

# VISION KEEPERS GROUP



## Meeting Notes *Thursday, May 31, 2007*

### **Attendees:**

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

Town Administration: Audrey Rogers, Gary Buxton, Patrick Sorfleet

Media: Tanya Foubert, Rocky Mountain Outlook, Aaron Paton, Canmore Leader

Regrets: Don Sears, Amy Krause

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

Gary Buxton recorded the minutes of the meeting.

### **1. Adoption of Agenda**

### **2. Adoption of Meeting Notes**

Meeting Notes from April 26, 2007 - Approved

Meeting Notes from May 3, 2007 - Approved

Meeting Notes from May 17, 2007 - Approved

### **3. MDP Terms of Reference**

The Town's current standards and policies need to be referenced in the MDP, when it is produced, and references to the "latest" policy to allow for new policy to evolve, to ensure that development is consistent with current policy and policies as they develop. The MDP should also indicate where there are policy gaps, and direct how the gap should be filled. The policy will not be necessarily created but some direction needs to be provided.

There is a concern with timelines, to ensure that the process does not get bogged down in details. Discussions need to be facilitated and directed to ensure that they are output focussed and directed towards achieving the objectives.

The Group was agreeable to the Terms of Reference being released to the public.

### **4. MDP Terms of Reference Presentation**

The Vision Keepers Group was assembled as a result of Mining The Future process. It has been tasked by Council to assist Council in implementing the Vision, and how to carry the Vision forwards, the first part of which was to develop a Terms of Reference for the review of the MDP.

The group has met with Council to clarify its purpose and mandate, and this will be reviewed once the MDP is complete, to determine what the group will do.

The existing MDP is currently focussed on land-use and physical development issues. The Vision Keepers wants this review to result in the MDP covering a larger range of issues, than just land use, and needs to cover the issues and concerns raised in the Mining The Future document, and should cover social, environmental, cultural, recreational etc. It is intended to be a broad document that covers the issues that the community wants to address, as outlined in the Mining The Future Vision, and to ensure that the Foundational Values and Guiding Principles of the Mining The Future can be addressed in the new MDP.

The media asked about whether the Mining The Future process covered a broad spectrum of the community, and whether or not some groups were not represented or excluded. The Group felt that the process had many opportunities for all to participate, with diverse interests, under differing circumstances. It was well advertised and inclusive, and did allow many people to participate that traditionally do not participate in public processes in the community. Overall the process was inclusive and valid.

The media noted that the process proposed is detailed and is very similar to the Mining The Future process. The Group noted that the process is open to suggestions from contractors to provide details about particular processes.

The Terms of Reference will go to Council for approval on June 19. Public comments can be submitted until about June 12, either by fax, phone or e-mail. It will also be posted on the web site for review. Any comments provided will be given to both the Vision Keepers and Council.

The Media asked why this had been given to the public prior to any formal comment or consideration by Council? The group felt that traditionally the public had been allowed access only after consideration by Council, and that following the Mining The Future there was a feeling that we need to have better community engagement, and that this was an attempt to do things in a different way, consistent with the Vision. It was felt that we want the community to be involved from the very start.

The Media asked if it had been interesting to translate the Vision into an MDP process. The group felt that it had been tricky, but principally from the point of view of giving some direction, without pre-supposing the result. The group wanted to provide direction, but not to define the outcome. The group also wanted the new MDP to go beyond rhetoric, particularly sustainability, which is used often but not done much in practice.

The Media asked about a concern with ambiguity with the current MDP, and that it could mean many things to many people. The group felt that the new MDP needs to be much more detailed and not all things to all people, and that the new one should make clear that there are certain things that are not appropriate. The group felt that the Terms of Reference gave direction that the ambiguity had to be lessened and more clear direction provided. The group had this discussion with Council and all felt that this was necessary, and could provide clear direction on all decisions.

The Media asked if there were particular items that were weaker than others. The group outlined that this was addressed in the first part of the process, where there was an opportunity to review what had and had not worked with the current MDP.

The Media asked about the role of the group in the review process. The group would be involved at the landmarks at the end of each stage of the process to ensure that the objectives of the process have been met, and that the output from the process is consistent with the Vision.

The Media asked about the process? The group noted that the first process phase was to identify issues and what the process had to deal with. The second part was to identify solutions to those issues. The third part was more administrative and involved consolidation and integration of policy proposals to ensure that policies were consistent and did not contradict each other.

The Media asked how the process would be better than the 1998 MDP process. The past model had been based on a traditional public hearing model, and this is a far more inclusive process that allows for far more public involvement. This one is more encompassing and has a broader scope. This process allows for far more detailed opportunities for the public to be involved. The process is also intended to be far more aligned with community values and to have the public assist in development of the issues and the solutions and not simply respond to policy suggestions.

## **5. Communication: Update to the Community**

The group reviewed the current web site and staff asked that anyone provide comments on the look or the content and they will try and update the site.

**ACTION ITEM: Members will provide a one sentence outline about why they were interested in participating in the Vision Keepers Group.**

## **6. Open Discussion**

None.

## **7. Next Meeting**

Thursday June 14, 7:00 P.M. (Anthracite Boardroom).

**ACTION ITEM: Gary to try and organize a meeting with Council.**

## **8. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 PM