

After attending the meeting of "Keep The Trust" at the Kew & Williamson residence and listening to various viewpoints, I think I will be taking a practical approach to the mandate & scope (or lack thereof) of the REVIEW, and be an advocate for a solution, which might contribute to the final draft, after the REVIEW is finished.

The REVIEW as I see it, has been initiated by Trust Council in response to those who see the Trust as an impediment to getting control of Salt Spring affairs at the local level, and also to improve service delivery, especially on Salt Spring.

Although opinions of under representation, seem not to have much validity on other islands, I'm sure they are quite valid to some vocal Salt Springer's and appear to be valid to the casual viewpoint, of other S.S. islanders.

My opinion coincides with Trustee George Ehring's, that for various reasons two more Trustees on Trust Council will have more benefits, than drawbacks, when one thinks the matter through.

The cost of two extra Trustees is manageable and the workload on Salt Spring as described will be more equitable.

I for one, would not argue as to how the S.S. Trustees should spend their time on Island affairs, if they help in other aspects and other organizations, they should be commended for their volunteer efforts.

Actually their involvement strengthens the TRUST, as it shows for very little remuneration the commitment & calibre of the present two Trustees, and the good sense of the S.S. electorate.

I do not think it is feasible to increase the Trustees on other islands at this time.

Earlier I mentioned the lack of scope of the Review, by that I mean that surely there are other methods of governance in other jurisdictions, that could be examined for feasibility, and at some future date, an investigative task force could be struck.

In the meantime, as I am not familiar with the mechanism of setting up Regional Districts, of which there are twenty eight (28) in B.C. possibly there might be some solutions to the myriad problems on all the islands, if a study was done, we might be pleasantly surprised if in addition to the Islands Trust, we could have the " Islands Trust Regional District"

The "Islands Trust Regional District" could have many unthought-of benefits, chiefly taxation with representation on the whole BOARD.

Subject: Islands Trust - Governance

I will not be attending the “Open House” at the Gabriola Community Hall on May 5th and would like to submit the following to the LTC for consideration.

Island Trust Governance

A. Increasing the Number of Trustees on LTCs to lessen the work load

Trustees are decision-makers. The work load they face is primarily initiated by applications for rezoning and reviews of local planning policies. The actual work of Trustees is primarily focused on the reading and analysis of relevant information pertaining to those applications and planning reviews under consideration by the LTC. The information gathering is the responsibility of staff.

IMO increasing the number of Trustees on serving on LTCs will not lessen the work burden for individual Trustees at all. Four Trustees would be individually required to do the same amount of preparatory work prior to decision making as two Trustees do now.

The provincial government grant to Island Trust is ever decreasing and as the island populations grow the tax burden on the property owners and residents in the Islands Trust area is ever increasing. Currently taxpayers in the Island Trust area are responsible for financing both Islands Trust administration and Regional District administration, including salaries, benefits and expenses for two Trustees and one Regional Director. In terms of representation a simple comparison with taxpayers in B.C.'s other unincorporated areas demonstrates that Island Trust Area are already better represented than other unincorporated area taxpayers are. Other unincorporated areas have a single decision-maker and a single administration to finance. In the Islands Trust Area taxpayers are financing three decision-makers and two administrations.

Conclusion: The result of increasing the number of Trustees serving on LTCs would not only fail to meet the goal of lessening the work load of individual Trustees but it would also result in an increase in taxes.

B. Trustee NGO advocacy activity being passed off as Islands Trust work

Trustees are elected to make unbiased decisions for the benefit of their communities as a whole, within the context of the “preserve and protect” mandate. Although individual Trustees may be involved in NGO environmental advocacy activities IMO such involvement should cease when a resolution to receive an associated application is carried by the LTC.

If Trustees were to continue to “work with” such organizations while an application is under consideration by the LTC they may create an apprehension of bias. Moreover, it is the responsibility of staff to “work with” the public in regard to applications. And if and when Trustees usurp staff responsibilities by “working with” NGOs on applications they are in danger of fettering away their discretion and committing themselves to courses of action that can give rise to legal challenges.

Conclusion: Trust Council needs to develop an advocacy policy that clarifies the legal requirement for Trustees to avoid undertaking activities that could result in an apprehension of bias. Legally speaking Trustees must behave at all times as

unfettered, unbiased decision-makers, who are not committed to any particular courses of action pertaining to any application, while it is under consideration by the LTC.

C. Broad representation and influence from all sectors of the communities on the Island Trust decision-making process

Securing two “protect and preserve” nominees who will run for election to Islands Trust office is frequently problematic on most islands. Consequently it would seem that securing four “protect and preserve” nominees would be even more problematic.

Increasing the number of Trustees serving on LTCs is not IMO likely to result in more focus on achieving the mandate. The more likely result of having four Trustees could result in less of “protect and preserve” focus on decision-making than we currently have.

The faction that is least likely to be represented is the “growth promoting” sector of the Trust Area communities. This is not surprising given that their agendas are frequently at odds with the “protect and preserve” mandate and consequently, this sector is frequently unable to elect a single Trustee to office.

IMO the better way to accommodate broad representation and influence on the decision-making process by all sectors of the Island Trust Area communities is to reinstate elected Advisory Planning Commissions.

D. Representation on Trust Council

Currently there are 26 locally elected Islands Trustees on Trust Council and if each member were to address each item on the Trust Council agenda the quarterly meetings each session would likely extend to a week in length. Increasing the number of Trustees on the Trust Council would simply extend the length of quarterly sessions and the associated expenses.

Conclusion: I believe that increasing representative influence of islands with larger populations on decisions made at quarterly meetings Trust Council could be best addressed by weighting the votes of the Trustees in accord with the populations they are elected to represent just as is currently done on Regional District Boards.

E. Increasing remuneration for Trustees

This item is already within the purview of Trust Council.

F. Increasing the number of staff

This item is already within the purview of Trust Council.

G. Increased co-operation between the Islands Trust and Regional Districts

This item is already within the purview of both Islands Trust and the Regional Districts and is a statutory requirement expressed in the Islands Trust mandate. IMO quarterly meetings between LTCs and Regional Directors should be instated and where required memorandums of understanding between LTCs and Regional District Boards ought to be pursued.

Islands Trust Governance Review

As one of the island trustees elected very early in the life of the Islands Trust, I have watched the growing pressure on the Trust to become a developer's tool. By that, I mean more and more time is allocated to addressing various development proposals than is spent planning and implementing measures which promote the protection and preservation of islands in the Trust area, a concept based on *place*. As small-lot subdivisions proliferate, urban-oriented residents are attracted to these areas and they, in turn, demand more and more urban services and conveniences. As development intensifies, entire islands become predominantly urbanized and with urbanization comes the demand for the service and utilities management of a municipality. The focus shifts to individual entitlement rather than *place*.

Providing for more local trustees on Saltspring Island will not resolve the problem. In time the number of residents with an urban orientation will outnumber those with a rural orientation and with a commitment to the environment and social fabric of the island. Every small lot subdivision, every gated community has eroded the possibility of retaining the preserve and protect mandate. (I do want to emphasize that urban orientation is not directly correlated to the creation of small lots, but it is mostly the case.)

The governance options presently under consideration need to be seen in this context. If the preserve and protect mandate is to be salvaged, the sense of *place* must override considerations of population size, and the collective good of the environment and rural community must override that of individual entitlement. At the very least, this means retaining the status quo, because no matter how it is dressed up, the real issue on Saltspring is a large population of taxpayers who want more power over local decisions.

If Saltspring Island is too large a land mass to preserve and protect effectively, then the place could be separated into two (or three) local trust areas as suggested by Jenny Balke at the May 1st meeting on Denman Island. I had not considered such a possibility before coming to the meeting (which is an indication of my limited thinking). If a local trust area can have many islands under its jurisdiction, why cannot a significantly large island contain more than one trust area.

Delineating two local trust areas on Saltspring Island would require much thought and discussion but the result could resolve - really resolve- a number of issues. The creation of smaller governance areas would address concerns regarding fair representation of diversity and would produce a more manageable work load for trustees and office staff. In addition, smaller jurisdictions would facilitate community involvement both qualitatively and quantitatively. Nothing in the governance review mentions the effect of *place* on community involvement. For example, how do residents of Saltspring Island presently cope with the sheer number of issues and development proposals? How many development proposals are passively accepted because the proposal is insignificant when viewed against the backdrop wherein entire villages are orchestrated?

Please consider splitting of Saltspring into more than one local trust area. Opting for more trustees for Saltspring as a whole may be administratively relatively easy, but will likely be ineffective in terms of reducing trustee workload, representing diversity, preventing Saltspring from incorporating, enabling participatory democracy, and maintaining the Trust mandate.

On a lesser matter, I would urge the Trust to stay with a three trustee Local Trust Committee. The matter of quorum can easily be satisfied by the trustees talking to a variety of islanders with a result that is incomparably more representative of opinion. Further, if a trustee is in conflict of interest so often as to impair the functioning of the the LTC then that issue should be dealt with, not enabled. The use of one member from the Executive Committee as a third member whose focus is on the Trust area and Trust policy works well if that member fulfills the function. I have witnessed one LTC wherein the Executive Committee member acted and voted as if he were an elected local trustee for the area.

Finally (because there seems to be no mechanism for speaking to these issues), two critical matters need to be given priority by the Trust Council. One is the issue of the Province jettisoning its obligation to provide tax dollars to support an agency created and mandated by the province. As

the islanders pay more and more tax dollars to support the work of the Trust and as the province adds to the work load of the Trust by off loading additional Provincial obligations, the Trust is undermined. Islanders are paying more and getting less which undermines islanders' support for the Trust. The second priority is for the Trust to gain real control over the protection of the marine and fresh water environments in the Trust area. It is absurd to have the Trust mandated with preserve-and-protect when it is powerless to protect the core of the islands.

Thank you for giving residents the opportunity to become involved in the process of reviewing governance in the Trust area.

Re: Islands Trust Governance

My wife, Sue, and I own a small parcel of land on Saltspring Island which we've had for some 25 yrs or so. It was bought as recreational property and as we lived in Nelson at the time we vacationed there for a few weeks every summer with our children. Almost all our neighbors on the island were likewise recreational users of their properties and there was little if any impact on the environment. In the 90's property values took off, many of our neighbors sold out and permanent residents moved in giving the place a whole new atmosphere. Lots were clear cut, and holidaying there was no longer special. The environment and ecology of the gulf islands is very fragile and can not support the year around populations that live there now. Where we would gather clams and oysters now often reeks of sewage. Saltspring Island is forever changed.

The mandate of the Islands Trust is to preserve and protect the unique amenities and environment of the Islands. In this it has failed through no fault of its own. Once the land was subdivided long ago the die was cast. All that was left was for the Islands Trust to try to control development and mitigate its impacts as the islands filled with people. In that respect I believe the Islands Trust has had some success.

I am aware that there is a stigma attached to non resident property owners in general as they do not contribute to the sense of community etc. True that might be, but my understanding is that it is the sole object of the Trust to preserve and protect the islands for the benefit of all British Columbia as well as local residents. No mention is made of any mandate to consider social issues. Although non resident property owners pay for all the amenities and receive none of the benefits they do the most to preserve and protect the trust area and its unique amenities by simply not being there.

I have seen my property land taxes climb from \$93.72 in 1985 to \$753.68 in 2006. Throughout the same period there have been absolutely no improvements in any services (which are nil), and in fact the unique amenities of the island have declined considerably over this time. Granted, some may say that the increased property values compensate off island owners but bear in mind that we are subject to capital gains taxes unlike resident owners so for investment purposes it's not really been relevant. We own our property because of the enjoyment it brings us, although that enjoyment has been declining rapidly at the same time that taxes have increased steadily. These are the reasons our neighbors sold out over the years, not just for the profit taking, but primarily because of the declining ambience and increasing taxes. It's pretty difficult to rationalize owning a recreational lot that you use a couple of weeks a year when for the same money you pay in taxes you could take the kids to Disneyland. As more people want to come to the island, property values and taxes go up, pressuring landowners to sell for development, which requires more governance and infrastructure and increased taxes which in turn pressures more land owners to sell. Hand in hand with this development goes the destruction of the unique amenities and environment of the islands.

So what can be done? Well bearing in mind that off island recreation property owners have by far the least impact on the environment such ownership should be supported by the Islands Trust. As with certain forest lands and agricultural lands there should be tax incentives for off island owners to keep their lands undeveloped or kept for seasonal use. One suggestion is to freeze taxes at current levels (or lower) for all non resident owners until such time their lands may be developed. Requiring restrictive covenants that effectively sterilizes the land for any future development in exchange for any tax relief is somewhat onerous.

Governing the Islands Trust area through a council made up of only on island residents would seem counter intuitive considering that the Islands Trust mandate is to govern for the benefit of the entire province, as well as the local residents. The best analogy I can think of is what would

happen if the ALR lands were governed by local municipalities or by only representatives that owned such lands? If anything the Islands Trust should be at arms length from local residents. Planning and development should be carried out by local governments within a framework set and enforced by the Islands Trust on behalf of all the citizens of British Columbia, much like say developments within a park. That framework should clearly identify what it is within the Trust Area the Trust is seeking to preserve and protect, clearly identify the unique amenities it seeks to preserve and how all this is to be carried out. As Provincial legislation is paramount to that of local districts you have the unique opportunity to have a real impact on development within the Islands Trust area. I suggest the Islands Trust restructure along the lines of the Agricultural Land Commission, do away with local elected representatives, become more focused and effective, and perhaps by so doing, even save us all a bit in taxes.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments

Subject: Response to Governance Review

1974. I attended the GTF meeting at our Community Hall on May 4, and I have these further thoughts.

The Islands Trust Governance Review Report by Nielson-Welch says a few things that I don't agree with. Throughout, it asserts that large communities typically generate higher volumes of core planning work for LTCs, and that the large volume of LTC work makes it difficult for some trustees (presumably those from Salt Spring Island) are unable to participate fully at Trust Council meetings.

I don't understand what would make the Trustees unable to fully participate at Council meetings. Surely they can schedule four three-day meetings each year, no matter how busy they are in their LTC work. This is never explained. I note that one of the SSI trustees is able to participate in the Trust Governance Task Force.

It is far from clear and obvious that increasing the number of trustees would make for more efficient sharing and decrease of the workload. I am fairly sure that more support from planners and others in the Trust office would be just as useful, and probably more useful, in reducing the workload.

On page 12, as a closing comment on the size of LTCs, the Report says "a larger population typically contains a broader diversity of perspectives and positions to represent than does a smaller one".

I don't think this is at all true. On an island with fewer than 500 people, there will be one or two people with views (on nearly every topic) that are very extreme. The main difference is that on an island with more than 5,000 people, there will be larger numbers of people with such views, and there is a much greater likelihood that they will organize and be active and gather more members, and thus will have more influence and need more time and attention. This is true for all sorts of issues and topics. It's not a bad thing. It's just different.

On more heavily populated islands, there are more participants in discussions, and more active organizations that request or demand trustee attention. The actual land use planning process is very similar, and lots of work can be done by IT staff, and local committees and volunteers working with them, to formulate and update community plans and land use bylaws. More trustees might make it a bit less work for each, but it might not.

Having two more trustees from SSI (or any other island) looks particularly odd when, if they subsequently incorporate, they will revert to two trustees.

I strongly prefer the equal representation that we have had all along. I think that it is an important principle, and we should stick with it.

I am sure that ways other than increasing the number of trustees can be found to reduce the local workload on trustees. I hope that some ways can be found to make it possible for trustees to informally discuss problems, ideas, procedures, etc.

As for increasing cooperation and coordination between SSI and the CRD, I would support increasing the informal ties and processes, sharing office space if appropriate, and having specific agreements and protocols as needed. I encourage and support sharing, cooperation and coordination, but don't support institutional changes until all informal methods are explored and used, and institutional changes seem necessary.

Thanks again.

Finally, I would like to thank the Task Force for holding meetings. I particularly appreciate it that Kim Benson and Linda Adams came to Lasqueti. The eight or nine people who attended might seem small, but I think it was important and useful. I am particularly glad that they brought printed documents for us to have. It is very slow and cumbersome to download documents, particularly with graphics, from the web site.

Governance and the Gulf Islands

Discussions on governance would do well to comprehend that there are two very different foundational 'archetypes' for governance. They are sometimes illustrated by way of analogy with a bacon-and-egg breakfast, where 'the breakfast' is the satisfying result being sought which one can contribute to in two ways, that of the chicken that contributes her egg and that of the pig who 'puts her skin in the game'. There is an important 'systems effect' between these two approaches; i.e.

1. Pig Governance: - when one puts one's skin in the game, there is no separation between authority and responsibility (this is the 'way' of the exceptionally performing team and community)
2. Chicken Governance: - when one supports or invests in the community/team operation from arms length. This arm's length 'authoring' or 'authorizing' of the joint effort splits apart 'authority' and 'responsibility' (for implementing the desired scheme). This splitting of authority and responsibility is the classic source of dysfunction in organizations since in the event of failure, those in 'authority' can always argue that those responsible for implementing the 'authorized plan' were incompetent, and those responsible for implementation can always argue that the 'authorized plan' they were responsible for implementing was impossible.

The dysfunction that comes from the splitting apart of authority and responsibility is common in government (governance systems) and is sometimes referred to in the context of the difference between 'representative democracy' (Chicken governance) and 'participative democracy' (Pig Governance). In the US, the representatives of Congress, which authorizes such stuff as wars, have no children in the military (the military commonly recruits youth whose families cannot afford to send them to university or trades schools, on the basis that the military will give them a secondary education that will help them make a living). The 'authorities' can thus launch ventures that those 'responsible for implementing' will never be able to implement, and it is common for politicians to fire generals for their failure to accomplish what to the authority was an excellent plan. The split between 'responsibility' and 'authority' invites 'authority' to authorize plans that go where angels fear to tread since it is only those responsible for implementation that have to go there (Vietnam where the French were defeated, Afghanistan where the Russians were defeated, Iraq where the authorities claimed they would have a heroes welcome when they removed the evil dictator Saddam Hussein).

That these two types of governance systems have very different exposures to dysfunction is everywhere evident. Currently 'Islands Trust' governance only minimal administrative machinery, so that the people who are authorizing the governance are the same people who are responsible for implementing it; i.e. they 'keep their skin in the game'. When conflicting viewpoints emerge in the community, it is often the case that some prefer, instead of 'working through it' in Pig mode, ... and being so convinced that 'their views are the correct views' (i.e. that they are the wise ones in the community and they must take control so as to protect the many fools from shooting the whole community in the foot), argue for more powerful administrative and regulatory machinery that will be 'responsible' for implementing the wise plans of the 'authorities'. This, in effect, splits apart 'authority' and 'responsibility' since it will no longer be the common communitarian that both authorizes and is responsible for implementation, as the responsibility for implementation shifts to the bolstered administrative and regulatory machinery. The wise ideas of the authority will no longer be critiqued as 'unfeasible', 'impractical' or 'impossible'; instead, problems will be blamed on the government machinery responsible for implementation, ... and the police chief may be fired by the politicians for not having sufficient riot police to keep the growing number of fools in the community whose mental capacities do not allow them to see the wisdom in trickle-down Reaganomics etc. from rioting and damaging the business property of the communities wisest members ('wisdom' tends to be measured in proportion to accumulation of wealth)..

Now, insofar as an individual believes that there are 'wiser' and 'more foolish' IDEAS-IN-THEMSELVES, out of the context of the sustaining of harmony in the community (community harmony is demoted to a secondary consideration), and that, for the good of all, such wise ideas must be imposed on the community, ... he/she is going to believe in the need for a strong administrative and regulatory governance structure that will be 'responsible' for implementing the wise ideas of the governing authority. This shift from Pig to Chicken governance can be the fallout in a community where factions develop as to the vision for the community (e.g. slow development, rapid development etc.).

* * *

Now, unbeknownst to many, this 'difference' in how one participates in sustaining a harmonious community dynamic (or sustaining order in the community as in Chicken governance) goes all the way back to Galileo Galilei and his 'heresies' one of which was his disagreement with Aristotle who claimed that bodies fell to earth with a speed proportional to their density (Aristotle approximated space as a viscous medium) while Galileo claimed that bodies fall to earth all with the same speed (Galileo approximated space as a vacuum).

Our real-life experience is that Aristotle was 'more right' than Galileo; i.e. a light, low density object will fall to earth more slowly than a heavy dense object. Galileo argued that this would no longer be true in a vacuum, in the absence of viscous air, ... but of course, viscous air 'is there' in real-world dynamical behaviours, and there is no such thing as a vacuum (we can only reduce the viscous resistance of the medium, we cannot eliminate it). Still, our schools have 'vacuum chambers' that approximate the unattainable-in-the-real-world 'vacuum' that demonstrates how a feather and a ball bearing fall pretty much at the same rate.

The space of our real-life experience is nothing like a vacuum chamber, so where was Galileo trying to take us, or better, where DID Galileo take us, with the supplementary assistance of Isaac Newton?

Now, how does this 'tie back' to the opening discussion on 'Pig' (integrated authority and responsibility; i.e. 'skin in the game') and 'Chicken' governance (splitting apart of authority and responsibility so that authority associates failure with incompetency in the ranks of those responsible for implementation, and associates success with the wisdom of their ideas rather than to the skills of those responsible for implementation, ... and conversely, where those responsible for implementation associate failure with the unfeasibility of the plans coming from authority, and associate success with their ability to turn a sow's ear idea into a silk purse implementation). .

The tie-back is by way of the foundational notions embodied in 'regulation'.

For regulation to be 'definitive' and 'explicit', it must rid itself of the particularity that comes from real-world situations (spatial-relationships). What Galileo did was to 'vacuum pack' the dynamics of material objects so as to remove the particularities that associate with the accommodating/resisting backpressure of the space that the objects/organisms are situationally included in. What this does is to invest all of the dynamical aspect into the behaviour of the objects (as if these dynamics of objects were playing out within a vacuum [otherwise known as 'euclidian space']) and to ignore the participation of the dynamical commonspace that, in real-life, inductively actualizes and shapes the outwelling of creative and productive behavioural potentials.

The only way to formulate definitive, universally applied laws, is to use the 'vacuum packed space' model of Galileo and Newton so that the particularity presented by the accommodating/resisting quality of the dynamical space we are situationally included in, is something we can ignore; i.e. the feather does fall slower than the ball bearing depending on the particular accommodating quality of the space it is situationally included in. the feather may fall to the bottom of the ocean somewhat faster than the metal submarine that is slightly negatively buoyant.

Clearly, the particulars of the dynamics of space the dynamical object is situationally included in will have an over-riding influence on 'what transpires'. The genius idea of the corporate authority to sell a new honey-baked ham product cannot ignore the particularity of the dynamical space the sales effort is situationally included in (e.g. its Muslim relative to non-Muslim composition).

Still, it is an attractive proposition to generalize dynamical behaviour by way of definitive rules/laws and it is for this reason that both Galileo and Newton resorted to 'vacuum packing' 'material object dynamics' (imposing the convention of absolute, empty, euclidian space). Without this simplifying imposing of a the euclidian space (vacuum packing) convention, the particularities that arise from real-life situational inclusion in space dominate; i.e. they do dominate in real-life but as henri poincaré observes, we allow the definitive, universal laws we have formulated (by way of simplifying approximation) to 'correct our experience', and it by this correction that we say 'bodies fall to earth at the same speed regardless of their relative mass', ... and that we say; 'the respective sales performance facts prove that this ham salesman is superior to that ham salesman', out of the context of the particulars that associate with their respective situational inclusion in a dynamical community space.

This 'vacuum packing' goes deep into the foundations of our popular scientific thinking. In fact, it is embodied in Darwinian evolutionary theory and in the 'machine model' of man. For example, it can be found in the thinking of influential biologists such as Edward O. Wilson;

"People, after all, are just extremely complicated machines," ... "an organism is a machine." --- Edward O. Wilson

Darwinian evolution is a device whereby this simple (vacuum packed dynamics) science can seem to explain the complexity of community dynamics and yet stay with the prescriptive machine model; i.e. we introduce competition amongst machines as a fix for the overly constraining foundations of vacuum-packed science in terms of prescriptive machinery). that is vacuum-packed science needs a device to 'blur' the prescriptive machine-like determinism of its foundational model. As Wilson says;

"I concede that the very expression 'genes to culture', as the conceptual keystone of the bridge between science and the humanities, has an ethereal feel to it [too bad Wilson didn't 'run with this theme']. How can anyone presume to speak of a gene that prescribes culture? The web of causal events comprising gene-culture coevolution is more complicated [than genes prescribing culture. Thousands of genes prescribe the brain, the sensory system, and all the other physiological processes that interact with the physical and social environment to produce the holistic properties of mind and culture. Through natural selection, the environment ultimately selects which genes will do the prescribing."

First Wilson 'blurs the prescriptive determinism' in the system by invoking the notion of simultaneous prescription by thousands of prescriptive agents, and then puts the determinism back in by way of nature selecting which genes will be endowed with the operative dynamical behaviour-prescribing powers, ... a game of smoke and mirrors, to be sure, ... but a necessary type of game for vacuum-packed science to try to play, to get itself out of the hole it has put itself in by starting off with vacuum-packed machinery ('organisms as machines operating in empty euclidian space') as the foundational explanation for nature's dynamics.

So what was wrong with 'ethereal feel'? Does our real-life experience not make us aware of an ethereal feel, inviting us to partake of the space-based possibilities in which we are situationally included? Vacuum-packed science prefers to stick with prescriptive, deterministic material dynamics in vacuum packing not only because of its secure definitiveness but also because using such simple models help us 'get things done' (help us with our productive achievements). That is, vacuum-packed science would be of immense help to accomplish a project that involved cutting

down every tree on the planet earth (perhaps to build everyone a home, or whatever). What a difficult challenge that would be, but mankind, working together, with the help of science and technology, could achieve this if everyone worked together on it. After all, vacuum-packed science is all about what things do to other things within a scenario that characterizes space as emptiness populated by independently existing objects/organisms with their own internally originated behaviours. Trees, according to vacuum-packed science, are such items and forests are also vacuum packed collectives of independently existing organisms.

But what a different 'understanding' would result if we, as vacuum-packed science and definitive universally applied law worshippers, were to acknowledge as truth, that the invisible energy-flow-field was the mothering stuff of trees in the manner that the atmospheric energy-field-flow is the mothering stuff of hurricanes, ... that trees are not really the independently existing organisms that vacuum packed science imputes them to be. In this case, we would understand that 'trees' are not 'independently-existing objects out there in vacuum-packed space' but that our tree cutting project amounted to our meddling with the very stuff we and trees and all things in nature are made of, the energy-field-flow, otherwise known as the dynamical commonspace of nature. Such is the implication of vacuum-packed science's substituting a non-participating vacuum for the dynamical participating space of our inclusional experience.

Who is it that prefers to ignore the particulars of our situational inclusion in a common dynamical space, and to build this into our governance schemes?

The vacuum-packed science of Galileo and Newton (very different from relativity and quantum wave dynamics) with its definitive and universally applied laws that ignore the particularities of situational inclusion in a dynamical, participating space, goes hand in hand with the 'authoritative' function of Chicken governance. The authority in the corporation tends to stick with his 'genius idea' out of the context of the particulars of situational inclusion in a dynamical space that is experienced by those responsible for implementing the 'genius ideas'. The 'responsibles' understand that it is 'their skin in the game' and 'their skin only' and the 'authorities', many of them, may live their lives without ever finding themselves in the crunch between a rock (the wise idea of authority) and a hard place (the resistive quality of the dynamical space one is situationally included in).

The definitive, universally applicable laws of Newton and Galileo, by virtue of imposing vacuum-packing to get rid of the cumbersome particulars of the real world, the accommodative/resistive backpressure quality of the dynamical space that idea-implementation transpires in, have a certain elegance that gives the impression of perfection and correctness. But as we full well know, they cannot be 'more correct' than the reality of our real-life experience which refutes the notion that 'bodies fall to earth at the same speed regardless of their mass'. We do not live in a vacuum, ... we live in a dynamical, participating space that presents to the outwelling of our creative and productive potentials, an accommodating (more receptive or more resistive) backpressure, and there is thus no way to realistically re-render dynamics in terms of 'what independently existing objects do', out of the context of the particulars of the situational inclusion within the dynamical commonspace of community and nature.

Right now, in the Gulf Islands, we have light Pig style governance that works by, to a large extent, avoiding the splitting up of 'authority' and 'responsibility' as comes with heavier administrative/regulative machinery. The ordinary citizen is both 'authority' and 'responsible' at the same time; he is in Pig mode rather than Chicken mode. Insofar as we can keep conflict from splitting us into factions that have us see 'those others' as 'fools' and 'ourselves' as 'wisemen' (the others, embracing the reciprocal view), then we can keep on working out the issues in Pig mode. But if a large enough faction does develop, that has this belief in the absolute correctness or wisdom or genius of their ideas, irrespective of the accommodating backpressure implementers may experience in the dynamical space of local community they are situationally included in, then they may opt for governance that employs stronger administrative/regulatory machinery in order to

brute-force the 'correct', 'wise' or 'genius' ideas and overcome the accommodating backpressure of 'those fools' who are unable to see the 'correctness', 'wisdom', or 'genius' in the ideas.

Community is not simply 'machinery' orienting to 'what we make happen' and it is therefore not simply about 'wise ideas' or 'correct ideas' or 'genius ideas' in the realm of 'making things happen'.

That is simply the 'vacuum-packed' view of community dynamics, but community is about 'place' and 'space' and the quality of space. As McLuhan said, it is not the machinery and what it does that is important (it matters less whether it makes Cornflakes or Cadillacs), but how the mechanical implementations induce changes in our relationships amongst ourselves and with the dynamical space we share inclusion in. If its productive accomplishment we are after, we can cut down all the trees on earth and make good use of them, but productive accomplishment is something that comes from vacuum packed science and it says nothing of the inherent interdependence between 'what we do' and the dynamics of the space we are included in. That was what we (Galileo and Newton) left out in order to get to those elegant, definitive, universally applicable laws pertaining to 'what independently-existing things do in empty, non-participating (vacuum-packed) euclidian space'.

The machine view (vacuum-packed view) of organisms including the human organism (as created in Darwin's theory) allows us to see ourselves and our communities as 'independently existing machinery' and in this view, governance equates to 'keeping the machinery running correctly' (or 'wisely' or 'brilliantly' or 'more competitively'). This doesn't work simply because, vacuum-packed abstraction aside, the reality is that we live within a common dynamical space and it makes no sense for us each to 'do our own thing' as if we were 'independent', neither on an individual basis within the common space of local community, nor on a national basis within the common space of global community.

The more that the inevitable conflicts broil up from this vacuum-packed thinking dysfunction, the more that those 'in authority' want to take control and impose the 'correct ideas' (toughen up the administrative and regulatory machinery) and the more that those responsible for implementing the 'correct ideas' feel the backlash in terms of the accommodating backpressure of the dynamical space the implementers are situationally included in, become more strongly resistant. The continuing split between 'authority' and 'responsibility' allows those in 'authority' to assume that the resistance to their 'correct ideas' is the product of foolishness or other forms of irrationality (hatred, evil) and that any failure to implement these 'correct ideas' will be due to incompetence in those responsible for implementation (a growing regulatory, and ultimately police and military force).

My vote is to recognize that the vacuum packed formulations of dynamics in terms of definitive universally applicable laws, a la Galileo and Newton, are not suitable for a primary role in 'governance', and that the organizing principle for community should be the sustaining of harmony within the shared commonspace of community and nature, rather than the machine paradigm organizing principle of 'keeping the machinery of community running correctly' and assuring this by way of strong administrative/regulatory machinery.

In the non-vacuum-packed theory of relativity and quantum wave dynamics, the connection shows up (which is evident to our real-life inclusional feeling experience and vitally important to the development of our self-governing) whereby the dynamics of the space we are included in inductively actualize and shape the developing of our creative and productive potentials.

Participation in this reciprocally complementary spatial-relational dynamic can only come in Pig mode of governance. Chicken mode demotes direct participation to implementation by a third party, the administrative/regulatory machinery and thus brings on the dysfunctional splitting between authority and responsibility.

Oink oink for keeping our skin in the game via the Island's Trust low-machinery (low authority-responsibility splitting) governance approach!

Dear Sir, Madam,

In response to your invitation to express ones opinion on the subject of "Excellence in Governance", I would like to contribute a suggestion which might be beneficial to this effect.

In every human society there used to be a council of the "Elders" who, through lifetime of experience were able to express their opinions on matters of Governance.

Those people, who went through hardships, hard work, maybe success or even failure,

I would like to see the older people of this Island, who have made their living here most of their lives, to be able to give their opinions and views on matters of Governing.

A group of seniors (who have lived & worked here and did the groundwork) to form an opinion, without being politically involved or even known who they are, to have an input on decision making on our Islands.

Please consider this suggestion

After consideration and gleaning what information I can, I see that the Governance Review is addressing the mechanisms of governance, not the fundamentals of governance. I would recommend to the Islands Trust that, before addressing the mechanisms, it is logical that the Islands Trust ensure that the fundamentals of governance are on a firm footing. Unfortunately, they are not. The Islands Trust is deeply flawed in that it is designed to address goals and objectives that are unachievable, no matter how much regulation they put forth.

The Islands Trust must accept and understand that environmental change is inevitable. They must accept and understand that, for any given growing site, there are a number of valid ecosystems, and that it is mother nature, and not Islands Trust regulations, that will decide what ecosystem shall exist on the site at any time. To think otherwise is unwarranted arrogance. The Islands Trust, simply cannot, as much as it may try, "stop the clock" and maintain the environment exactly as it is right now. That goal is absolutely unachievable. Adherence to this concept of preservation is laughable, and more and more people are seeing it to the detriment of the Islands Trust.

The Islands Trust has a very narrow, focused, view of governance. This will be its downfall. The narrow focus of the Islands Trust has created a political vacuum in that, to the best of my knowledge, there is no governing body charged with addressing and promoting the economic and social wellbeing of the people of the islands. Change in the political arena, as well as the environmental arena, is inevitable. The Islands Trust would be well advised to embrace the promotion of the economic and social wellbeing of the people of the islands, while also sensibly maintaining the constantly changing landscape and rural nature of the islands. This should be the fundamental basis of governance. To not do so will increase the view that the Islands Trust has become tyrannical and a nuisance.

Therefore, I advise the Islands Trust to admit that its current objectives are unachievable and set new objectives that are achievable. I advise the Islands Trust to embrace a broader "mandate" and abandon the narrow, unworkable, mandate it has right now. It must abandon the concept that draconian regulation alone will be sufficient to achieve unachievable objectives. If the Islands Trust does not have the courage, or is unwilling to do so, I would think that the Islands Trust will become redundant making way for a new "governance" that will address and promote the economic and social wellbeing of the people of these islands while also maintaining the ever changing landscape and the pleasant rural nature of the islands.

EXCELLENCE IN GOVERNANCE SURVEY

WORKBOOK MAY 07

PART 1 - NO ANSWERS - SEE PART 3

PART 2 -

MORE LOCAL TRUSTEES ARE NEEDED
IN MORE POPULOUS LOCAL TRUST
AREAS



PART 3 - I THINK IT IS POSSIBLE
TO HAVE EACH ISLAND REPRESENTED
AS A REGION EQUALLY AND ALSO
HAVE REPRESENTATION BASED ON
POPULATION - THIS APPLIES TO
ALL YOUR "PRINCIPLES" AND "OPTIONS"

I LIVE ON HORNBY ISLAND VORIZO

THE WORKBOOK WAS HELPFUL BUT
THE ANSWERS WERE TOO LIMITING

RE: Governance Task Force Review

Islanders for Self-Government wish to respond to the recent release of the Governance Task Force Review paper by Allan Neilsen-Welch. This report formed part of the presentation on Salt Spring on Sunday, April 29th, by yourself, and chair of the Trust, Kim Benson. We are doing so under our mandate (www.islandgov.org):

≈ To Campaign for the Incorporation of Salt Spring Island as a Municipality.

≈ To Liase with local elected officials, Provincial Government Officials, and organized groups in an effort to educate Islanders on the benefits of self-government.

In our view the present Local Trust Committee, and possibly most of Trust Council have a strong aversion to the idea of municipal government for Salt Spring under the preserve and protect mandate of the Islands Trust, to the point where they have not included this possibility within the framework of the NW report.

1) The Islands Trust is a trust for the sole purpose of preserving and protecting the Trust area. It is not a local government designed to provide services to residents of the Trust area, and has no legal mandate to do so.

2) Trust Council, and its members have clearly defined and limited roles. The Trustees are elected locally, but do not represent local residents. They represent the Trust as a whole.

Page 2/Governance Task Force Review

May 6, 2007

3) The legislation limits each Trust island electoral district to two Trustees because it believed that this would best serve the goals of the Trust.

4) In 1990, an amendment to the original act allowed for the incorporation of municipalities within the Trust area. This amendment recognized that the population of certain islands was growing to the point that local government was desirable to reflect the diversity of viewpoints in a larger community and to provide the services they needed and requested.

5) The Salt Spring Trustees have ventured into what the Governance Review call “non-core activities” for which they have no legal mandate. This is taking up an increasingly larger percentage of their time and they are therefore calling for the enlargement of Trust Council by two additional members. The NW report however states that much of the alleged overwork could be

eliminated by greater efficiency at the Trust office and the restriction of their activities to their legal mandate.

6) The Trustees have advocated greater integration and information sharing with the CRD. There is nothing restricting information-sharing in areas of common concern presently, but complicating the interface further with more infrastructure is non-productive and leads to further unnecessary expense.

7) In response to the NW report, the Trust has posted a survey on its website and in printed form that clearly illustrates the non-acceptance of diverse viewpoints. The online version cannot be completed unless you agree with their viewpoint. There is no provision for other points of view, because you cannot proceed to make individual comments unless you mark all the boxes.

In summary, Islanders for Self-Government do not support the current options for governance renewal that are being suggested. Our view is that they negate the original intent of the legislation which set up the Trust in 1974, and which was revised in 1990 to allow for the incorporation of islands as their populations increased. Doubling the number of Trustees for Salt Spring, would in effect double the costs associated with running the Trust office on Salt Spring. And in the meantime, the voters of Salt Spring would not have local, effective governance.

Page 3/Governance Task Force Review

May 6, 2007

Islanders for Self-Government believe that incorporation of Bowen Island, with half the population of Salt Spring, has been successful and cost effective. We would like to hear officially from the Trust Council Executive their views on the current governance on Bowen, and why a similar structure would not work for Salt Spring Island.

We look forward to your response to our concerns. In closing we would like to affirm the hard work that our local Trustees perform on behalf of our island, and we applaud Trust Council in trying to address these issues. But in effect, the most obvious option for Salt Spring, incorporation, has not been addressed by the Governance Task Force.

Subject: "Towards Excellence in Governance"

I just read your information sheet as it arrived at our mail box on Dolphin Road, Sidney after we left for 2 weeks holidays on April 24th. This didn't provide an opportunity to attend the Salt Spring open house on April 29th.

I was fascinated to see that you addressed my wife and I, plus others on Piers Island as "non-residents". I assume this is because we have no mail delivery here but pick up our mail on Dolphin Road, Sidney, from a mail box beside the ferry terminal. Yet another reason why we feel alienated by the Islands Trust. My wife and I have owned our property on Piers Island for 31 years and have been full time residents for the past 5 years.

If Piers Island must be associated with the Islands Trust it should be under the North Pender Island Local Trust Committee and NOT Salt Spring Island.

Our impression is that Salt Spring is mainly focused on issues concerning Salt Spring and hardly knows we exist. Reading your web site, I see that Knapp Island, (within spitting distance), Pym Island (immediately adjacent), Coal Island, and even Arbutus Island which is immediately to the West of us, are all associated with North Pender. Why must we be governed by Salt Spring? We have absolutely nothing in common with Salt Spring. We have no ferry service, no commercial development, no further subdividing can occur, no policing, a small volunteer Fire Department, no paved roads, no medical, no government services at all, and yet you assume we are like Salt Spring. Ideally, all 'small' Gulf Islands with no ferry service etc should be under a separate Trust Committee.

We have a lot more in common with each other than with Salt Spring. The current situation is not 'Excellence in Governance'.