

From: Dan Rogers
Sent: Wednesday, June 1, 2022 4:58 PM
To: Paul Milley; northinfo
Subject: RE: Shoreline Protection proposals

Paul. I am quite perplexed by your message both in tone and content. I have somehow not managed to convey my intentions or messages clearly to you despite trying to do so.

I was not dismissing your comments but simply acknowledging that we have your commentary and point of view as input into our decision making. To the contrary, I specifically raised all of your points at our last LTC meeting to ask staff to look into them. My practice throughout my time as a Trustee has been to not respond to "input" (except acknowledgment) as I don't want to be seen as "arguing". I do respond when I think there is a mistake or misunderstanding or if something is inaccurate.

So I acknowledged your point of view and indicated I understood and I didn't need to reply to it. That is not dismissing it anymore than any others who write – as they do.

I did respond to a few points I thought might need clarifying. We had and continue to have discussions with the Keats community. But I don't think negotiate is the right term any more than any local government "negotiates" with communities about bylaws nor the provincial government. Maybe it is terminology. We take input and then it is up to us to make decisions

The relationship with First Nations is more formal. They have recognized rights to consultation embedded in the law and the Constitution.

I/we have heard you clearly on your view of the DPA. As I have said before, the concept was vetted quite thoroughly with the working group. And is common around not only the Trust but many many local jurisdictions. But I understand you and am not in any way dismissing your point of view.

Dan

From: Paul Milley [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, June 1, 2022 3:21 PM
To: Dan Rogers; northinfo
Subject: Re: Shoreline Protection proposals

Dan,

It's a bit disturbing to have much of my correspondence dismissed as "my point of view" and therefore not worthy of consideration. You asked for my suggestions and this is your response??? If you want feedback, I suggest you don't dismiss the feedback quite so quickly. On one line you claim that "regulations are not negotiable." Then on another line you indicate that you are in "discussions" with the indigenous community. Seems to me that proposed regulations are always "negotiable" or open for "discussion". Use whatever word you like. Again, I emphasize that the DPA concept is a huge step forward in controlling the waterfront environment. The rest of the proposed changes are just aggravations that will unnecessarily

complicate life and further undermine the relationship between Keats residents and the Islands Trust.

Paul Milley

On Wed, May 25, 2022 at 10:56 PM Dan Rogers <drogers@islandstrust.bc.ca> wrote:

Hi Paul. I realized I hadn't responded to your email although most of what is contained is your Point of View needing no specific response. Please see a few comments embedded.

Dan Rogers
Trustee, Gambier Islands Trust Area
Vice-Chair Islands Trust
drogers@islandstrust.bc.ca
604-220-1500

From: Paul Milley <[REDACTED]>
Sent: May 12, 2022 9:20 AM
To: Adam Anderson; Dan Rogers; Darren Gough; Glen Donaldson; Jessica Martin Dueck; Jim Burnham; Joshua Lepin; Mikael Bingham; northinfo
Subject: Shoreline Protection proposals

Dan,

In our telephone conversation a few weeks ago I committed to sending some suggestions on the current proposals. Since I'm not getting around to actually reviewing the draft proposal again I'm going to respond from memory.

My general reaction to the whole document is that it comes from writers who do not live on Keats Island and definitely do not rely on a waterfront float and dock to access their home. We are dealing with an island where many people have relied on waterfront access for their homes for many years so these changes become very personal. People will continue to rely on this access since they have no other means of getting to the homes they love. In addition, as people age and families grow they tend to want larger boats which require larger floats for moorage. If some changes need to be made, let's keep in mind that people live here and will continue to live here so make appropriate changes that don't just aggravate residents and instigate inappropriate behaviour. Let's make the changes moderate and appropriate.

Minimum distance between floats of 10 meters.

In the area around Keats Landing the average lot frontage is 50 feet. Irregular shorelines and rocks and shoals make it impractical to insist on 10 meters between floats. We could suggest a

minimum of 5 meters but this makes no sense since that does not create enough room to operate a boat. Most residents would like to have easy boat access to both sides of their float so they will naturally find an appropriate location depending on their neighbours and their shoreline. I'm not sure this regulation serves any helpful purpose but it will certainly not work in our area. I suggest removing it.

Maximum float size reduced by 45%

This seems like an arbitrary change and the huge reduction involved is aggravating. As mentioned earlier, people are trending to larger boats and will need larger floats. Reduce the maximum float size by 25% and this will draw much less reaction. **As you can imagine, while we take into account what people would "like" or want, (ie larger boats) we are mandated to preserve and protect the environment. We are trying to balance, this.**

The reduction for Keats Camp and Barnabas Landing is even greater (65%) and will have more impact on their operations. Such a large proposed reduction with no consultation with these organizations is insulting to them. **Keats Camp and Barnabas have had as much chance for input and consultation as anyone. I'm not sure what you mean by "insulting". Are you suggesting we should have singled out the two camps for discussion separately from the community at large? As it turns out I have met with a representative of Barnabas about this exact issue.**

Setback of 7.5 meters / Development Permit Area of 15 meters.

Most people don't understand that these are two different factors and many people will be surprised when they learn they must get a permit when they planned to build beyond 7.5 meters. If we are truly concerned about the shoreline I think these two regulations should be matched at 7.5 meters. That will be sufficient to avoid 95% of the inappropriate development on the shoreline. Making them different is overly complicated and will add to the aggravation people are already feeling over this proposal.

One more Permit Process.

It is only polite to give people more detail on how this process will work before these regulations are adopted. This process will not only involve more time and expense with professionals and the Islands Trust but I would like to know exactly what will be involved with the Indigenous approval process. This is a huge change and shouldn't be slipped in without much more effort to educate residents on what it will mean. So far any explanations make it sound arbitrary and poorly defined. If this process can't be clarified now then this proposal shouldn't be established until we all know just what is involved. **The First Nations approval process is coming in some form or another and is not something we can (or will try) to control. The process will be what it will be and I can't tell you what it will look like or what form it will take. Referrals to First Nations are common place particularly on foreshore issue given that there are historically so many connections with First Nations to marine areas. It will evolve in its own way regardless of what we put in place.**

Make it for Keats Island

It will take more time and energy but the customized end result will make it more acceptable. Recall the working group or advisory group and review these proposals line by line and listen to the feedback and accept negotiated regulations. Then you will have several more advocates and the Islands Trust needs more advocates on Keats. **Your request is on the public record and i will raise it at the LTC meeting but personally I don't see this being the way forward. Regulations aren't "negotiated". I am comfortable we have substantial community feedback and will got more as we head forward. I believe this is now a matter for consultation with the whole community including the Squamish Nation. If you haven't seen the suggestions from them ... they are more restrictive than what we have proposed. We have paused our consideration pending further discussions.**

Thanks for all your thoughts.

With respect

Paul Milley

██████████

██████████

Keats Landing

--

Paul Milley

Grandfather

--

Paul Milley

Grandfather