 2 feet wide on each side and/or down the centre of the length of the dock. When the ramp is added, where the ramp rides back and forth on the dock with tide change, there are now 2 layers of light permeable deck and the sunlight will not penetrate through 2 layers plus the ramp is always at angle, varying as the tide changes. Between all of this factors of dock construction, the amount of light that will penetrate any of these open grid materials is well below the 43% of the product that is open work.

Depending on the tidal change the ramp may have to overlap 1/3 of its length on the dock creating 2 layers of decking at different angles so little too no light will penetrate. Expanded metal grating is slippery when wet and requires rubber matting for safety on ramps and docks. Neither the fibreglass panels nor expanded metal are safe for family uses like swimming and getting in and out of small boats - something regularly done by water access only residents because that is how we go visiting and sailing, kayaking, rowing, paddle boarding and canoeing, which are popular amongst most people on the water. These deckings will damage small boat bottoms as many of these small boats are pulled up on the dock and also stored on the dock or on racks above the dock, thereby creating shade. A dock during the summer is often a busy space with lots of family activities. Wood planks offer the best solution which is relatively safe in terms of non slip grip when wet providing the surface is pressure washed every year or two to keep the surface algae free. Families can walk bare foot on the wooden planks on a dock and also sit on the dock to get on or into small boats and crawl out of the boat and onto the dock when done. None of these things can be done on either the fibreglass panels or expanded metal decking. A wood plank decking can be lifted up board by board to access and adjust or replace shore and anchor lines as needed - an important point as docks and ramps may move over time, and adjustment can be made to keep the dock where it needs to be placed. Lines can also

be replaced as needed. The expanded metal and fibreglass panels are large and awkward to handle so won't allow a property owner to do this work easily or at all and getting contractors to do small jobs like this takes time and is costly - leaving the dock vulnerable.

There are ways of securing docks that haven't even been mentioned in Trust drafts that don't require pilings or anchors. Not suitable for all locations but being used successfully on Gambier by a number of people. Other simple solutions that can be done now at little expense is to wrap existing pilings at lowest tides of the year up to where the highest tides are. This allows marine growth much like on the bottom of docks that is habitat and herring will lay their eggs on the pilings and if the pilings are wrapped the eggs will hatch and this is contributing to the increase in whales, and other marine life in Howe Sound. Creosote pilings means the eggs are burnt by the creosote and die. Four people, some wrap and fasteners at low tide and again at high tide and it is done. We don't have to wait for these pilings to age out, some creosote will still be exposed but much of the potential damage is mitigated by wrapping the pilings. In protection for the marine environment, and dock installations, this is where I can see vast benefits from one size fits all zoning with regards to dock sizes, pilings, breakwaters and mooring buoys - all of which have an impact on our marine environment. The large the dock or breakwater, it is likely the damages will also be larger.

From our observations and experience, marine growth and the health of our waters has improved immensely since the log booms were removed, with the clean up of Britannia Mines' decades long leaching of arsenic and Wood Fibre and Port Melon operations. Further, what was clearly evident to anyone who paid attention was that during the heat dome of 2021 where we had low tides every day from morning to mid afternoon and unusually high air temperatures, every life form that couldn't move into shade or stay in the water died. Bivalves were cooked alive in their shells. Howe Sound and English Bay reeked of millions of dead mussels, limpets, barnacles, oysters and other bivalves and mollusks. The news was that marine researchers were foreseeing sea water catastrophes as these small mollusks filter and clean an astounding amount of water every day. Within 2 weeks of the start of the heat dome the rocks and beaches were bare - no live filter feeders remained - just empty shells. What happened, however, wasn't gloom and doom, nor were there any news articles about it - our dock, and other private docks with anchor and shorelines had offered plants and marine life shade throughout parts of the day and were in the water at all times. We have a healthy crop of seaweed, bivalves and water bugs that live in the protective environment on the underside of docks and the shorelines and anchor line and it was full of small fish. Small sponges and anenomes decorate our shorelines and anchor line. Sea stars, when we have them, will use shorelines to get to the mussels growing on the lines and underside of our dock - and we don't have open grid decking - we have wooden planks. Next came spawn in the water due to warm temperatures and 2 to 3 weeks later we had a thick layer of minuscule baby mussels growing on the rocks again - the entire foreshore of our property was deep blue/black with baby mussels. The mussels, oysters and clams had fully regenerated by the following spring. Instead of this picture spelling out disaster for our Howe Sound and coastal waters, it re enforced the resiliency of marine life in an unusual situation and suggested we have a fairly good balance. What would have happened if there hadn't been any docks covered in marine plants and other marine life to

restart new life while the water was warm and conditions ideal to reverse what could have been a catastrophe? Would the intertidal life have regenerated so quickly? Perhaps docks as they presently exist, aren't quite so bad after all, providing they are not too large nor too dense along the shoreline and not placed in sensitive areas.

We need to have comprehensive locally done studies over several years and better yet, on an ongoing basis to map kelp and eel grass beds and to know what areas of our intertidal zone need to be protected (better yet, the ocean conditions are changing so ongoing studies would inform us about ongoing impacts to marine life) just as we need studies as to the areas where archeological items have been found to date. While the conservancy has done several sessions of eel grass planting, no one has shared how well this has worked. The Trust should be following up on this as part of education and engagement of the public in this process. In a marina setting the open grid decking is okay although the expanded metal decking is slippery and has to be covered with rubber matting for safety on ramps and some docks, the result is light has to be blocked - using surfaces that are slippery or otherwise unsuitable will only result in them being covered for safety reasons and will reduce the amount of light able to get through to the water and seabed. Nor do these materials provide a full 43% of light transmission in the best case scenario because of the overlap of a ramp on the dock and the floatation underneath the dock. The fibre glass panel decking will slough off fibreglass particles though age and use, a negative result that we don't need to add to our waters. Regardless of the decking - in our latitude the sun will only penetrate these decking materials when directly overhead and when not blocked by other layers that are there out of necessity as part of the engineering of a safe dock and ramp installation. Local knowledge of other options is in place but has been missed or ignored by whomever is making the recommendations for this review. Where the shoreline is suitable, these options should be the preferred method for a private dock, but no one has asked the residents of Gambier what their recommendations are as should happen in an official community plan consultation process.
Private docks: usually approximately, 10 feet wide by 30 to 40 feet long to be large and stable enough for a group of people to disembark from a boat and for the dock to take deliveries of large items and heavy loads. The size and weight of the dock as well and how it is oriented to the shoreline, is also important in how secure and useable it is during rough weather is an important factor in safety. The requirement to have it perpendicular to the shore can put a dock in a position where is takes the brunt of waves so it is sometimes wiser/safer to have the dock oriented where it takes the waves head on rather than on the side for the security of the boats, safety of people who have to be on the dock, and to reduce how much the dock moves and works in heavy waves. Further, in an area where there are few, if any connecting roads, shared barge landing ramps are impossible without destructive road work - as are shared docks. For the south west peninsula to have 1 or 2 barge ramps to serve deliveries to most areas with a road network In water access only areas we have the choice of barge ramps or putting a barge into a beach at high tide. The trade off is simple in that while the barges are large and Gambier has mostly rocky beaches some mollusks may perish if a barge is brought into a beach or suitable solid rock shoreline but some also perish in winter storms with logs that have been lodged on the beach and

then get tossed around in the high tides and storm surge - a carefully placed barge won't do any long term damage when used infrequently and most households don't need frequent barge deliveries. A shared barge ramp and shared docks in roadless water access only areas, however, are not quite so simple especially on stand alone lots there are the damages and costs of putting in connecting roads to serve 2 or 3 households that last forever.

There are dock and breakwater installations on Gambier that are doing far more damage including the derelict West Bay dock which has exposed styrofoam billets (not wrapped) and missing skirting boards leaving the styrofoam buoyancy susceptible to being damaged by driftwood and setting free styrofoam chunks in the marine environment. For all the restrictions being considered for private property dock owners, the West Bay dock is both a danger and a disgrace and should be repaired, replaced or removed. Mooring buoys can cause the permanent loss of eel grass and boats anchoring can also do extensive bottom damage.

When considering the size of the dock, it is not only size, safety, permeable surfaces but some people live on Gambier and commute to work. Our dock is like our garage. We don't have access to the ferry, other than by boat. Two people commuting requires 2 commuter size boats in these cases. People commuting all year round need a larger boat to handle the rougher winter waters. There are so many flaws in the proposed policies that need to be remedied to make life workable in water access only communities. Knowledge from text books and studies need to be balanced with real life practicality and safety. If barge landing ramps are discouraged then docks, ramps and jetties may have to be larger to take the weight and size of small vehicles and trailers. Heavy equipment has to be delivered via beach or barge landing ramp. There is still much to be done to make the right and workable decisions to carry this OCP review forward successfully. All of this can be solved fairly quickly and easily with simple measures but none of these items have been addressed in the OCP draft material. There are other problematic installations and correcting these individual large installations will do more good than targeting private dock owners needing a private dock for a water access only property. There is a wealth of experience, skills and knowledge in any community but the Trust doesn't seem to have tapped into those people and is therefore missing some opportunities to find better local solutions.

Local meetings around the island could turn this process around to be friendlier - thus far, it has been a divisive process. Trustee Stamford has said that First Nations meetings were only 1 1/2 years - that may be the the time frame in which meetings have taken place, but more relevant information is how many hours have been spent with Trust staff and First Nations meeting? I suspect more hours than consultation efforts with residents of Gambier. Nor have residents been able to put forward their ideas and recommendations to balance out out the ideas and recommendations from First Nations. There are 3 partner groups in this process and each should have done visioning as to what they would like to see then collectively we could work through to consensus decisions.

Gambier Islanders are stakeholders in this process and the public in general feels like this is just another meeting to be rubber stamped through to the legislative finalization and that the Trust and First Nations won't be interested in making changes to the work that they have been doing over the past years without the input of islanders. Whether or not that is true, it is what islanders think to the point they cannot be bothered to even respond to questionnaires, let alone attend meetings or write letters. It is more difficult to change a perception once it has been formed. We don't get minutes from the APC meetings which is required by law when an APC committee is created. Where are the minutes? Why have they not been circulated? The Trust has many email addresses. Instead we get a meeting agenda a couple of days before but not how those items were discussed by the APC - essential information in my opinion. Engaging and informing the public is a basic tenant of what an OCP process about but this process has had no feedback with the results of the early questionnaires questionnaires and we never hear about how many people attend meetings in person or via zoom - just that it was well attended - that is too general and numbers count and should be reported. This information should all be in the minutes that are supposed to be shared with anyone who wishes them but we have not seen minutes from these meetings. Correspondence from the public: should be shared regularly as well - this is how you find out what people want and what they are concerned about. It is on the website. Had the process been that islanders worked with the Trust to update their vision of Gambier (as is done with all renewals of OCP plans as per the international and Canadian guidelines for community planning) and at the same time the First Nations could be developing their wish list and recommendations. Then the 2 plans would be put side by side and the process of critiquing finding commonalities and compromises would begin. Through discussions and consensus decision making between the 3 parties we could have updated our OCP through harmonizing the 2 (or 3) sets of plans adding in new materials dealing with climate change and Aboriginal rights and how to protect our forests and shorelines. Saying that now, near the end of years of talks, we are told it is now time for islanders to <u>finally</u> have their say. "Finally" is the word used by the Trust- not the word I would have chosen given the history of this process. This is not community planning or a real consultation process and it seems that it also isn't good enough to get people to participate on a regular basis and this is both sad and extremely unequal. Reconciliation is supposed to be about respect and understanding, and equal opportunities, and those opportunities should include the general public being treated openly and with transparency throughout the process including receiving minutes of all meetings on the planning process. The individual meetings with 1 group first and later the other group is divisive and doesn't generate engagement. People in the latter group are just expecting that all they can do is react to what the planners have assembled. That isn't real consultation and sharing of information.

My apologies for the length of this but it has been a long process and with numerous and unnecessary errors, delays and misconceptions - likely on both sides because of the lack of opportunities to participate. Community meetings around the remoter areas of Gambier have been offered to the Trust but not accepted. If Trustee Stamford doesn't know how to contact people in these communities, how does she know if they are interested or not and

whether they have, or can, provide an acceptable venue? Ask before giving up! The Trust sees this a challenge they cannot overcome but until we try, we don't know. Some residents feel this is something worth pursuing so as to help the process be more inclusive. Community meetings on Gambier should be planned for next spring and summer. Work on this process shouldn't go any further until then and Trustee Stamford has indicated nothing much will be done until the new year. Let residents work in the winter and spring with water access only communities to see if they have spaces to host a meeting for their immediate area and maybe some neighbours. Each community will be different out of necessity of potential number of people and space available. That is part of the uniqueness of Gambier which has, so far, been largely untapped in this process. Once we know if people are interested we can schedule meetings through the spring and summer (weekends may be necessary and it will likely vary) and of course there can be a meeting in New Brighton and should also be one in town with all the information and responses from the community to be updated. Please let me know if the Trust would like to meet in some water access only areas of Gambier, otherwise maybe some meetings in town would work over the winter, starting with sharing the minutes of all APC meetings. Perhaps space in the community centre above Horseshoe Bay and other lower mainland locations to facilitate different needs. Again, if we ask for suggestions, we may find spaces not thought of before.

Regards
Irene
Sent from my iPad