

**District of Squamish  
OCP Community Advisory Committee**



**Meeting Notes**

Monday, April 10, 2017, 6:30-9:00 p.m.

**Location: Council Chambers  
Squamish Municipal Hall  
37955 Second Avenue**

**Public Members:**

Lisa Ames  
Christina Bergin (absent)  
Bill Cavanagh  
Gary Fitzpatrick  
John Hawkings  
Murray Journeay  
Grant McRadu  
Darcy McNeil  
Sally Rudd  
Toran Savjord

**Council:**

Mayor Patricia Heintzman  
Councillor Karen Elliott

**Consultants:**

Vince Verlaan (Modus)  
Laurel Cowan (Modus)

**Staff:**

Gary Buxton  
Linda Glenday  
Matt Gunn (absent)  
Sarah McJannet  
Christina Moore  
Jonas Velaniskis

**1. Adoption of Agenda**

The agenda was adopted as presented.

**2. OCP CAC Terms of Reference**

Staff provided an outline of the intent of the Committee's Terms of Reference and past committee activities. Staff apologized for recent communication void, when there had been little information provided to the committee, during which time the new appointments had been made. Staff also outlined past activities, and that committee engagement had been far more substantive in earlier phases, while lately committee work had been light while staff were developing the draft document. Staff suggested that the purpose was to guide staff and not to be creating policy, to oversee rather than create content.

Staff also acknowledged that past input from committee members has been very useful, and that staff would encourage the committee members to continue to provide feedback in the way that they have and in the way that they feel provides most value.

A roundtable discussion of the issues took place. A concern was noted that a committee had raised an issue from the public, and that this had not been received well by staff. How to deal with these sorts of issue? It was noted that guiding policy and writing policy is not clearly distinguishable, and that the process will be a little messy at times.

The committee noted that the members still be able to share issues that they hear or receive from the community. Staff agreed that this is still possible to do, but the key will be for staff to connect it to the larger public input process. The Committee's role at its' heart was to make staff smarter. Committee members noted that the fundamental purpose is to check in that the process is going well, and to be confident and secure that the plan is connected to the

community. The Committee also noted that this is a staff advisory committee, and would be doing the heavy lifting. It was suggested that members limit future email chains to reduce the workload on staff. There was no consensus that this was appropriate as some members were interested in the resulting discussions.

There was a suggestion about a change to terms of reference to reflect current practices. Staff suggested that there would not be a great deal of purpose, as staff were happy with members to provide feedback as best as they see fit. There was a suggestion that we move to the remainder of the agenda and review the process, as this provides a great deal more structure to how input can be provided. This may resolve some of the issues identified.

### **3. OCP Workplan Recent Project Activities Update**

Staff provided an outline of recent activities. Both major and minor edits have been made since the document was last shared, based on feedback from the committee, information from other key plans (e.g. active transportation, flood hazard management plan), comments from referral agencies and others. The Executive Summary was also prepared as suggested by the Committee, and all the revised mapping has been done on a draft level.

Staff outlined some of the “deep dive” works that have been conducted with Vancouver Coastal Health, to examine healthy community issues in much more detail (e.g. food systems, active transportation, and early childhood development issues).

Staff also outlined a summary of the inputs and suggestions previously provided by the Committee. Staff are now trying to weave all of the input sources that have been incorporated along with all of the public content received to date, and that coming from Phase 3 and 4.

### **4. OCP Workplan Squamish Nation Update**

Staff provided an outline of consultations with the Squamish Nation. Draft core content has been provided to staff at the Squamish Nation. Staff had also asked about Totem Hall hosting either the formal or informal engagement Phase 3 event.

### **5. OCP Engagement Next Steps**

Staff outline the proposed next Steps in the Phase 3 Public Engagement Process, including the plan and timing for communications for imminent release of a Discussion Draft release, a public event, an online survey, pop-up (mobile) plan engagement schedule/locations around Squamish and desired involvement of CAC in engagement activities. The Discussion Draft will be circulated to the Committee ahead of the public. Staff asked about the utility of the feedback forms that had been used last time. Staff noted that on Tuesday the 18<sup>th</sup> there would be a Council discussion on growth management issues, which was the major issues identified by the public. The meeting starts at 1:00 p.m. The Committee asked if direction has been provided to Staff by Council. Staff outlined that they would provide options and recommendations but have no direction from Council at this time.

Once details of the engagement process and events are developed, Staff will share them with the Committee.

Staff outlined the proposed event plan, and to position the plan around the 5 goals outlined in the Executive Summary. Staff will be present at the event as the content or subject matter

experts, and Committee members are not expected to be “content specialists.” Staff thought that members could be event hosts to help people orient to the material, where to find issues of interest and assist in how people can provide comments as part of the process. To help people understand the material. Staff advised that there would be some form of tutorial to help guide Committee members.

The Committee thought that the maps were telling the OCP story, and so these were essential to focussing people and letting them get to material that would be of interest to them.

Members suggested that key priorities may also be a way to sort the material to allow for people to access it in a way that is familiar to people and so more accessible. Staff indicated that they would review this suggestion.

Members asked about a deadline for new content to be introduced into the document. Initially Staff indicated that the first deadline will likely be a few weeks after the upcoming event. Comments may trickle in after this, and Staff will need to review these as they arrive. The formal process with Council will also allow for further input and other deadlines will be established as part of that process. People will be lobbying right up until the 11<sup>th</sup> hour.

Members asked about dissent on draft policies. Staff indicated that they will demonstrate to Council with the document presented as part of Phase 4, where there were areas of consensus, agreement and disagreement.

Members asked if they would get to review the survey instrument. Staff indicated that they could provide this. At present it was not designed or intended to be a numerical or statistical census type instrument, but more qualitative in nature.

## **6. OCP Executive Summary + Discussion Draft Finalization**

Staff provided an overview of the Executive Summary, which is intended to provide a snapshot of the material in the Discussion Draft and make it more accessible to the public. The intent is to drive people to the larger Discussion Draft. Staff and Modus noted that they had not found another community that had tried this approach.

## **7. CAC Contributions and Inputs**

The Committee was tasked with the following questions in reviewing the Discussion Draft.

- *Is the draft content on point and clear? (Usability / plain language)*
- *What are the gaps and/or ‘critical misses’?*
- *Does the draft content meaningfully incorporate and reflect the community’s input to date?*

The Committee thought it was a very good piece of work. It would help people to find key issues that they might be interested in, and encourage people to go the Discussion Draft.

- The Committee asked about the distinction between vision, goals and objectives in the document.
- The links between content in the document were also seen as useful.
- The document does seem to make it easier to find content of interest for people reading it.
- There was a suggestion that the cover page has less text to make it less intimidating.

- There seemed to be a lot of similarity (overlapping) across the goals, and could be more distinct. Staff would review this issue.
- There was a suggestion of a brief community overview /snapshot (infographic with a spatial component) in the Executive Summary.
- There was a question about whether the Discussion Draft would be graphic. Staff noted that it would be fairly dry and to get the content correct. The graphic presentation of the draft would come towards the end of the process.
- There was a suggestion that the term “community protection” could be used in certain instances to replace the use of the term sustainability in some cases.
- There was a question about the longevity about the document and how will some of the policies be implemented over the long term, and about when some of the policies would be implemented. What confidence could the public have that some of these policies are implemented? And when could people expect actions? How could the public hold the District’s “feet to the fire?” Staff noted that the implementation part of the document may answer some of these questions.
- Tracking measures were suggested as a means of tracking progress and holding the District’s “feet to the fire.” This however was noted would require establishment of benchmarks and the resources to collect and track the information.
- There was a comment that an OCP may be more of a guiding document rather than a directing document. It was suggested however, that it could be directive.
- There was a suggestion that some form of performance scorecard could form part of the annual report. Staff noted that prior annual reports had been more corporate in nature, and that it may certainly be possible to incorporate OCP performance reporting into the District’s annual report.
- There was a suggestion about the comment form and perhaps increasing the clarity about the question it was asking about the vision.
- There was a question about developing robust performance measures during a period of rapid change. Staff noted that the measures selected needed to be verified through engagement with the community.
- There was a suggestion that the footers in the document be used for teaser questions.
- Members asked if they are able to suggest policies from the Discussion Draft that could replace those selected in the current Executive Summary. Staff noted that a lot of work had got the Executive Summary to this point, but that if suggestions were forthcoming they would review.

Staff requested that members review the Executive Summary and Discussion Draft and provide comments within the timeline (April 28), and to advise if they felt that the deadline was reasonable. Staff were looking for comments from the Committee, asking the similar questions asked in earlier sessions about clarity, gaps and red flags.

Members noted that this is an onerous ask, and that it could be split into sections to ease the workload. Staff said they would split the material in some way, in the way that they were previously assigned, but the invitation would be to review the entire document. The Discussion Draft would be confidential and not for public release, to ensure that when the draft is in the public realm, there is only one version.

**8. Next Meeting**

Staff thought the next meeting would be following the engagement event and to review the engagement summary. Members asked about support for the event, and whether or a meeting was required to provide orientation. Staff suggested that this could be done just prior to the event. Brennan Park is the likely location.

The next meeting date and time was May 1, 2017, 6:30 p.m. in Council Chambers.

**9. Meeting Close**

The meeting terminated at 9:05 p.m.