

FINAL REPORT OF THE GABRIOLA ISLAND
OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MAY 31, 1993

Submitted by:
Sandy Frances Duncan
Cathy Humphrey
Jay Mussell
Arnie Pollmer
Dick Suitor
Susan Yates

© Sandy Frances Duncan (for the committee members)

RR 1, Site 10, C 4,
Gabriola B.C. V0R 1X0

All rights reserved.

This publication may be reproduced without charge or written permission provided, only that the material is copied in total, with no change or abridgement, and that appropriate acknowledgement is made of the source. Such reproductions are not for sale.]

INTRODUCTION

On June 29, 1992, five people were appointed by the Local Trust Committee, and later confirmed by Trust resolution, to a committee to discuss with Weldwood representatives the disposition of its lands as part of the ongoing review of the Official Community Plan.

HISTORY

Weldwood of Canada, a forest company whose parent company, Champion International, trades on the New York Stock Exchange, owns 2800 acres, approximately 1/4 of Gabriola. The community liked Weldwood owning the land as long as there was no active logging or there were fifteen to twenty years between cuts. But the latest round of logging, from 1989-92, raised considerable concern in the community. The sub-contractor used logging methods that were viewed as incompatible with a rural residential lifestyle, an increasing population and a province-wide demand for changes in forest-use philosophy.

Weldwood, realizing that logging was no longer economically feasible on Gabriola, approached the Local Trust Committee in 1991 through its representative, Strong Western, a development consultant firm, to discuss how to dispose of its lands in a way that might benefit both the company and the community. Since one of the Islands Trust policies under its mandate, to preserve and protect, is to secure land, we understand that the Local Trust Committee and the Trust Council considered that Weldwood's offer had possibilities that might benefit the community and the Island itself.

From November, 1991 to February, 1992, three public community meetings were held to discuss different areas that were being re-worked in the new draft of the Official Community Plan: commercial; residential; parks and recreation. At the last meeting the will of the residents present was to have a meeting to discuss forests, forestry and Weldwood. That was scheduled for March, 1992.

In the meantime, Herb Auerbach of Strong Western was meeting with individuals and groups on the Island to try to discover what the community would like done with the Weldwood lands. Every day a new rumour erupted. Weldwood was going to build horse trails, Weldwood was going to build a golf course, swimming pool, high school, forty storey condo and heliport. By the time Weldwood held an Open House in May, 1992, the community was stirred up.

Meanwhile, over on Galiano, Macmillan Bloedel, the province's largest forest company, filed a SLAPP (Strategic Lawsuit Against Public Protest) against the Local Trust Committee, Galiano Conservancy and individual members of both because of that community's attempt to preserve their forest land by zoning. Within this context, we understand the Islands' Trust Council's and Local Trust Committee's apprehension. As well, our local Trustees, who had wanted to negotiate with Weldwood, were told that any discussion could compromise, or be seen to compromise, their legal right to judge, and so invalidate any land deal. If they really wanted to explore options with Weldwood, they had better find another way.

Weldwood/Strong Western had sent a letter to every resident and landowner on Gabriola stating that 63% of the respondents to the questionnaire they'd sent out in Spring, 1992 wanted comprehensive development rather than Weldwood's exercising its options under the current zoning of selling 23 district lots or 140 20 acre parcels.

We understand that the Local Trust Committee paid attention to the results of the survey, to the rumours flying around, to the general suspicions about dealing with a corporate landowner and decided, probably with legal advice, to appoint a committee that would be under its purview and as such be a responsible and representative group able to find a solution, with Weldwood, for the disposition of its lands that could incorporate the majority of the community's wishes.

WHO WE WERE

Dick Suitor—57, 2 year resident, 32 years of corporate management experience, member of Ratepayers and Residents Association

Jay Mussell—49, 2 year resident, educator, facilitator, experienced in the cooperative movement, left the Committee, because of other commitments, by Trust resolution in August 92

Arnie Pollmer—47, geologist, marine rescue operator, Silva Bay Yacht Club member, moved off-Island after 8 years in July 1992, left the Committee, because of other commitments, by Trust resolution, February 93

Susan Yates—37, 11 year resident, librarian, ex-Islands Trustee, single mother of young children

Sandy Frances Duncan—50, 5 year resident, writer of children's books and feminist fiction, ex-psychologist

Cathy Humphrey—51, 3 year resident, ex-teacher and community worker, Chair of Advisory Planning Commission, replaced Jay Mussell by Trust resolution in August 92

Our committee held 3 meetings early in July 92 to get to know each other, to share our thoughts about Weldwood and how we could carry out our mandate. We decided that we would rotate the duty of Chair amongst us, that we would strive to operate by consensus and that four of the five of us had to agree on a plan before we proceeded. We decided that we would capitalize on each other's strengths and compensate for each other's weaknesses.

Three of us had been adamantly opposed to any deal with Weldwood until the month before; one of us had actively boycotted the Open House; one of us had been a vociferous opponent of the logging practises; one was a known environmental activist. But during May and June, each of us, independently, had come to realize that negotiating a comprehensive plan with Weldwood in which some land would be ceded to the community in perpetuity, and therefore not available for future development, could be more beneficial to the present and future communities than simply letting Weldwood proceed with its present option of selling its lands to unknown buyers and developers or than ignoring the problem in the hope it would go away.

That became, and remained, our committee's basic goal: to obtain as much land as we could, to be ceded to the community at a price we thought would be acceptable to the majority of residents.

THE PROCESS

By the second week of July we had run into what were to become our three ongoing problems with the Islands Trust Staff: communication; time; awareness of our community.

A meeting, run by a hired facilitator, was scheduled for July 7th to discuss Islands Trust Policy. The timing was inappropriate; the community wanted to focus on its very real concerns about Weldwood. Although the Local Trustees would have rescheduled the meeting, it was one of a series on all Trust Islands and beyond local control. At the meeting the Trustees were villified and the community given the perception that a Staff member was lying when asked the whereabouts of the draft Official Community Plan.

We decided to hold a meeting as soon as possible to introduce ourselves, to state our intentions and to invite input from the community. We asked the Trustees and through them, the Staff, not to attend; not only might their discretion be fettered, but also we did not want a repeat of the previous meeting. There was no time to advertise in the local papers; we posted notices at all mail drops and the ferry and stores.

At this meeting on July 15th we thought the frustration, anger and fear of the attendees lessened; people seemed pleased that something was being done by members of the community. We explained the precedent-setting nature of a small community and a large corporation attempting to negotiate something that would benefit both parties and tried to explain the need for a legal process agreement.

Because of the Macmillan Bloedel SLAPP against Galiano, the Trust lawyer decided to create a document that prevented Weldwood from suing and that laid out the rights and responsibilities of both sides and the steps to be followed. He also recommended that we be appointed to the Advisory Planning Commission to protect us from possibility of suit by the community. We laughed at this idea, but went along with it. It was wise, as it has turned out.

Islands Trust staff and the lawyer sent us a draft process agreement and then went on holidays for 3 weeks. Staff holidays have interfered with and slowed down the process throughout. Frequently we did not know they were taking holidays until they had left and, at least once, four staff members critical to our talks were on holidays simultaneously.

The draft of the process agreement was vague, unclear and not detailed enough. Because we wanted to start the talks with Weldwood, thinking that, as we had been told on June 29, the process was to be completed by September 30, we located a community member who was willing to donate her legal expertise. With her help, we drew up our own process agreement, most clauses of which were incorporated into the final document when the Trust lawyer returned. We also requested conflict of interest guidelines and an outline of our terms of reference from the Trust lawyer.

With the help of another knowledgeable community member, we initiated a search through Land Titles to ascertain to our satisfaction that Weldwood did indeed have fee simple title to its parcels and therefore the right to sell. We were disappointed; we had hoped we could locate a snag that might allow the land to be re-zoned and prove the forthcoming talks unnecessary.

It took until August 15th to have the process agreement signed by all parties, including the existing members of the Advisory Planning Commission. We understood their signing to be a tacit support of the whole process initiated by the Trustees.

By now two community members had collected 1200 signatures on a petition requesting a stop to any further subdivision until a thorough Environmental Impact Assessment of future development on Gabriola could be completed. We thought our desire to have as much Weldwood land ceded and out of development as possible was in concert with the petition's intention.

On August 20 we held another public meeting, again without the Trustees, to explain the process agreement and to seek ideas from the community before our first meeting with Weldwood. One resident expressed concern about our not having been elected and therefore not representative of the community. He handed over a letter to that effect and said that this was the last we would hear from him about it. As it turned out, it was not.

Our sense was that the legally elected Trustees have every right to appoint ad hoc committees and that a recommending body, as opposed to a decision-making body, need not be elected.

A community member volunteered to organize a newsletter as a way of disseminating accurate information about the Trust and our committee. This was a wonderful idea. We think the newsletter worked well and it is unfortunate that there were not enough Trust funds for it to continue.

Another community member volunteered to video all the meetings; later, when we offered to find out if he could be paid, he declined, saying this was his community effort. Yet another person offered to post our notices at all the mail drops. We felt very supported as we went off to talk with Weldwood.

THE MEETINGS

At our first meeting with Weldwood and Strong Western representatives on August 26, we suggested that the Staff member chair the meetings. This would keep her from having undue influence, we reasoned, but have her available for information. She did a good job of chairing throughout the meetings. We also requested an in camera session with the Weldwood representatives only. We did this to show ourselves proactive, as we had been with the process agreement, not just reactive to Weldwood; and to establish that the talks were between Weldwood and the community, not Strong Western and not the Trust Staff.

In the in camera session with Weldwood we discussed tax benefits and write-offs which might have been antithetical to the interests of the development consultants. Weldwood stated categorically that the company had all the tax benefits it could use and was not in a financial position to need write-offs.

Because tax write-offs as ways of acquiring land were dear to the hearts of some community members, we again brought the topic up at the last meeting with Weldwood in January, after we had learned what questions to ask and what language to use from the Trust lawyer. The answer again was: no.

We spent the morning of the first meeting drawing up general guidelines for our talks, among them: to be acceptable, any plan had to have a majority (defined as 80%) of community support; the process had to be rewarding; a plan had to have minimal impact on the Island; Weldwood had to realize ten million dollars; the community had to realize maximum ceded land.

Then we were shown the concepts the consultants had drawn up which had development in all their parcels except 1000 acres. We told Weldwood and Strong Western to draw up a plan that kept development out of the centre of the Island, that concentrated it in the view property above Whalebone, that kept the number of lots to the presently allowable 140, and that gave the community more land. The meeting ended with their agreeing to try.

Because it was our desire to be as open as possible with the community and to use local expertise whenever we could, we had secured the services of a skilled community member to act as recording secretary. However, by now we had become so sensitized, perhaps overly so, to all the legal ramifications of conflicts of interest, confidentiality and process agreements, that we worried about having a person present during the talks who was not a signatory to the process agreement. After the first meeting, we decided to use an Islands Trust Staff member for that job.

While we were aware that there were many other community members who would be an asset to our committee and with whom we could work, we recommended that the Trustees replace Jay with Cathy; as a member of the Advisory Planning Commission, she was already a signatory to the process agreement and cognizant of the situation.

During the same time as meeting with Weldwood and trying to keep the community informed and giving us suggestions, we knew we had another problem. Two of us had been working on the draft of the new Official Community Plan since June, 1991. It had gone to the Victoria Trust office for the Staff to work on in November 91 when we began holding the meetings on the sections referred to under HISTORY. The draft we had seen in May 92 was the same we had seen in January 92. In March 92 we had been told to slow down, it was now up to the Staff and we could relax until the summer.

During the period we had been working on the document, the legislation was changed to standardize Islands Trust Official Community Plans, the Staff was reorganized and the office moved, our Planner had surgery and holidays. Our frustration continued to build. The community was asking us when it could see the draft and how it could make a decision about Weldwood if it didn't know what was in the Community Plan. At the August 20th meeting we announced what we had been told by Staff: that the draft would be available to the community on September 6th, 1992. Later we were told that was a miscommunication: the draft would be available to the committee, not the community.

Finally we met with the Local Trust Committee and Planners and, after explosively reiterating our frustration and request for information, we were told that the draft was no further along than when we'd last seen it in May and that it could not proceed until we knew the Weldwood plans so that they could be fitted into the draft Community Plan.

We were, and remain, angry that this explanation was not proffered months earlier and that the different ways of dealing with Weldwood vis a vis the Community Plan were not discussed with the community at large, to say nothing of with our committee. Withholding that information and preventing that dialogue was unacceptable. As it turned out, we think this lack of information played some part in the community's later disapproval of the draft document.

On September 18 we met again with the Weldwood representatives. None of their concepts satisfied us and the one we had requested they draw up was not financially feasible for them. Everyone was a bit testy by the end.

We had realized we needed a financial expert, someone who could analyze development costs and check the figures Strong Western was supplying. Now we intensified our search, phoning everyone we could think of, but to no avail. We asked the Trustees and the Staff to find someone, but no one did.

We also realized we would not complete the process by September 30, as originally planned, because so much time had been lost in the summer. The process agreement was extended to November 30.

We did not call a community meeting between September 18 and our next meeting with Weldwood on October 13, because all the plans were so unsatisfactory that we were not sure we and Weldwood could come to any agreement, but we did not want to discourage the community or Weldwood or abandon hope ourselves. We had agreed with Weldwood that until a plan or plans were acceptable to our committee and to them, we would not discuss them with the community. In retrospect, we are not sure if this was the right decision.

We were discouraged and beginning to get tired. Interspersed with meetings with Weldwood and the community were weekly or twice-weekly meetings of our committee, a meeting with B.C. Ferries, with the Ministry of Forests, the Gabriola Conservancy groups, phone calls and/or meetings with the Trustees and Staff and experts on every topic relevant to our task. We found many more experts on sewage than we did on finances, many more on water too, few of whom could agree.

At the October 13 meeting, we concurred that Option 7 was the best we could do, assuming that Weldwood's economic figures were correct. We thought that 368 developed lots was high, but we were delighted that the amount of ceded land had nearly doubled since our initial meeting. We were also glad to have a plan to share with the community and thought that maybe we could work on reducing the number of developed lots after the Open House, when we worked on other details, if there was enough community support to proceed.

Some people have not wanted to discuss any comprehensive plan with Weldwood right from the beginning; some people reluctantly changed their minds when they considered the alternatives; some people thought the price we had to pay (368 lots) for the land was far too high; some people have been in support of the plan from the beginning; some people have thought the land cheap. After the Open Houses, November 14th-16th and 20th-22nd, and from the comment cards filled out there, it appeared that the concept had the support of the majority of islanders, with the caveat that most were concerned about the effect on the water table and the number of developed lots.

Halfway through November we still were not finished. The process agreement was extended until January 31, 1993. Then to March 31 and to May 31. If discussions of this sort between a community and a corporation are conducted again, we suggest making the agreement for a year with the proviso that it may be terminated at any time upon mutual agreement. There was a tremendous waste of time and energy getting all the signatories to re-initial the document every time it was extended.

Provision had been made in the process agreement for a preliminary Environmental Impact Assessment to be done by a consultant of our choice, paid for out of the Weldwood budget. We considered four consultants and chose Christoph Altemueller on the basis of a report he had done on a proposed development in North Oyster (he did not support it), his qualifications and a phone interview. He did more work than the fee provided for and we were heartened by his dedication and eventual enthusiasm for the plan. We continue to think his report of December 31, 1992 is thorough, solid and an excellent basis for a development agreement.

During our negotiations, Weldwood representatives stated that one of the conditions for a deal would be their satisfaction about the holding and management of the ceded lands. We knew there were a number of options and we knew we all (the community) had to become educated so we could make informed decisions.

Originally our committee had thought that the people forming a conservancy could hold meetings about the ceded land. But when, in October, we had suddenly moved from having none to having two incorporated, non-profit Conservancies whose members did not seem able to work with each other, we decided we would tuck this meeting under our mandate as well. We invited Ann Hillier of the West Coast Environmental Law Association to present options for acquiring land at an information evening on December 17th. Due to a potential storm, this was cancelled and could not be re-scheduled until January 21, 1993.

January was killer month. We spent the 14th, 15th and half of the 19th working on the draft of the community plan with the Planners and Trustees. The Trust had hired a freelance Planner to key into the computer the remaining sections and Gabriola's newly assigned Planner had prepared the maps. According to our schedule, this was happening one year later than it should have been. A lot of the wording that we had constructed through 1991 had disappeared into bureaucratese and we had little time or energy to edit the document to the satisfaction of some of us. We thought it most important to get the draft out to the community.

It was at this point that the term, Comprehensive Planning, entered the document. It was the Planners' idea; some of us had never heard of it before. We thought that if Weldwood and the OCP could be tailored to fit each other, this would be simplest, assuming the community agreed with both the Weldwood option and the Comprehensive Planning concept. This became a contentious section during the neighbourhood meetings in April. We do not think the section has had a fair trial because of poor wording and explanation, misunderstanding about the concept and high emotion around Weldwood and the Trust.

On January 18, 1993 we had our last meeting with Weldwood. Here we pressed for: no development on Parcel B, the watershed serving the Pat Burns area; decreasing the number of lots on Parcel E, the agreed-upon area to be developed; and once again, for more creative sewage treatment. The consultants concurred with the latter; it is the Ministry of Health's caution that makes some of its requirements draconian.

We knew our committee's job was done: we and Weldwood had constructed the basis of a plan a majority of the community seemed able to live with; we had proven to our satisfaction that, if will and good faith are present, it is possible for a community and a corporate landowner to negotiate a solution that, if not totally mutually beneficial, is at the least a compromise both can work with; we had managed to nearly double the amount of ceded land. We thought there was still some room for negotiating the number of developed lots; the fine-tuning of the plan could be done in the next stage between the Local Trust Committee, the Planners and Strong Western. We were weary. The process had continued four months beyond our initial understanding and some of us felt as if we had put the rest of our lives on hold.

The process agreement was to run out January 31st and we still had to make our recommendations. We asked for guidance because we did not know what sort of recommendations would be useful. Did the Trustees and Staff want concepts, did they want each covenant spelled out? We were told: do what you want, we can't tell you what to do. The trustees might have been fettered, but the Staff was not. We were willing to be well-meaning amateurs and, yet once again, ask for professional help.

In fact, we had little guidance and no leadership throughout the whole six months from either the elected Islands Trust Council or its paid Staff. Frequently it was difficult to get answers to our questions and we had to rely on our own resources. We think that Gabriola should have had more Staff time and attention during this critical period of talks with Weldwood and revisions to the Official Community Plan. Perhaps the Islands Trust could develop a crisis management scheme or a contingency budget for critical land use negotiations.

We formulated our recommendations based on our bottom line: what we are willing to pay to know that nearly 2000 acres of important watershed is safe from development forever. We also knew that we were making recommendations, not decisions, and we expected the Trustees to accept or reject them. Our recommendations became a compilation of the most important things that we had learned over the previous six months. We were also facing a deadline. Had we known the process agreement was going to be extended as it has been, we could have taken a few weeks off and come back refreshed. But that was not how it was in January.

We knew the number of lots to be developed was high and we knew that if no water was proven on Parcel E, then some wells on the ceded lands was a controversial recommendation, but we said, that is how important this deal is to the future of the island as we see it and the Trustees can refute any recommendation.

At the January 28th meeting we saw heads shaking at some of our recommendations, especially at drilling for water on the ceded lands. We heard calls for more public meetings, more public process. We said we've done our job, we've fulfilled our mandate and we're too tired to have another meeting. We said if you want to have another meeting, we'll support it, but we're not going to call it.

Our experience at all the community meetings was that some people seemed to want to discuss the topics of a previous meeting, not the topic of the meeting that was called. This is a problem of time and information lag and we do not know how to overcome it.

In retrospect, we think we were asked to do too much. Should this process happen again elsewhere, we suggest that there be two committees or a larger committee with two functions: to deal with the landowner and a possible plan; and to deal with community ideas, input and involvement.

Throughout the dealings with the Weldwood and Strong Western representatives, we found them to be open, available, willing to negotiate in good faith, respectful, concerned about the community of Gabriola, both present and future, and, most importantly for us, interested in exploring a new way of handling the resource/development/community problems that are facing us world-wide.

No, this is not the hostage syndrome. We have remained clear and un-co-opted throughout. Some of us, having seen what is possible, are even more willing to go on the line for Clayoquot and the Walbran to say: another way is possible. We think we have participated in a unique experience with people who care, as we do, people who happen to work in a corporation and business which have allowed them freedom to explore ways other than confrontation to solve mutual problems. We think we have been fortunate to have participated in a precedent-setting process.

THE AFTERMATH

At the end of January we assumed that the Trustees would make a public statement about our recommendations, accepting some and rejecting others. In fact, as the community distress mounted, we assumed that the Trustees would loudly reject the drilling in the ceded lands recommendation, state that the number of developed lots was too high and encourage Weldwood to submit an application for re-zoning, so all players could enter the next stage of the process.

Not only were community members upset with us, so was Weldwood. Its representatives had assumed that, if we did not write our recommendations together with them, at least they would get to see them before the community. We assumed that we were to make our recommendations unilaterally and direct them to the Local Trust Committee. Some community members assumed that they would have specific input into the recommendations whereas we assumed that they would have after we had made them.

There were cries of, "it's a done deal," and "you've sold the Island." There were requests for us to "recant".

We wonder if some members of the community had assigned too much power to our committee, more power than we had or would have wanted. We had been appointed at a time when the community was in distress. To have a committee that was actually formed to do something and whose members were willing to talk openly about their task was calming. For seven months we acted as a focus. Those who wanted to ignore the Weldwood issue could because others were looking after it; those who wanted to be involved had a means of being so. When we refused to chair more meetings the end of January a vacuum was created. As one person said, "I feel as if I've been cut off at the knees." We think that the level of abuse (the April 26th letter outlining the intended petition to sue, for example) is, in part, a direct indication of how much power we had been assigned. Another indication is that some community members conveyed the sense that they believed that our recommendations were, in fact, decisions, despite our protestations.

If January was killer month, February was a nightmare. There were various ad hoc meetings as people struggled to cope with the public silence of the Trustees and our recommendations. The February 19th Local Trust Committee meeting was a travesty. The more reasonable the Chair, the lawyer and the Staff tried to be, the more rancorous the audience became. It was indeed tumultuous.

We do not know if the Gabriola Electors' Action Group (GEAG) was formed after this meeting or before. (Since we have never seen a public notice of a meeting and did not know of its existence until late April, we assume this to be a special interest group.) However, it was at the February 19th meeting that the first public allegations of wrongful process were made. These became the GEAG platform, the basis of the intended petition to sue and of the May 8th election for Advisory Planning Commissioners.

On March 27, some members of our committee and the Trustees met with an independent development consultant who had been located and invited to Gabriola by a member of the community. When shown the details of the Weldwood plans, particularly Option 7, the consultant became enthusiastic and encouraged the Island to "go for it." He also expressed amazement that Weldwood had made public the development costs; "developers never do that," he said.

To "negotiate with Weldwood," to "go for the deal," have been statements we have heard throughout the process, especially from residents of Galiano and Saltspring who know what it is like to lose their forest land, despite, or because of, attempts to "downzone" it. We heard it most recently on May 16 from the Mayne Island Trustee who stood up at the public forum on "Water, Woods and Weldwood" to urge negotiation.

During the April neighbourhood meetings to discuss the draft of the new Official Community Plan, it became apparent that there was much dissatisfaction with its length, its bureaucratic language, its "urban-ness" and the section on Comprehensive Planning.

At the same time, there were increasingly voiced concerns about the possibility of "losing the Weldwood deal", although it is our impression that most of GEAG, whose candidates won five of the seven Advisory Planning Commission seats, are **not** in favour of any deal with Weldwood. But it is hard to tell; most of their election platforms were about process, not substance.

At the Local Trust Committee meeting on May 7, 1993, the evening before the election, the Trustees passed a resolution inviting Weldwood to submit an application for no more than 280 developed lots and providing 2000 litres of water/day/lot from the area to be developed. They also decided to remove the Comprehensive Planning Section from the draft of the new Community Plan and to deal with a possible Weldwood application under the existing one.

We fear that if Weldwood does make an application, to meet the new criteria it will have to remove a considerable chunk of the land it was willing to dedicate under Option 7.

At the same meeting the Local Trust Committee refused to name the signatories to the intended petition to sue eighteen members of the Advisory Planning Commission, including the Trustees and our committee. We think the Local Trust Committee should have shared this information, should have, in fact, made it public much earlier; the information was even more important because of the impending election. As far as we can tell, the signatories have been active in GEAG.

We consider the threat of a petition to sue abusive behaviour, the very height of confrontational politics. It is far from conflict resolution at a community level. We consider the attempts to minimize the significance of a threat to sue, as happened Sunday, May 16th at the public forum, to be equally abusive.

Whether the signatories intend, or ever intended, to take their petition to court is not the point. The point is that a letter under a legal masthead threatening to sue for such reasons as: missing minutes; some people not being on an out-dated voters' list; some people not being removed from an APC by Trustee resolution; and the like, is harassment and intimidation. We are saddened and concerned to see this behaviour tacitly condoned by the election of some associated with the petition to sue. We can only hope that many voters did not know.

The aforementioned forum held May 15,16, 1993 was an attempt to educate and provide a means of drawing up resolutions to present to the Trustees. It was organized by well-intentioned community members and we fear it was co-opted by some with perhaps another agenda. For example, we saw how the ingenuous desire for more time to discuss plans with Weldwood fed directly into others' desire to stall so that nothing is settled with Weldwood until, probably, after the election of new Trustees in November.

A Weldwood representative clearly stated that they will not wait that long and that they have never desired to have the disposition of their lands be an election issue.

With the expiration of the process agreement on May 31, 1993 our committee dissolves.

WE HOPE THAT

1. Weldwood will not put its twenty-three parcels of land up for sale on June 1st, thus cancelling the most important land deal in Gabriola's history.
2. Weldwood will submit an application for re-zoning.
3. The application will contain as much land to be ceded to the community as in Option 7.
4. The new Advisory Planning Commission will not stall, should the Trustees refer an application from Weldwood to them.
5. There will be no plan to harass or otherwise attempt to force the Trustees into resigning.
6. The Trustees will see fit to approve such an application.
7. A development agreement with stringent covenants will be part of a legal, registered settlement with Weldwood.
8. The process between Weldwood and Gabriola will set an example for other Islands and communities which have large corporate land holdings.
9. The negotiation process will become smoother and more refined as other communities and corporations use it.
10. The Gabriola community will decide it prefers a consensual rather than a confrontational approach to problem-solving.
11. Meetings will be structured around a respectful discussion of differences so that those people who have refused to attend, because of the abusive style of some, will return and feel comfortable to participate.