

Zoom Meeting Notes from auto-transcribing service

New Brighton Dock June 26 2020

Danny Tryon President Gambier Island Community Association (GICA)- chairperson

Attendees:

Federal: MP Patrick Weiler, Morgan McCullough, Executive Assistant; **Province:** MLA Nicholas Simons, Kim Tournat – MLA Simons assistant; **SCRD:** Mark Hiltz, Area F Director, Lori Pratt, Chair SCR D, Ian Hall, General Manager – **Islands Trust:** Dan Rogers, Trustee, Kate-Louise Stamford, Trustee, Sonja Zupanec, Planner; **GICA Directors** – Danny Tryon and Brian Thorpe; Bruce Kerr, Kona Winds owner, **Community Members:** Bruce Pollock, Joe Wright, Michelle Hughes, Jamie McJannet, Sarah McJannet, Camilla Berry, Barb Miklashek, Erik Pawson, Paco Cauley:

The Squamish Nation representatives and Squamish Nation Marine Group were invited to this meeting but were unable to attend.

Introduction: We acknowledge with respect the Coast Salish peoples on whose traditional territory we are meeting electronically today. We value the historical relationship to the land, culture, and spirit of this place that continues to this day.

Thank you To Kate Stamford for inviting and coordinating the attendees on behalf of GICA

1) Purpose of this meeting: Kate Stamford:

The First Nations have stated that there are timelines that need to be achieved to accomplish the correct outcomes and a reply as soon as possible is needed. The perspective is that we are going to supply the Squamish Nation with options in how they might deal with this facility. Our framework for this meeting should be how do we supply them with those options.

2) Community Perspective from Danny Tryon President of GICA

Although there are other docks on Gambier Island, this dock is the most integral one to the well being of the community.

- **We need this dock to remain open to the public and serve the purposes it has traditionally done over the past decades.**
- There was a reason this dock was built here over a 100 years ago to service the needs of the island. Its location is sheltered from most winter storms and allows for the most direct route to the mainland.
- It has served as a dock for BC ferries and is a vital part of the transportation infrastructure to bring people, supplies including food, and necessities to

the island. This has become more important in the time of COVID as food transportation has been organized to allow for less physical travel.

- The dock services mostly the SW Peninsula, consisting of 125 full time residents, 300 recreation lots which can see an increase in people on the island to over 500 in peak times. Recent road additions have expanded its availability to people living in the center of the island.
- It is the major egress for people catching the ferry and for school children to attend classes and residents to attend health care appointments
- It allows emergency responders to attend and even remove people from the island.
- It has been the site of children's fishing derbies
- Boaters use it for commercial and private docking
- Our parking infrastructure has been coordinated around the use of this dock as no other area on the island allows for parking.

The Community Association believes that **this dock must remain open to the public** and future use or ownership of this dock requires consultation with the taxpayers and residents who live on this island which did not occur when the dock was divested in 2013.

3) Islands Trust:

Trustee Stamford: The Islands Trust is a planning authority and zoning authority for the W2 zone for this dock. We control zoning for this dock as well as the other docks. The Trust helps develop the official community plan and is involved with the advocacy policies. However, the Islands Trust does not have a specific role in the dock per say. **Trustee Rogers:** Keats Island has public docks which were part of the original divestment in 2001 and therefore we have our own communication conversations around those docks. They are SCRD docks. I can just confirm what trustee Stanford said which is that the Trust has no ability legal or otherwise to hold public property of this type like a dock or any other kind of community property.

Comment- Michelle Hughes: I just wanted to make a quick addition to what Danny had said about the use of the dock and its importance to the people who live here. This dock is very important for people who commute to work and live on the island because the island provides

<https://d.docs.live.net/143d93475e36e124/Documents/New Brighton Dock Zoom Meeting Notes June 26 2020.docx>

affordable accommodation. So, this dock is something that allows us to live here and work on in Gibsons and the Sechelt area and that is very important to allow us an affordable place to live.

4) SCRD Representatives:

- **Director Mark Hiltz:** This is the largest gathering on this topic I think that I've seen in my short 18 months doing my job. The SCRD manages 9 ports in the various areas and roughly I'm going to say around \$1,000,000 has gone into the 2020 budget for this. A ballpark figure appears to be around \$100,000 per year for expenses and capital for operating expense for this facility. I question if there really is a concern about losing this as a public facility. I have not got a clear answer if that is even happening.
- **Ian Hall:** to add to the director's comments about the ports service that we operate since 15 years ago when the federal divestment happened. Since that time through a combination of deferred maintenance and increasingly variable items there were a lot of asset management pressure to keep the docks open. I noted in the Trustee Stamford's summary, mention of the climate exposure of some of the ports that limits their use. I would particularly highlight Gambier Harbor as an example of a challenging location where despite our best efforts we struggle to keep that float open. As a consequence the investment that the director referenced is just barely enough for us to keep most of our ports open most of the time, while meeting a pretty basic service level. Through the course of the time that the SCRD has managed these docks we have been faced with a lot of the same sustainability issues that the Squamish Nations marine group are facing on this facility. That's led to every few years a conversation being held with varying degrees of formality and community involvement about the challenge of maintaining more than \$10,000,000 of infrastructure to serve a relatively small population even having the support of all the electoral areas. So this leads into a conversation about potential divestment or consolidation of our docks. Then on the other hand as has already been mentioned the absolute reliance on the infrastructure for people to live, work and play and bring tourists that contribute to our economy on our islands.
- **Lori Pratt:** Director Hiltz and Jim Hall have summed it up. What I would add is that for future policy we look to the past when the SCRD takes on projects. This has involved ports affected by the weather small waste management systems. We really need to look at what the future costs of those are going to be because in the IT asset

management policies they say 20% of the asset is when you purchased it and then you must plan for 80% over the lifetime. So, we're very cognizant of those issues and need to review the financial implications for us as we move forward.

- **Question:**

When general manager Hall mentioned that they might consider a consolidation or looking at a consolidation, what does a consolidation of your docks mean?

- I thank you for the question. So in the time in the four years that I have worked with the regional district at least twice there have been conversations about the future of the port sustainability service and prior to me joining there were there were several conversations that were similar. In one of those conversations, maybe around 2017, the question was asked of staff (I believe in terms of looking at the overall costs and benefit of the service) " would it be possible to offer services or like nearly the same level of services, with fewer facilities. The practical reason the question was asked is that some of our facilities are close together but that doesn't necessarily mean that one could substitute for two. So might that include a possibility of bringing New Brighton into the fold and consolidating others so that were fewer docks but includes one of the more main mainstream ones like the New Brighton Dock because it serves a a larger amount of people. But that wasn't the scope of the question when it was asked previously. It was more about for example keep the landing in Eastbourne . Is it better to have one great dock rather than two that were just barely keeping alive? So, the scope previously was amongst the nine docks that we have but I guess the principle of what you're asking Michelle is similar to the way the question was put previously.
- **Question from MP Weiler:** Ian does SCRD manage any other docks on Gambier?
- We have four facilities that we own that were all divested from the federal government: Gambier Harbour, West Bay, Port Graves and Fircom. They all exist within provincial water leases and they do not have the level of traffic that the New Brighton dock has. Each facility comes with unique environmental conditions and unique bathymetric situations. As I understand it from our ports monitors committee, several members of which are on the call today, they serve different community needs at different times of year.
- **Comment from Joe:** I just point out to Patrick that two of the docks that were mentioned are not connected at all to the western half. New Brighton is the main one and is sheltered. Gambier Harbour and West Bay have fairly severe winter weather, but they do not have anywhere near the level of capability of handling what we do now with the New Brighton Dock.

- **Mark:** I think I can add that the idea of adding the New Brighton facility into the assets of the existing service support service or having its own separate service and having some kind of a partnership would require voter assent. I would think it's not within the discretion of the board to initiate the tax burden on people without their assent. There is a process to follow and professional people like Ian Hall in our corporate officers follow a legislated plan.

5) Provincial BC Government:

- **MLA Nicholas Simons:**

Just to advise you that we are aware of this situation and realise that it hasn't gotten any further but at no point did anybody stop working on this file or that we have been ignoring it. It is pretty complex with many levels of government and many competing interests. We do have a directive to the marine services for the province regarding transactional issues around cost. I did make an effort with the government since 2012 and nobody was ever assigned to this file as far as I remember. Kirk Handrahan, Minister of Transportation Marine Branch, has taken an interest and has forwarded a question to the legal division to see if it's possible to put up a covenant on the property on the foreshore requiring that the property remain accessible to the public and ferry service. They have not got an answer unfortunately yet, but I think that's the most promising so far. I can not believe that it would be possible that we would lose this as a public asset. I cannot believe that it would be possible quite frankly, without any public input. It doesn't follow what I think would be a fair process so I'm hopeful that the problems can be resolved and have an answer.

Comment from Kate:

Our discussions should focus on providing options back to the Squamish Nation, as they are the owners and it is up to them what happens according to their agreement with the federal government. As I understand it, they are allowed to do whatever they want with the dock --so they have the option of keeping it, selling it, or walking away from it or even dismantling it. Dismantling is not really an option because it will cost a lot of money to dismantle, but I believe they do have the right within that contract. So we need to have some options we can take back to them.

Comment: This is an interesting approach to put a covenant on land leased water lease etc but it doesn't answer the question as to who owns and operates it. I would think it would then limit the number of people that would be interested in taking it on, so that is a concern. This approach could restrict what the dock could be used for. It is possible the Squamish Nation might not be particularly happy about that if that

happens before they disposed of it. It does not sound like there's anything going on with the province to come up with a scheme to try and work a solution as to the ownership and operation of the dock. We need to figure out what the options are and then move forward with agreement and full cooperation. It is good that the government transportation infrastructure is alive to this issue which it had not been before.

6) Bruce Kerr owner operator of the Stormaway for BC FERRIES

I made a few enquiries and it turns out that when the Squamish took over the dock they were supposed to get into the process of acquiring the leases. As I understand it, the area above the water is in the hands of the Federal government and the land underneath the water, which is where the water leases usually come from, is in the hands of the province of BC and that's handled by natural resource and Forest Land Management. Apparently that lease area is protected at the moment by an OIC, which is an order in council, and the Squamish are now involved in the process of finally trying to get that transferred over to them so that they can deal with it. The province has to release it from that in order for any new lease and it would be up to the province through the forestry and land as to what kind of covenants they put on it, what kind of lease it is, and what kind of a deal goes on there. My concern was that if the dock went to a private operator or a Yacht Club or whatever, we might be banned from going in there or it might be cost prohibitive to go in there. Our operations have about two-thirds (*approx. 35,000 people trips per annum*) of our passengers coming from New Brighton Dock on route 13 for the ferry Corporation so it's pretty critical to our operations.

7) Federal Government -MP Patrick Weiler

Thanks to Danny and Kate Louise for organizing this session. Even before I was elected Kate raised this as an issue, so this is something that I've been aware of right from the beginning. It is a very tricky situation right now and I have made overtures and reached out to the Squamish Nation to figure out what their plans were for this dock. I have been essentially working from some of the information from my predecessor on this as well as more recent conversations I've had with Transport Canada. The information that I have is that back in 2001 the federal government transferred the water lease or the water lots and back in 2013 this was divested to the Squamish nation as part of a wider overall program to divest of these types of assets. As I understand it, this is really the direction that the government is wanting to go. The major cost of operating these types

of facilities and Ian's comments mentioning the \$10,000,000 infrastructure investment kind of really speaks to that as well. The agreement that we have with the Squamish nation included a contribution agreement up until 2019 which had some funding for the operation of the dock. This has elapsed as of May of last year and all federal government interest in the dock also concluded as of that point. I'm here to see if there are any types of solutions we can find to work with and am open to any ideas that folks have. I think it is a little bit difficult to be having these discussions without the Squamish. The idea of putting on a covenant is probably a difficult one to do because that would engage definite requirements about consultation and accommodation required when the government is doing any types of actions that could impact First Nations rights. So that is a bit troubling. Also I don't have a clear sense exactly of what the nation's intention is with the with the dock and what the potential buyer would look like. It was interesting to hear Bruce's suggestion that it might be sold to a sailing club which would not want to maintain public access. But I think in the absence of this information we are kind of speculating.

Question Joe:

The arrangement between the federal government and the Squamish nation during the five year or whatever extension, I believe there was an obligation to provide free and Open Access to the public to the Wharf . I wanted to just ask whether in their ownership of the Wharf if there's an out from that clause that says when they sell the dock that the obligation goes away? That would be extremely worrisome if that were the case.

Reply:

The arrangement between the federal government and the Squamish nation in the first five years or the first period up till 2019 included that there must be public access for the community. I know that the contribution agreement that was put together ran out in May and if there was any funding leftover that money would be transferred back to Transport Canada. I do not know about any requirements as part of that agreement that they maintain public access to the dock .

Question:

The year 2024 was mentioned in that agreement to do you know anything about what that means for the involvement of the federal government.

Reply: I don't know the relevance of the date of 2024. Kate responds that she can resend the original agreements to Patrick. Dan Rogers states when he reviewed the agreement there

<https://d.docs.live.net/143d93475e36e124/Documents/New Brighton Dock Zoom Meeting Notes June 26 2020.docx>

[Type here]

[7]

wasn't any provision that required the dock be maintained as a public facility after the agreement time ending in 2018 or 19. The Squamish nation refurbished the dock quite extensively and is in particularly good shape now. But we are left with the dilemma that even if we could zone the dock a certain way or there could be a covenant placed on it, we still can not control the operations. The only way these kinds of public facilities operate is through a tax-based contribution system so you have a funding ability. I don't want to speak for the Squamish nation but it looks like they got to the end of their contribution agreement and said we have no ability to monetize this facility. There's just not enough traffic and it's too difficult to convert to a private facility like a Marina. The only way facilities like this are supported is through some sort of contribution agreement that comes from the people by the users or the community. and that's why they end up under local governments or something like that.

Patrick response:

I agree with what Dan is saying and that is the real challenge of this. Without the ability to monetize the facility it makes it exceedingly difficult. I am just curious if there has been any discussion in the past about the possibility of having any types of user fees commercial private or BC ferries? My understanding is that it takes around \$100,000 a year to service this dock.

Comment:

To monetize this dock involves expenditures on a wharfinger. But the bigger issue is that this dock is our critical infrastructure, so there's a real problem that as a community we are being asked to pay fees for our essential service. Kate states that this appears to be a Southwest Peninsula issue and she represents other areas that already pay into docks and many of those individuals don't actually use any of the docks. For instance people on Anvil Island pay a levy into the Langdale dock. So there may be a limit as to how much we can spread this across all islands. The Southwest Peninsula community may be asked to pay for an essential service that has been an essential service for a century. The issue really goes back to how this dock was divested back in 2013 and that it was done with zero consultation with the community and no understanding that they were cutting us off from future input on this dock. The province pays for minimal roads across the island because there aren't many. We are a water based community and that is our dock and the one dock in the Southwest Peninsula that is the most important! I'm really hoping that there can be some action forward to see a combined effort by our different levels of representation to come up with some kind of solution that maybe shares costs. User fees for the use of that dock could be part of a larger discussion.

Comment Dan: The New Brighton dock is a critical access point and it's also far larger than any other dock. There is also a fairly extensive moorage function which doesn't exist in any other any other dock, holding about 30 boats. I gather I'm hearing from MP Weiler that there

seems to be absolutely no appetite for the federal government to actually reclaim some of its essential infrastructure as it did on a few other islands.

Patrick Weiler response: I brought that up in my most recent call with Transport Canada and rather than acquiring more facilities and more docks they're looking to divest even more. There really is no interest in taking on more infrastructure like this.

Moderator comment: Patrick one of the issues that we seem to have is the ability to communicate with First Nation groups as they like to talk nation to nation. I think we have to look to the federal government to hold discussions at the nation level.

Comment Patrick: I'm happy to reach out to the to Squamish about this. I would also say that the Squamish have a huge amount of things going on right now and are quite busy but I'm certainly happy to be able to facilitate using existing mechanisms that are there for the federal government and the Squamish nation to be able to bring up an issue like this.

Comment Brian Thorpe: All the communication we have had from the Squamish nation has been verbal and this is a problem because we think we know what we're dealing with but we don't have anything in writing. So Patrick we would appreciate using a nation to nation approach so you could urge them to put down in writing what their intentions are. We've heard a verbal message that they are going to give the community first right of refusal to purchase the dock but that in and of itself is insufficient to base any kind of decision making or consultation with the various levels of government.

Comment Kate: I'm not comfortable being the conduit for which information is coming through from the Squamish nation. I'm hearing it now from the consultant to the Squamish nation marine group which is separate from the Squamish nation itself. From what I've been told and today reemphasized, that this is almost a chicken and egg thing. We are looking for their plan and they are looking for our plan. I can send the email out from their director. So as owners of the dock, the Squamish nation council would like to see options presented to them for their consideration as to what they would like to do with the dock. They have said they want to divest it or sell it. They want us to come up with a solution and so this is where I'm having difficulty because we keep saying, Oh well we need information from them and they're looking for information from us. I would prefer if discussions occurred at the federal level or a different level of government rather than me as a trustee. My role has been to communicate maintenance issues between the community and the SNMG and this is way out of the scale of authority that I have.

Comment MLA Nicholas Simons: It wasn't entirely clear to me that you were waiting for their plan and they were waiting for our plan. The issue of whether there is a covenant or should be , might not have been raised. Let me just be clear about that. There was no intention of

<https://d.docs.live.net/143d93475e36e124/Documents/New Brighton Dock Zoom Meeting Notes June 26 2020.docx>

[Type here]

[9]

usurping a process. What needs to happen is that a new connection be formulated between the person you're talking to and a senior person in the federal ministry of transportation. I appreciate learning that the council is looking for offers and options on how that happens and their decision will be entirely up to them.

Comment Mark: The Squamish have, I understand, something like 22 to 26 levels in their organization. There's too much uncertainty and too much speculation and assumptions, so we need something that puts it all together in the public sphere or with a partner. The Squamish might not have the capability to do it themselves and might need assistance. They have a lot of other things going on and only 4100 members and we've got how many hundreds of thousands. Can we find a way to contribute to their capacity to make the decision and allow some greater certainty around this uncertain future of his dock? As far as the access to property I do not believe it is a statutory requirement for any level of government to provide access to private property. There are landlocked parcels of land or water and I don't think the access is a statutory guaranteed to anyone who owns private property. If we look at the amount of money required for maintenance we can take the \$100,000 a year and divide by the number of parcels on the Southwest Peninsula -400 lots – comes to \$250 a year. Recently by referendum the SCRCD created a service which is funded only by the islands for use of the Langdale dock. We need some kind of more data to create an accurate solution.

Comment Michelle:

One of the one of the issues is that the Squamish are looking for an offer from the community. We don't have an idea of what to offer, if even if we could afford the maintenance costs. The number \$100,000 has been bandied about as a purchase price but there is a deficit of information in order to give an educated response. Mark asked in the beginning if there was a real reason for us to have to worry about this right now or if it is sold to somebody else is that going to be an issue. Honestly we don't really know! We are at risk of losing an essential service and I think we need to talk to them and have a means of talking to them which could be facilitated by some of the parties at this conference.

Comment Bruce:The province owns the lease and they would have to change the lease in order to give it to this Squamish or any other buyer, so right now it's protected by an OIC (order in council). They are going to have to cancel that OIC and issue a release and that needs to happen before anybody can use that dock for anything other than it's being used now. I would like to ask Nicholas if he's aware of that and if he's talked to that arm of the provincial government or if he's got any pull to affect that or if the province just plans to just let the lease go to whoever wants to use it.

Comment MLA Nicholas Simons: I have to say that my understanding and my expectation is that the main division of the ministry is now apprised of the issue and are inquiring about the possibilities from a legal perspective. They'll be researching that thoroughly and I guess I'll relay that as a possibility if it hasn't been considered. I think that part of the issue right now is that everyone sort of has a part in it and we all expect someone else to do something and then we kind of wait. Then when we get back together there are issues that seem not to be any closer to a resolution. I'll make sure that the transportation infrastructure is aware of the situation. Maybe even eventually speaking to the federal government to determine their interest.

Bruce Comment: I was asking if the lease is in the Department of lands and natural resources and I can send you the email where they refer to it being an OIC and the number of the lease and all that sort of stuff.

Dan Rogers Comment: I agree it would be great for either the provincial and the federal government to assist with opening the lines of communications with the Marine Group and Squamish nation. We know that the Squamish nation wants to divest themselves of this dock. They are looking to this group as a whole to find a way for this divestiture to happen. It's why I asked MP Weiler whether there was any possibility of a scenario of taking the dock back. Trustee Stamford outlined a series of questions. If nothing else comes out of this meeting I would really ask all of the various levels of authority to go away and answer those questions for themselves. I don't think the impediment is going to be the purchase price but it's going to be whether someone is willing to take on the long term operation of the dock. I have this conversation on Keats all the time as to why don't we have a community Hall. My response is that it's the long term operation of these types of facilities that are the real challenge. I don't want to put anybody on the spot but is there a scenario whereby in their various service levels, that the province and the federal government, could see themselves either setting up a system or facilitating or actually taking on operation of the New Brighton dock in the future.

Kate Response: I would like to see some actions from the various levels of government as to an overall solution and I don't know what level wants to take it on but as trustee and private person on Gambier Island I find that this is way out of my league and needs to be bumped up to a level where it's engaging nation to nation where there is the capacity to work within the staff or with the council to provide a solution. I do have a difficulty when I hear the director Hiltz say there's no requirement for government to provide access to property. While that might be true but then that could be that could be a really big boulder that rolls down. I mean then you could say that the SCRD could look at all of docks and make the same statement or the province could say the same about the ferry terminal at Langdale. I do believe that all levels of government have a responsibility to look at this as an essential service to the island

and that yes part of that would be what responsibility belongs to the community. But to say that the community should take it on completely by themselves is beyond our capacity. It could mean that governments could look at this as a solution for other docks that's a really dangerous precedent to take. So I am really hoping that there could be a way of ramping this up to a higher level. I'm willing to participate but I'm hoping that the province or the federal government has a space with which to deal with this.

Comment:

You have it embedded in your in your OC P to be advocate. Is this an administrative advocacy or an elected one? Response -It is an elected one and there is no capacity for staff to take this on.

Joe Comment:

Going back to the original divestiture and Patrick this is background for you. Kate Louise said there was no consultation with the community from the federal government when the divestiture happened. That's a statement of fact and I agree with it but the community went to all kinds of measures to attempt to have a discussion with the federal government at that time including large numbers of access to information phone calls, emails to people in Transport Canada and elsewhere all kinds of outreach demanding that we be allowed to have a say in this divestiture process. We were told we will not talk to you about anything because our line of divestiture goes to the First Nations and that is final . Go away and don't ask anymore questions. It was very strong and I can tell you that if we don't find some kind of a way forward then the community will go back to that starting point and will make some pretty loud noises regarding all of these things including the way this critical community infrastructure was taken away from us in that original divestiture. We've got to find a way to reconcile some of that and I don't have a magic answer. A couple of observations for clarification. There is currently no money raised from the users of the dock. Unlike many other facilities BC ferries does not pay a fee to land there and over 30 people who moor their boats pay nothing. There's nowhere else in the country you can moor your boat for a whole season for whole year and not pay in the order of \$1,000 to \$3000.00 a year. There's a huge Community movement of goods and services and emergency services. You (in the general sense) can't just allow a community to suddenly be cut off. This is a hot button for CBC national news. This is a good story they will do that and the community will do that. I'm not trying to be threatening here but to raise the level of understanding that the community needs to find a path forward.

Comment from Patrick Weiler: Like I said I'm happy to try and connect with the Squamish nation about this. Like you I have lots of difficulties getting through to speak with the Squamish nation about anything because they are slammed with things. They get as I

understand it about 350 referrals a day and they've been undergoing some pretty major restructuring of their governance processes although that is starting to bear fruit as they bring out more capacity. I think it will become easier and easier to engage with them on a number of matters. This is certainly one that I've raised when I have had a chance to talk to council members before but with that said I don't have a magic wand to get the nation's attention at any time, but I will be happy to continue to make those overtures. We need information from their consultants because really we're kind of in the dark on a lot of things here. It's kind of difficult to make an offer until you know what you're making an offer for. You have to know what the cost of this is going to be. We can look at what state the dock is in now but we don't know how much it costs to maintain and we need to do that due diligence. I think Joe brought up some good points about the possibility of user fees. I was not thinking that this is something that will be placed only on the property owners of the island but the possibilities of raising money through moorage and potentially BC ferries contributing to the ongoing cost in some way needs to be considered. But I think before we even get there, we need to have a better sense of all the facts as they are right now. I would be very interested if we can get a little bit more information from this consultant. Of the two questions that were posed to me in advance of this discussion one was to ask Transport Canada if the federal government would take an interest in this again. I got a hard no... that there was no interest in the federal government getting involved in the operation or management or ownership of more docks. So I kind of hit a wall in that sense but if I can play a role to facilitate I'm happy to do that. I think probably the first thing we should do is to get a little bit more information from this consultant and get a better understanding of what the facts are right now and the type of options. With that information we can explore some different options about how we can maintain public access to it in a sustainable way.

Kate responds that: The Consultant has only said that the dock is for sale but there are no details as to how much it costs, the detailed costs of the accounting for the year or other basic information. I believe manager Hall has tried to get some basic information as well on what is available and what they're looking at as an offer. No details were forthcoming.

Comment: We obviously need to circle back on this after we get more information.

Bruce Kerr Comment: They have indicated several times that there is a buyer in the wings but their preference would be to have a discussion with the community and that the community look at purchasing it. I got a call a little while ago from somebody saying that they had bought the dock. Now it was probable that they were in the process of buying it and were doing a bit of research in a weird way. I mentioned about the lease and being released from the OIC. I got the impression that if this is the same guy who was a buyer that he'll be looking to max out the

thing and or to cut it off from the public if he gets a lease. Then obviously the provincial government has to be involved.

Comment MLA Nicholas Simons: if you can connect me by email with this consultant that's a good place to start and I am concerned about what Bruce just said. I don't think we should have secrets anymore. I used to work as a consultant for over a decade. There are a lot of responsibilities at First Nations governments level and there are not the same number of experts in every area so I think that once we become aware of what the consultant is expecting from government and we get proper government to government communication lines open then we can move forward. Please send out an email next week to ask if there are any updates.

Original Questions asked by Kate:

- 1) **Would the SCR D consider the New Brighton Dock as part of its overall port review process if an appropriate funding regime could be negotiated?**
- 2) **Most other ferry routes terminate at docks owned by the ferry corporation. Would the province consider some form of joint ownership of the New Brighton facility to ensure it remains the Route 13 terminus on Gambier Island?**
- 3) **Would the federal government consider negotiating with the Squamish Nation for the return of the New Brighton Dock to a federal port facility? Is there a possibility of the Squamish Nation Marine Group continuing to own and maintain the facility with the right funding agreement?**
- 4) **Given joint financial support from regional, provincial and federal governments, is there a scenario where the community consider some form of local ownership including a partial levy with the appropriate consultation?**
- 5) **Is there a scenario where private ownership could support the community? This is an option that the Skwxwú7mesh Uxwumixw Council is considering.**

ACTIONS:

- 1) **Kate to email any correspondence from the Squamish nation consultants to Nicholas, Patrick and Ian**
- 2) **Kate to email the Divestiture agreement to Nicholas, Patrick and Ian**
- 3) **Determine if that agreement offers any protection to the community for the long term sustainability of that infrastructure.**
- 4) **Bruce to email information about IOC and lease agreements to Nicholas**
- 5) **Patrick Weiler in his capacity with the federal government to reach out to Squamish Nation and Consultants to establish a line of communication and then keep all parties apprised of that status.**

- 6) SCRD representatives to determine scenarios that could support a joint financing of this dock**
- 7) Nicholas to assess if the Squamish need help to contribute to their capacity to make the decision**
- 8) Determine if a government agency can appoint an advisor or consultant to negotiate the process or if there is funding for the Community to engage such a person.**
- 9) Community outreach to advise the residents of the status of the New Brighton Dock and if further outreach might be needed.**
- 10) Regular meetings of the government representatives including federal, provincial , SCRD and Island Trust to review this file and report on progress.**