

VISION KEEPERS GROUP



Meeting Notes *Tuesday 7th. August 2007*

Attendees:

Members of the Committee: Doran Hanert, Peter Schied, Hugh Simson

Town Administration: Audrey Rogers, Gary Buxton, Patrick Sorfleet

Regrets: Jim Ridley – Representative of Council, Don Sears, Ron Sadesky, Amy Krause.

The meeting was called to order by the acting chair, Doran Hanert, at 7:06pm.

Gary Buxton recorded the minutes of the meeting.

1. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was approved as presented.

2. Adoption of Meeting Notes

The Meeting Notes from June 14, 2007 were adopted as presented.

3. MDP RFP Document and Process

The T-Six and Municipal Planning Services submissions were rejected by the group as inadequate and not sufficient to meet the requirements of the RFP. The Stantec, CitySpaces and UMA - CSE Group submissions were all deemed to merit further consideration.

The Stantec submission was very good with a very strong sustainability component. It was very professionally presented. There was some concern that the company was very big and the team was very big on the project. The company also has many other projects that will be competing for corporate resources. On the other hand the company has lots of depth to provide resources for the project if needed. The project price was also a fixed contract price. They also talked about the concept of back-casting, and reviewing the Mining The Future vision, which is a very powerful concept.

The CitySpaces submission was reviewed There was some concern that the level of public consultation was not as deep as others and some concern that there was not a deep understanding of the Mining The Future vision. There was also some concern that they were coming with pre-ordained solutions and asking the community if these ideas were acceptable, rather than seeking answers from the community. CitySpaces were seen as the third submission, i.e. behind the other two submissions.

The UMA - CSE group submission was very strong. There was some concern that the team had not worked together as a group. Some concern about an ad hoc grouping of skills in the team. Some concern that sustainability was perhaps not as strong as it could be on the UMA team, compared to

others. The local team is also very well known in the community, is well respected and had proposed a very strong process.

Stantec and the UMA-AECOM / CSE Group were selected for the interview process.

Questions that we should ask during the applicant interviews?

FOR STANTEC:

ACTION ITEM: Gary was to request that Stantec come to the interview on Thursday with a draft of a proposed flow chart outlining the process you could use for the MDP review.

- What is their level of engagement on this project?
- How does this project fit in their corporate strategy?
- How do they see this building corporate profile?
- What about this project intrigues Stantec?
- How do they plan on assigning all the staff resources to the project? Will some be involved all the time or just part of the time?
- Who will be the primary staff contact for Stantec?
- How do they get people out to the events? What strategies will be employed?
- What inputs will you use in creating the Municipal Development Plan document?
- How do you get past engaging groups and stakeholder organizations to engaging the public?
- What does the submission mean when it says local experts? What is the role for local experts in the process?
- Stantec was a consultant for a number of years for Three Sisters Mountain Village (TSMV). How, if at all, would you address or deal with a negative public opinion regarding your selection?
- What conflict or dispute resolution expertise do you have? What part of your process will deal with disputes as they arise? How will these be managed by your team / process?
- Can you start this on time? Will the team be continuous throughout the process?
- What do they think is the most unique portion of your proposal?
- What are perhaps the weakest part(s) of your proposal? What do you hope to learn from this process?
- What is not included in the budget? Advertising, space rentals?
- What question did we not ask that we should have, if you were on this side of the table?

FOR UMA-AECOM / CSE GROUP

- What is their level of engagement on this project?
- How does this project fit in their corporate strategy?
- How do they see this building corporate profile?
- What about this project intrigues UMA?
- Who will be the primary staff contact for UMA-AECOM / CSE Group?
- How do they get people out to the events? What strategies will be employed?
- Can you start this on time? Will the team be continuous throughout the process?
- What inputs will you use in creating the Municipal Development Plan document?

How do they plan on assigning all the staff resources to the project? Will some be involved all the time or just part of the time?

How will the team be structured and managed (between UMA & CSE) given that the parties have not worked together on a project of this size before?

How will you mitigate the risk around the fact that the team has not worked together on a project of this scope before?

Describe your level of expertise and experience with respect to sustainable planning documents and initiatives?

What do they think is the most unique portion of your proposal?

What are perhaps the weakest part(s) of your proposal? What do you hope to learn from this process?

What is not included in the budget? Advertising, space rentals?

What question did we not ask that we should have, if you were on this side of the table?

ACTION ITEM: Gary is to reformat the questions for the interviews and circulate them for e-mail. Please submit your comments and changes and Gary will finalize them prior to the interviews. Gary also to contact Stantec and UMA-AECOM / CSE Group to schedule interviews on Thursday afternoon August 9th.

4. Open Discussion

None.

5. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for August 23, 2007.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 P.M.