

MINUTES
GOVERNANCE REVIEW CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Held at the Police / Fire Building, Kirby Room

Thursday, April 27, 2016 at 7:00 p.m.

Chair: John Schmuck

Present: Julian Anderson; Art Beck; Joe Calenda; Matt Gauk; Caleb Horn; Phil Lancaster; Andrew Medd; Karin McTaggart; Mano Sandhu; Jim Schneider; Brian Wilkes

Regrets: Zig Hancyk; Fiona Morgan

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

- **REVIEW OF AGENDA**

The Chair called the meeting to order and welcomed the Committee and guests.

MOVED by J. Calenda and Seconded by P. Lancaster that the agenda be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

- **ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

MOVED by J. Calenda and Seconded by A. Beck: "That the minutes of the Governance Review Citizen Advisory Committee meeting held on April 14, 2016 be adopted as amended."

CARRIED

- **ROLES OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR**

Ms. Allen provided an overview of the role of the Chair and the following was highlighted:

- The Chair chairs the meeting;
- The Chair encourages discussion and consensus and conducts a vote if consensus is not achieved;
- The Chair sets the agenda with the Vice Chair, the consultant and invites others to contribute to the agenda process; and
- The Chair is mindful of municipal protocol and bylaws related to meeting procedures, as well as the GRCAC Terms of Reference (ToR), to ensure meetings are conducted properly and effectively.

- **COMMITTEE GOALS – WHAT DO WE WANT TO ACCOMPLISH? (ROUND ROBIN FORMAT)**

The Committee discussed goals and anticipated accomplishments and the following was noted:

- The GRCAC mandate needs to be more clear and succinct in the ToR and roadmap by clarifying the language; the role and purpose of the Committee is still unclear and needs to be agreed upon or complications will likely arise.
- A priority is to complete and implement the Request for Proposal (RFP); the issues identified in the search session can then be synthesized and addressed in order to create actionable recommendations to Council.
- An important goal is to effectively communicate to Saanich citizens that they will have a real opportunity to engage and help govern their community. Change is possible if the GRCAC recommendations, decisions and actions are comprehensive and properly communicated.
- A solid understanding of the current governance of Saanich, including finances, public engagement and delivery of services is necessary in order to set goals and timelines.

- **PRESENTATION / DISCUSSION – CALEB HORN**

Caleb Horn presented some of the findings of his undergraduate thesis paper "Consolidation and Fragmentation: Regional Governance in Greater Victoria" and the following was noted:

- There are three main regional governance theoretical frameworks: Traditional Regionalism (Metropolitanism), Public Choice Theory and New Regionalism.
 - *Traditional Regionalism* is a classic form of regional governance that sees the scope of governance grow in tandem with the growth of the metropolis it governs. This model was used across most of Canada with the exception of British Columbia.
 - *Public Choice Theory* is based on a business model and free-market competition; the concept being that inter-municipal competition within a region will result in better service delivery; however, this model of governance is more common in the U.S. and has not been proven to work effectively in Canada.
 - *New Regionalism* is based on a balance of regional and local needs and is a collaborative governance model.
- Greater Victoria utilizes a Regional District governance model and is a voluntary association of municipalities in a second-tier governance body (the CRD). A Regional District model is unique as it is not chosen directly by its electorate.
- Mr. Horn identified four potential outcomes related to governance restructuring options: Status Quo, Full Consolidation, Ad Hoc Amalgamation and an Alternative New Regional Model. These potential outcomes were measured against the themes of analysis of efficiency, equity and civic voice.
- Civic voice equates to accountability and accessibility. Mr. Horn's research did not locate a governance model that has resulted in a high score for civic voice.
- The GRCAC should think about core issues and what analysis criteria should be used for the purposes of this governance review.
- Mr. Horn's full thesis paper can be found here:
<http://www.uvic.ca/socialsciences/geography/undergraduate/honours/Regional%20Governance%20in%20Greater%20Victoria.pdf>

6. DISCUSSION OF DRAFT REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

Linda Allen presented the draft RFP and the following was noted:

- The draft RFP builds on work done over the past year including background, objectives, timing, role of the GRCAC and criteria for evaluating proponent submissions.
- Procurement will be undertaken by Saanich; the District will have standards of expectation which proponents will need to agree to as part of their submission.
- A sub-group of the GRCAC will undertake proponent interviews and report findings to the larger group.
- The ultimate goal is to find ways to optimize local governance via the office of the Chief Administrator Officer through to Council. The hope is to encourage proponents to respond who have applicable and varied experience in local governance framework, writing educational materials, the public consultation process, planning logistics and writing policy-orientated reports.
- It is likely two or more individuals will be hired in the consultant capacity; if so, all individuals will need to detail their experience.
- All inquiries from proponents should be directed to the Saanich contact person, which will likely be at the Director level and will be, if necessary, in consultation with the Chair and / or Vice Chair of the GRCAC.
- The RFP should not include subjective questions.
- Committee objectives include preparing a report to Council for consideration; providing educational materials to allow for an engagement process that is more productive and inclusive and to oversee the consultation process with residents and stakeholders to ensure diversity is attained.
- The consultant will be in consultation with the Chair for agendas and will participate as a resource at approximately 12-15 meetings of the GRCAC.
- There will be one GRCAC meeting per month from June-August, 2016.
- The table within the "GRCAC Objectives" section of the RFP is confusing and redundant. The role of the Committee and projected timelines should be very clear in the RFP.
- Deliverables as noted within each Goal of the RFP should be better laid out and the deliverable itself should be stated before the description of the deliverable.
- Phases and timelines being laid out in tandem would be useful for the successful consultant(s).
- An evaluation of effectiveness should form part of the RFP.
- Phase 2: "...and seriously considered by decision-makers" should be deleted.
- Evaluating Criteria and Scoring of submissions can be undertaken using a points system; however, the scoring model should be made clear in the RFP. Saanich does have a standard scoring practice (weighting done on the basis of points received out of 10, then averaged). An answer key should be considered by the GRCAC. A one-envelop submission format is the norm for Saanich.
- Examples of written educational and other materials would be appreciated in link format.
- The RFP will be revisited by the GRCAC at the May 11, 2016 meeting.

The GRCAC discussed the allocated budget and the following was noted:

- The budget will need to consider where the consultant(s) are based; Vancouver based consultants would not be cost-effective.

- The remaining GRCAC budget is approximately \$80,000; however, payment of Ms. Allen's fees and Saanich staff will have to be considered, as will the successful consultant and their fees. Advertising, the creation of educational materials, facilities for public engagement and other costs should be considered in regard to the budget. If need be the GRCAC may have to request that the CAO approach Council for additional funding.
- Utilizing Saanich facilities for community outreach and making extensive use of existing Community Associations should be considered.
- The Committee will need to decide on the pros and cons of including a stated budget for the consultant in the RFP. The Province has completed their RFP and a budget number was included (\$95,000) to allow consultants to measure their expectations within the constraints.

7. NEXT MEETING ITEMS

- An invitation to a member of "Amalgamation Yes" should be considered once the RFP is finalized. The GRCAC should be open to having a balanced opinion on this issue. The Committee is to determine when this invitation should be included in a future agenda.

8. OTHER BUSINESS

- As requested, subject folders will be created in Dropbox.
- The Chair will not be available for GRCAC June meeting(s); the Vice Chair will assume Chair duties.
- Correspondence will be addressed at the beginning of future GRCAC meetings.
- GRCAC member email addresses can be broadcast in communication within the Committee, any outside communication will be blind copied.
- Agenda items to be forwarded to the Chair.
- The correspondence received from Ms. Marsha Henderson will be responded to by the Chair, Vice Chair and Ms. Allen.

7. NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting date is Wednesday, May 11, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. and will be held in the Cedar Hill Golf Course, Banquet Room.



John Schmuck, CHAIR
Governance Review Citizen Advisory Committee (GRCAC)



Penny Masse, Senior Committee Clerk
District of Saanich