

VISION KEEPERS GROUP



Meeting Notes *Thursday, April 26, 2007*

Attendees:

Members of the Committee: Amy Krause – Chair, Doran Hanert, Hugh Simson, Ron Sadesky, Don Sears, Peter Schied – via conference call. Jim Ridley – Representative of Council.

Town Administration: Audrey Rogers, Gary Buxton

Regrets: Don Sears, Peter Oprsal

Felicity Edwards, Mining The Future / The CSE Group

The meeting was called to order by the chair, Amy Krause, at 7:05pm.

Gary Buxton recorded the minutes of the meeting.

Prior to commencement of the meeting, Peter Oprsal's resignation was noted.

1. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as presented at the meeting.

2. Adoption of Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of April 12, 2007 will be reviewed at the next meeting.

3. Mining The Future Introduction

Felicity Edwards gave an overview of the Mining The Future process that led to the actual vision. Intent had been to create a grassroots process unlike any process that had been seen before in the Town. Very small group discussions were the key. Groups were self-forming and not created by outside forces. All groups were hosted. The Host was responsible for basics (i.e. location and provisions) and they were trained by the CSE Group to lead their group. Were looking for general agreement to be created through the small group discussions, and implementation was discussed by participants right from the start. Intent was also to create capacity in the community to continue to discuss matters, in a manner better than they had before – to have a real conversation and not advocacy. Tried to have as many means of participating as possible. The process was scenario-based, looking at driving forces in the community and the possible futures that could result from these driving forces. Five (5) phases were separated by work parties and community cafes. Once these phases were complete then the Vision was presented to Council.

www.worldcafe.com provides an insight into the process of accommodating large group conversations that this process was based on.

Advocacy was avoided largely through the use of neighbourhood groups that did not exist prior to the process starting. The CSE Group also hosted some of the advocacy groups and asked that they follow the process outlined and consider large issues, not just their prior opinions. Questions were worded very carefully to avoid advocacy and position-based conversation, to stimulate real interest-based conversations. This was the hardest thing to do – to provoke responses in an appropriate manner, to look at possibilities not opinions.

Most common community value was community cohesion. This was common across all the groups. Both physical and psychological connections. Tangible and intangible connections.

Many efforts had been expended to contact and engage non-permanent residents, to include and integrate them into the process, and to ensure that they were included as part of the community and not treated as “others.” Divisive relations in the community would be very corrosive to cohesion. If non-permanent residents are blamed or were not included and welcomed into the community, then cohesion would be impossible to achieve.

4. **April 30th Meeting with Council**

There was considerable discussion about the Permanent Resident Rebate Program (P.R.R.P.) (second homeowner tax) that is currently before Council, and its consistency with the Vision and the issue of cohesion, inclusiveness and identity. The group was uncertain about how to address this with Council.

VKG intent is to provide strategic advice to Council, not as a watchdog of Council's actions.

Items that we would like to address with Council.

Main Goal of the meeting is to have a common understanding of the role of the VKG, about what it does and doesn't do.

- There is a list of questions that have circulated via e-mail.
- To know from Council that VKG has some latitude to consider and review items that may be in the community and not directly in Council.
- To deal with various items that are not directly being considered by Council.
- Can Administration refer items to the VKG prior to consideration by Council?
- Are our governance and communications plans OK with Council?
- What exactly is Council looking for from the MDP?
- What are the possibilities to build a web site for the VKG?
- Need to get to know Council and understand Council's expectations of the VKG group?
- Need some further clarification regarding the content and direction of the proposed MDP draft.
 - What are the deficiencies of the 1998 MDP?
 - What was good or useful about that plan?
 - Is there any fully integrated planning document for the Town?
 - If yes, was or is it effective and what are its deficiencies?
 - Do we want a single fully integrated Town plan?
 - If yes, one or two documents?
 - What does Council see as the key goals of a new plan?
- How often or frequently should Council and the VKG meet?
- Could Council appoint 2 new members to replace the resignations.

5. Next Meeting

The next meetings are scheduled for:

Monday April 30th (with Council)

Thursday May 3rd.

Thursday May 17th

Thursday May 31st

Tentative

Thursday June 14th

Thursday June 28th.

6. Open Discussion

Resignation of Peter Oprsal due to other work and volunteer commitments. As it is Council's decision to replace these members we should ask Council on Monday to re-advertise for 2 new applicants. The group also agreed to ask if the advertisement could be circulated to the people who participated in the Mining the Future process.

7. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 9:20 P.M.