



AGENDA
RESILIENT SAANICH TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
Tuesday, November 24, 2020, 7:00– 9:00 PM
Council Chambers, Municipal Hall

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Call to order & agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ approval | Chair, B. Wilkes |
| 2. Minutes from October 27, 2020 RSTC Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ approval | Chair, B. Wilkes |
| 3. Communications Items: Update for RSTC <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ summary sheet | Chair &
Clr. Mersereau |
| 4. Review recommended Goals & Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ ratify | T. Stevens |
| 5. RSTC Workplan, Milestones & Schedule <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Update from the Chair▪ Update from Staff on RSTC activities Milestone 1▪ Discussion: three small working groups & additional steps | Chair, B. Wilkes
T. Munson
WG leads |
| 6. Adjournment | Chair, B. Wilkes |

* * Next Meeting: Tuesday, January 19th * *
Please email Thomas.Munson@saanich.ca if you are not able to attend.

**GO GREEN! MEMBERS ARE ENCOURAGED TO
BRING THEIR OWN MUG TO THE MEETING**



MINUTES
RESILIENT SAANICH TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
Council Chambers
October 27, 2020 at 7:00 pm

Present: Stewart Guy, Tim Ennis, Brian Emmett, Purnima Govindarajulu, Brian Wilkes (Chair), Tory Stevens, Councillor Rebecca Mersereau (Council Liaison), Jeremy Gye, Kevin Brown.

Staff: Thomas Munson, Senior Environmental Planner; Courtney Clarke (Committee Clerk), Planning Admin Assistant Clerk

Regrets: Bev Windjack

1. CALL TO ORDER & APPROVAL OF MINUTES

B. Wilkes (Chair) called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

Motion: MOVED by S. Guy and Seconded by B. Emmett, “That the Agenda be approved, as amended.”

CARRIED

There was consensus with B.Wilkes’ proposal that the Agenda include the report from facilitator Kim Walker, and to accept the minutes included in Appendix O, before moving to Agenda Item #2.

J. Gye joined the meeting at 7:03 pm.

It was noted that two main areas of focus for this meeting would be:

- a full discussion of document on goals and principles; and,
- a discussion about work plan and milestones and schedule.

The Chair invited Councillor Mersereau to read the Territorial Acknowledgement, and also the Equity and Inclusion Statement.

It was agreed members will work from virtual copies of meeting materials.

Motion: MOVED by K. Brown and Seconded by T. Stevens, “That the minutes from the September 9th conference call meeting be adopted.”

CARRIED

Motion: MOVED by B. Emmett and Seconded by J. Gye, “That the report from Kim Walker from the workshop on October 3rd be received and the minutes from the October 3rd workshop (Appendix O of the report) be adopted, with the amendment that the last name be added to the record for Senior Sustainability Planner, Maggie Baynham.”

CARRIED

There was group consensus that the report be posted to the Saanich website for public access.

2. DISCUSSION: MEETING MINUTES DISTRIBUTION

Following discussion about the format of the minutes, it was noted that:

- the group agreed minutes will be kept in detailed format for posting on the website.

Councillor Mersereau had no report, updates, or initiatives from Council for the committee, and asked to discuss some administrative pieces, highlighting:

- The Agendas and Minutes from RSTC meetings are part of the public record, when published to the Saanich website.
- There is a requirement to post the Agenda seven days in advance of the meeting.
- As with meetings of all advisory committees appointed by local governments, the public needs to have the opportunity to 'hear' the meeting.
 - Prior to COVID-19, this would include being present in the room to observe meeting proceedings.
 - In the COVID-19 context, this is enabled through an opportunity to register with Saanich staff to listen in on the meeting via a conference call line.
- If there is any concern from committee members, or if it is felt that this constrains anyone's approach to meetings, Councillor Mersereau suggests discussing with her, or with the Chair to address that.

There was group discussion, in which members expressed their support of this transparency. It was also noted that:

- There would be interest to invite the public to attend in person, once this could be allowable for space and COVID-19 considerations.
- There is frustration amongst members with the level of availability of technology, or Microsoft Teams, for meetings.

3. SEPTEMBER 9th MEETING MINUTES

Per the committee's consensus, this item was discussed earlier in the meeting.

4. FRAMEWORK GOALS & OBJECTIVES

Amended the name of this agenda item. "The Framework, Principles, Goals & Objectives"

This becomes the shell of the framework; this was created alongside the study of similar documents with vision, goals, objectives, and strategies. The understanding is that these documents from Burnaby, Vancouver, Toronto Harbour, Surrey, etc, took longer to produce; acknowledging that this document was only started on October 3rd, committee is making good progress.

T. Stevens was invited to present, on the assumption that committee members had reviewed the document in advance. It was noted in the presentation:

- How the working group came to this version of the document
- This document is not "done"; it is a work in progress and will be changing for quite some time.
- Instructions at October 3rd workshop included taking 14 principles and turning

them into something handier.

- The vision was provided already, in the OCP; the goal the group wrote includes 2-3 goals. The reasoning was that once there is more than 1 goal, you split objectives, and they can be difficult to split up. The thought was “Why not have 2 goals, and put all objectives under those 2 goals?”
- The objectives we had were not “smart”. We were thinking that at the objective level, 3 things matter:
 - Look after environment.
 - Make sure there is some level of stewardship – that people of Saanich are engaged and understand importance of environment and what they can do to help.
 - Make sure bylaws, policies, and programs make sense with our objectives and that staff from all departments are trained to filter through this framework
- All comments were considered in this draft. If you made a comment and don’t see it in Draft #6, you can talk to us about it and we can speak to it.

T. Stevens invited further discussion. It was noted:

- To keep a high level approach.
- This committee has the ideas and technical ideas; staff can make it look good, correct grammar, etc.
- Committee members indicated greater clarity about the process for submitting draft goals and objectives for public comment.
 - There needs to be a document the committee has consensus on, with feedback from staff.
 - It was acknowledge the group would not make the Oct 31 deadline, but agreement to update Council.
 - Discussion included that the RSTC is responsible for producing the product, and the staff is responsible to get public input. If RSTC wants to participate with public presentation, that is a possibility.
 - Concern was expressed about putting something out to public as though it is finished product; discussion surrounding the “good enough” approach, inviting staff input and audience to gain new input for improvement, making it very clear that this is a living document, that this is not set in stone.
 - It was noted members would like to have another chance to add wording once public feedback is received.
 - Part of the TOR final steps is that it goes to Council for approval; it was suggested that given the long-term nature and importance of the initiative, to consider things living, with the step of going to Council for the purpose of endorsement (versus a formal adoption of final goals and objectives).
 - Challenge will be moving forward through more strategies; this list is good, but not complete – the third point may need more articulation.
 - J.Gye agreed to join the working group.
 - Members discussed establishing clear deadlines and having everyone’s comments shared (CC’d emails to the group instead of direct to the working group).
 - Staff shared that in order for staff to take on role, they would like to see a direct motion or statement from the RSTC that staff is endorsed to do the work, and identify which staff would be included, and at what level.
 - Group discussed support for having staff input, and also Council and Mayor’s Office.

- Example was given of Burnaby's document, sample of similar work, with input from a huge group of people – really wide expertise.
- Members discussed what piece of the document will be up for review: goals, objectives, not the list of strategies yet.
 - Agreement that at some point there needs to be “meat on the bones – the strategies themselves”. What is the plan and series of steps to flesh out the strategies? How does the Climate Plan (something that staff has already worked on) fit in?
- Some members expressed the document is general enough – without needing a lot of staff review at this time, expressing it would be more fitting once the RSTC gets into the details, biodiversity plan, what environment is, looking for gaps. This step is about gaining a clear, overarching framework. Concern in asking staff for too much at this point.
- Members expressed dissatisfaction with the vision in the OCP. Discussion about providing an amendment in the report. Doesn't see a level of intention and outcome yet in getting real and effective about issues (climate crisis, etc).
- Goal is not to get “bogged down” by staff, but staff does need to be involved – help identify roles, responsibilities, and gaps.
- Discussion about vision being where goals flow from; even for working purposes.
- The RSTC has options in regards to the vision; could develop their own vision, additional make the recommendation that Saanich adopt it in the next iteration of the OCP; acknowledgement that working on a vision is outside of the TOR. However, discussion around incongruences between work of the committee and what is set out in OCP. Support for visiting something that can work with the committee, but not if it becomes a distracting rabbit hole from the committee work.
- Possibly more of a process vision – vision for what the process of developing and implementing policy framework looks like.
- Consider this a coatrack on which we hang the bylaw and policies of Saanich.
- Terms of Reference; key thing the RSTC is to hone in on what the strategic objectives of Saanich's Environmental Policies need to be – should be captured in vision.
- The Chair summarized:
 - RSTC is to develop a Draft 7, including a vision consistent with what was discussed.
 - Draft 7 should be prepared by first week of November.
 - Consensus by email, and then put it to staff.
- Members were invited to join the working group if there is interest.
- Consideration that the “coatrack” is smaller than what was included in the OCP.
- Discussion that sharing with staff not be a restricted process - that the document be shared with the heads of all departments; they can decide whether they want to comment. (While also making *sure* to receive input from some key departments – ex: Community Planning.)

Motion: **MOVED by K. Brown and Seconded by P. Govindarajulu, “To request feedback from Saanich Divisions and Departments on the draft goals, objectives, and principles developed by the Resilient Saanich Technical Committee, including, but not limited to, the Environmental Services**

division, the Sustainability division, the Current Planning and Community Planning divisions. Engineering and Public Works, and the Parks and Recreations department. The draft is to be received by staff on the 12th and returned with comments to the RSTC by the 19th.”

CARRIED

5. REPORTS FROM OCTOBER 3, 2020 WORKSHOP

a) Ground Rules:

K. Brown discussed the document he shared with the group (for the group). It was noted:

- Tried to condense of the list of long list of rules from the workshop; grouping into different sections and condense it down.
- Extended the invitation for feedback.
- Question re: consensus or vote.
- External communication – engaging with the public.
- Councillor Mersereau spoke to the two problems that need solving:
 - Place to store and retrieve electronic information.
 - Web form/email address for public input to the committee.
- What was agreed is to funnel communications to a place where you would have optional access to it.
- Included in Agenda Packages there will be a Summary of what was received, including only a name and date.
- Members have no obligation to engage with the public.
- For good governance, it's good to clarify the spokesperson roles.
 - Reaching clarity on spokesperson role would be beneficial.
 - B. Wilkes is prepared, as Chair, to handle this, with support as needed from Councillor Mersereau.

There was discussion around consensus or vote. It was noted:

- A consensus approach is preferred, except where you need to have a vote in order to meet legislative requirement; vote on minutes, implement and request staff to do things, accept the agenda, adjourn, etc.
- If a vote is taken on a contentious issue the minutes would record who was not in favour.

b) Themes:

B. Emmett presented on the document. It was noted:

- The list of environment value assets and potential themes; how might these be categorized.
- Reviewed environmental policies and biodiversity plans, and narrowed it down to six themes:
 1. Ecosystems and ecosystem health
 2. Environmental Quality
 3. Green Infrastructure
 4. Community Wellbeing
 5. Operational Leadership

6. Resilience

- Reviewed the Climate Plan; there are six themes (referred to as categories), under which they nest their strategies.
- Is it useful to think thematically to organize strategies and how they relate to objectives? Is it useful, or will it confuse people? IF we have themes, are these the right ones? (These came from the workshop and reviewing other material).
- Themes are more relatable to public. For this month, ignore themes and stick with objectives but keep themes in back pocket for writing it in a way that is user-friendly.
- Discussion about considering poetic, metaphorical language vs. technical wording.

c) Parking Lot Issues:

The Chair encouraged members to give T. Munson feedback on the circulated glossary. Proposed that each meeting, something be pulled from the “parking lot” list and addressed.

- T. Ennis would like to provide input for refinements to the glossary for next meeting.
- Some parking lot issues are included in the glossary; are the critical skills we need on the committee here? Do we need to bring anyone in?

6. WORKPLAN, MILESTONES & SCHEDULE

The next meeting is scheduled for November 24; the RSTC has a plan to develop a final draft document to discuss at this meeting.

The Chair proposes a mid-January meeting, with a monthly meeting after that. A consideration for the timing is that preparation is needed and the Agenda needs to be completed a week ahead of time.

Think about what needs to be discussed at upcoming meetings. It was noted:

- Gap Analysis: this was hard to discuss without goals and objectives identified. Do we now revisit this for a future meeting?
 - With the goals and objectives, can we identify further gaps? What policies do we need to integrate, etc?
- Milestone 1 – 8 are included in the TOR; however, there is confusion over who is responsible for what tasks.
- Councillor Mersereau expressed also having difficulty discerning next steps and division of responsibility, noting the clearest reference as Page 11 – Table 7 roles and responsibilities breakdown by milestone for staff vs. RSTC vs. consultants, etc. Councillor Mersereau suggested that she, the Chair, and staff meet to discuss and provide additional clarity for the next meeting on what specifics are expected of RSTC; from there, how does the RSTC work to support the other work of staff? More clarity would be helpful.
- Discussion about revisiting the assets and threats; look at what each member is skilled in, and if anything needs to be added. Identified someone would need to take the lead, set some deadlines; K. Brown volunteered to explore further, circulate some ideas.
- The interest to get crystal clear about what Saanich’s environmental policies will be. There is limited time and resource; what can be achieved and what could the

outcomes be? There needs to be strategic priorities identified clearly; work plan results from that.

- Discussion around the question: “Are we talking about what we ought to be talking about here”? Where do we need ecological conditions assessments to see if what we are doing is working?
- Discussion around possible dates for upcoming meetings in 2021:
 - January 12/13
 - February 9/10
 - March 9/10 (S. Guy would be the Chair by this time)
- It was agreed that the 7-9 time slot for meetings was sufficient provided that members prepared before each meeting.
- Update for the First Nations Representative: Councillor Mersereau has a meeting with a potential person for this role and noted that appointments are subject to Council approval. Perhaps there will be a member for the next meeting.
- T.Ennis invited members to a virtual webinar through the Comox Valley Conservation Partnership on October 29 about environmental development permit areas in the context of how to structure them for the maximum benefit of environmental protection.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:09 pm.

Motion: MOVED by T. Stevens and Seconded by B. Emmett, “That the Resilient Saanich Technical Committee adjourn.”

CARRIED

NEXT MEETING

November 24, 2020.

Brian Wilkes, Chair

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate.

Committee Secretary