

VISION KEEPERS GROUP



Meeting Notes *Tuesday 31st. January 2008*

Attendees

Members of the Committee: Amy Krause, Hugh Simson, Ron Deans, Hans Holthuis, Peter Schied, Simon Hudson, Doran Hanert, Jim Ridley

Town Administration: Gary Buxton, Patrick Sorfleet

Regrets: Don Sears

Members of the Public: Carole Stark, Sonoran Institute / CSE Group

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Amy Krause at 7:03 P.M.
Gary Buxton recorded the minutes of the meeting.

1. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as presented.

2. Adoption of Meeting Notes

The meeting notes from the previous meetings of November 29, 2007 and January 22, 2008 were approved as presented.

3. Community Sustainability Plan Process Review

Carole presented a summary document of what was "heard" as a summary of the Phase 1 process. The process had started a little later in November than planned, but the community groups had indicated that they were far more comfortable with the small group discussion process this time around, and that the Mining the Future process has built decision making capacity in the community.

Through Phase 1, CSE Group had attempted to group the information into emerging themes, and had developed this information progressively. There did not appear to be a lot of engagement through the web site. The web site was being used to find and read information, but not to deposit information. The participants in Phase 1 seemed to be a mix of familiar and unfamiliar people. The weekend community cafes had not been that well attended, and it may be related to some weak advertising. This would need some review in later phases. Overall, the participation seemed to be adequate. Throughout the Phase 1 process, CSE Group had tried to refer back to the Mining the Future values and principles, to ensure the process honours them. It was also important to recognize that the product to date was not fixed in stone, and that there may be gaps that can be filled.

Community identity was identified in the Mining the Future vision. But it appears to be less a "functional category," and needs to be addressed in all of the other functional categories - it needs to be an over-arching item in the other categories. Identity may need to be expressed differently from the other values that have been identified. This is a question that will still need to be addressed.

The group discussed the possibility of grouping the responses into clearer groups of issues. Carole and Gary expressed some discomfort about manipulating the input too much and honouring the input of the public. It may be possible to tease "issues" from some of the solutions presented in the material, but we needed to be careful about playing people's words. The group could review the Phase 1 materials to decipher what the issues are, and then submit that information to Gary to refer to the CSE Group for their review.

The group also discussed the possibility of the group identifying possible gaps in the information, both in terms of functional areas or Mining the Future values and principles. About a dozen 1-2 page Theme Papers are to be developed in Phase 3. The group could form an issue statement under each of the functional groups, or under new functional areas, and then these could be submitted to the Chair and then the Town, for the CSE Group to utilize as it sees fit in the Theme Papers. The group decided it would try to form these issue statements and submit them for consideration. These issue statements should be as detailed and focused as possible. The statements should not be posed in the forms of questions.

ACTION ITEM: The group will review the document and submit issue statements related to gaps under the functional themes and send them to Gary for collation and submission to the CSE Group. The materials would need ready by Monday February 4th. to be submitted to the CSE Group prior to Wednesday February 6th.

Carole stark advised that the February 16 Community Café had to be rescheduled as a location could not be found and would now be held on February 27 at 7:00 P.M.

Carole Stark asked if there were any concerns about the upcoming Phase 2 process. Using the Natural Step principles at such a detailed operational level is very complex and does not appear to have been done anywhere else. The process would be breaking ground, and would be difficult for the groups to use when they are reviewing possible solutions in Phase 2.

4. Election of Past Chair / Co-Chair or New Chair

The Chair expressed some concerns about fulfilling the role due to work commitments, and requested assistance, either in the form of a co-chair or a new chair, or having a rotating chair. The group discussed the possibility of having the past chair sit as the co-chair.

The group chose to elect a new chair and that the outgoing chair would become the Past Chair.

Amy nominated Ron Deans as the new chair, was seconded by Doran Hanert, and Ron Deans accepted the nomination. There were no further nominations.

The motion was approved.

Amy Krause agreed to sit as co-chair. The group agreed to Amy sitting in this position.

The group agreed to review the position of Chair again in six months, in June or July 2008.

5. Next Meeting

The next meeting was scheduled for Thursday March 6th. in the Georgetown Boardroom.

At the next meeting, it was decided that the group would need to discuss how the group could operate in the future, possibly through the use of sub groups between meetings to review and discuss issues that were of interest to individuals. The meetings could then be more productive and the group would achieve more.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 P.M.