MINUTES

GOVERNANCE REVIEW CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Held at the Police / Fire Building, Kirby Room Thursday, April 14, 2016 at 7:00 p.m.

- Present: Julian Anderson; Art Beck; Joe Calenda; Matthew Gauk; Zig Hancyk; Phil Lancaster; Andrew Medd; Mano Sandhu; John Schmuck; Jim Schneider; Brian Wilkes; Fiona Morgan
- Regrets: Caleb Horn, Karin McTaggart

Consultant: Linda Allen, Managing Partner, CitySpaces Consulting Ltd.

Staff: Penny Masse, Senior Committee Clerk, District of Saanich

Guest: Paul Thorkelsson, Chief Administrative Officer, District of Saanich

1. REVIEW OF AGENDA

Ms. Allen opened the meeting and noted that public input at all Governance Review Citizen Advisory Committee (GRCAC) meetings will be at the discretion of the Chair.

The Committee discussed the efficiencies of Dropbox as a document portal and the following was noted:

• While Dropbox is useful, includes good content and is easily accessible, it could be better organized by creating folders for pertinent materials related to each meeting and by enlisting a more sufficient naming regiment for files (i.e.: date not noted before the document name).

2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

MOVED by J. Calenda and Seconded by Z. Hancyk: "That the minutes of the Governance Review Citizen Advisory Committee meeting held on March 30, 2016 be adopted as circulated."

CARRIED

3. REVIEW OF GOVERNANCE REVIEW "ISSUES, GAPS AND PRIORITIES"

The Committee discussed the search sessions and how results will or should inform the content of the Request for Proposal (RFP) and the following was noted:

- The issues, gaps and priorities do not necessarily compare to the Terms of Reference (ToR); they could be more aligned in terms of purpose and should more clearly define the Committee's role.
- When the draft RFP is reviewed by the Committee it can then be compared to the results of the search sessions to ensure all input has been identified and incorporated.

4. INITIAL DISCUSSION OF REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR A CONSULTANT(S)

The Committee discussed the potential framework for the RFP and consultant(s) expectations and the following was noted:

- The RFP should emphasize that public engagement considerations should include what has or will be undertaken by the Province; redundancy should be avoided during the concurrent processes.
- While concurrent Provincial and Municipal governance reviews may occur, the GRCAC should be more Saanich-specific and not as general as the Provincial review; however, due to the timing of the GRCAC, Saanich may be in a position to provide a report of its findings to the Provincial committee.
- It would be ideal if a Provincial contact is established to ensure communication lines are open and available. Inviting the Provincial consultant to future meetings should be considered.
- While other Municipalities are discussing the Provincial review process and integration issues, Saanich is in the forefront in terms of forming a Committee to receive and act upon viable results.
- Amalgamation / integration with regional jurisdictions is only one factor the GRCAC will consider and review.
- Direction to the consultant will need to be deliberate and clear.
- While there is no intent for the Province to impose solutions on local governments, their interest is to work with the different jurisdictions and share services; however, final decisions will be made at the local level.
- The goal is for the GRCAC to endorse the RFP by May 25, 2016, a draft will be available for member review at the meeting of April 27, 2016. It may be possible for the GRCAC to make the final choice on a consultant by the end of June.
- A significant consideration will be the time constraints associated with engaging the community in the process.
- An 'escape clause' will form part of the RFP.
- There have been no discussions amongst Saanich Council regarding any changes to the GRCAC in light of the Provincial review.
- The format, accessibility and content of education materials is a key consideration for the consultant.
- An important deliverable for the consultant will be providing background research, summarizing outcomes, synthesizing and organizing a large amount of information as well as providing a draft of the final report for the GRCAC review.
- The GRCAC should take a role in the design of the process and outcomes, not strictly a management role. The consultant will have two separate functions; a machinery element (logistics / LGA) and a creative (writing, designing, engagement) element.
- Saanich has already done extensive work on the Public Participation Policy; the consultant should review the policy and see if the process can be utilized versus recreating the wheel.
- New opportunities for public engagement and innovative collaboration should be encouraged, the town hall meeting format should not be relied upon and avenues for attracting members of the public who do not regularly offer their input should be explored.
- Online activities and accessibility will be critical to the engagement process. The electorate needs to be reached in new and creative ways.

- Perhaps the Committee could be divided into three subgroups to evaluate each of the search session topics. Each subgroup could delve into and assess their chosen topic and bring findings to the Committee to further develop as a whole.
- Dividing the labour results in more work accomplished.
- The focus of the GRCAC is a governance review, not a services review.
- Designing the engagement process should be a priority to ensure efficient timelines can be met.
- The budget of \$80,000 covers the consultant as well as the cost of engagement.

5. ELECTION OF COMMITTEE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

- Chair of the GRCAC: Mr. John Schmuck by Acclamation
- Vice-Chair of the GRCAC: Mr. Art Beck by Acclamation

6. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

7. NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting date is Wednesday, April 27, 2016 at 7:00 p.m.

Linda Allen.

Linda Allen, CitySpaces Consulting Ltd.

Inuphassie

Penny Masse, Senior Committee Clerk District of Saanich