

Community Engagement Task Force Report

DATE OF MEETING FEBRUARY 19, 2018
AUTHORED BY COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT TASK FORCE
SUBJECT PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PILOT PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

OVERVIEW

Purpose of Report

To provide Council with clarification and recommendations on how to proceed with the Public Engagement Pilot Program. The Community Engagement Task Force recommends the following which ensures that Council's motion made on 2016-SEP-12 to encourage community engagement and public conversation through informal, open topic, facilitated sessions continues to grow through ongoing work towards its planning and implementation.

Recommendations

That Council:

1. Support the Community Engagement Task Force in its ongoing work on the public engagement pilot program, and direct the Community Engagement Task Force to continue its work; and,
2. Direct Staff to continue providing Staff support to the Community Engagement Task Force in the same capacity as other City of Nanaimo Committees and Task Forces, and, if Staff determines that it is unable to fulfill this directive due to conflicting procedural requirements, to direct Staff to provide Council with recommendations on how to remedy the procedural conflicts in order to fulfill this directive; and,
3. Direct Staff to re-engage the 2018 Community Engagement Task Force Key Date Calendar and direct the Community Engagement Task Force to continue with its meetings as adopted at the 2017-NOV-28 Community Engagement Task Force meeting; and,
4. Direct the Community Engagement Task Force to continue its planning for three more public engagement sessions and hold the next session in March 2018, followed by two sessions at three-month intervals; and,
5. Direct Staff to provide Council and the Community Engagement Task Force with draft minutes after each Community Engagement Task Force meeting in as timely of a manner as possible, prior to adoption of the minutes by the Community Engagement Task Force; and,
6. Approve a budget of up to \$18,000 in total, in support of the three remaining Public Engagement Pilot Program sessions, and direct Staff to determine the best suited sources from which to allocate the approved budget and commit that funding; and,
7. Participate in each of the remaining 2018 public engagement pilot program sessions when possible; and,
8. Direct the Community Engagement Task Force to submit a final report with recommendations to Council upon completion of the remaining public engagement pilot program sessions.

BACKGROUND

Council has directed the Community Engagement Task Force (CETF) to meet and return to Council with its recommendations regarding the public engagement pilot program.

During discussion and preparation of the recommendations, the CETF identified areas of importance that the task force should address in order to clarify points of concern and uncertainty articulated by Council and Staff at the 2018-JAN-08 meeting, which resulted in Council directing the CETF to return to council with its recommendations.

The CETF provides the following background information for clarification and consideration, followed by recommendations and rationales in the “Recommendations” section.

PRE-SESSION PLANNING

Upon formation of the CETF in August 2017, many of its members articulated the desire to “do it right, or not do it at all”. While awaiting the feedback from the series of open house consultations and online survey that was initiated prior to formation of the CETF, the CETF held meetings focused on completing its ground work, such as having dialogue around the mandate, developing a mission statement, formulating a set of shared principles, and discussing various potential process flows to achieve desired outcomes of the initiative.

Once the Open Houses were complete and the results of those consultations started to arrive from Staff in September, it was determined that embarking on a wholesome analysis of the data to generate a comprehensive report for the CETF to leverage, would be beneficial to the group’s work as there was a considerable amount of valuable data to consume and apply towards initiative. The CETF utilizes that 71-page report as part of its foundational work on the initiative, which has been publicly available for review on the CETF page of the City website and City Facebook page since its distribution by Staff on 2017-OCT-23.

As work on the initiative continued to progress, external pressures began to increase on the CETF to hold a first session. Through considerable debate, it was decided that while it wasn’t an optimum way to proceed since there were many areas that could not be sufficiently addressed in such a short time, with all-hands-on-board, the CETF determined it could apply enough essential components to hold an effective session if efforts focused strictly on that, albeit at the expense of having to put aside other key components until time was available to focus on them for future sessions.

Planning accelerated around the initial session in order to make it as effective and successful as possible within a short time. The CETF and Staff worked together and scheduled additional meetings in order to be able to meet the tight timeline of holding the first session on 2017-NOV-23.

The hard work and efforts applied by the CETF and Staff were rewarded in the form of success - the initial session was very well received and considered to have been a worthwhile and successful session by all who attended and provided feedback.

In summary, while the CETF would have preferred to have completed its planning prior to implementing the sessions, it wasn’t possible with limited time available. A balance was found by moving forward with the initiative utilizing an agile approach which enabled the first session to occur in a rapid manner and allow successive sessions to grow dynamically through the introduction of complementary elements and applying ongoing feedback towards planning as the public engagement pilot program progresses.

MEETING FORMAT

The initial session was based on an Open Space meeting format, which was chosen from the five meeting formats that feedback had been sought upon during the open house consultations in July and August of 2017.

The five meeting formats that were consulted upon are Open Houses, Townhalls, Open Spaces, World Cafés, and Revolving Conversations.

TOPIC SELECTION

Topic choices for the initial session were 100% community driven; being an open topic initiative, the CETF did not choose the topics. The community was encouraged to submit topics and feedback at the open houses, online, through email, and via phone. From the 89 topics that were submitted, the CETF determined that creating a process flow for the large number of topics to be addressed was crucial towards ensuring that the meeting time was well utilized; that all who attended were able to engage at the session around their topics of interest.

The CETF addressed this by creating 10 broad categories from which all submitted topics could fit under. At the session before table conversations took place, participants were asked to vote on their top categories, each of which contained all of their relevant topics.

Participants voted by placing dots on their categories of interest, after which the facilitator created 5 broad category table focuses in a democratic way based on everyone's votes, and supplied a "wildcard" table to facilitate any topic that wasn't covered at the other tables. Participants then seated themselves at their tables of interest and the focused conversations began.

The CETF arranged three focus sessions with two breaks which provided multiple opportunities for participants to switch to other conversation tables and apply their focus towards other topics if desired, or to rejoin at their current table and continue engaging upon the subject at hand.

Overall, the participant driven open topic selection process functioned well. There were a variety of benefits that resulted from this process:

1. Participants easily understood how to engage and conversate on their topics of interest
2. There was little repetition or topical fatigue during the engagement
3. Topic focused tables resulted in conversations of shared interest that were constructive with a level playing field where all felt welcome and heard
4. Topic discussion delved deep into the questions and concerns which were raised
5. Community bonds were strengthened through the shared interactions between all who were present

POST-SESSION ACTIONS

After the initial session was held on 2018-NOV-23, at the following CETF meeting on 2018-NOV-28 the CETF directed Staff to find a suitable location in North Nanaimo for a date in February 2018 to hold the next session. This was actioned so that the sessions would continue uninterrupted on a three-month schedule and be rotated to occur in different areas of the City.

During that meeting, discussions took place around:

- The results of the initial public engagement pilot program session that had taken place
- The CETF presentation to Council which was scheduled for 2017-DEC-18

- The start of planning for session #2, which included discussion on incorporating an Internet component into the session and increasing involvement of various community groups and younger demographics, and directing staff to find a suitable location in North Nanaimo for a session to be held in February 2018
- Creating an update which thanked participants for attending the session, summarized the initial session, and encouraged further attendance at upcoming sessions and the financial eTown Hall scheduled for 2017-DEC-04

After that meeting on 2018-NOV-28, the CETF was to meet on 2017-DEC-20 to continue planning towards session #2. However, after that Nov. 28th meeting the CETF schedule began to unravel.

On 2017-DEC-05, the CETF requested to meet with Council in order to seek clarification and clear up potential misunderstandings articulated by Council at its 2017-DEC-04 meeting around the CETF and its work. The CETF was advised that would occur at the 2017-DEC-18 Council meeting when the CETF was to present to Council.

On 2017-DEC-12, the CETF was advised by Staff that at a senior management meeting the CETF Presentation to Council scheduled for 2017-DEC-18 was being postponed until 2018.

On 2017-DEC-18, the CETF was advised that as per the CAO, the CETF meeting scheduled for 2017-DEC-20 was cancelled and the next CETF meeting would be held in January 2018. As well, the CETF was advised that the CETF meetings would now be held during regular business hours, and that the 2018-JAN-23 meeting was cancelled.

On 2018-JAN-02, the CETF received notice that it was to present to Council on 2018-JAN-08, and an update was provided from the CAO. Upon seeking further clarification on that update since it appeared to suggest that the CETF was being considered complete, the CAO responded that *"Ms. Gurrie has the highest praises for your: (1) Community Engagement Consultations Report, and, (2) planning and launch of a pilot session on November 23, 2017. Council has reminded her that she is now tasked with completing the remaining two action items"*. Subsequent follow ups were clarified with the CAO stating that *"the mandate will be complete once Council agrees to schedule 3 sessions in 2018"*.

Although CETF members had prior obligations, the CETF recognized the importance in presenting at the 2018-JAN-08 Council meeting since there was significant program changes being recommended and it was clear that it was potentially the one and only time the CETF would be able to present to Council.

As a result of having no scheduled meetings to plan further for the next session, the CETF has been unable to continue its work.

The CETF is also unable to reconcile the dramatic change in direction that occurred within a span of 26 days between the Staff recommendations for the 2017-DEC-13 meeting (Attachment A) and the Staff recommendations for 2018-JAN-08 meeting (Attachment B). In considering the differences between the recommendations and implications stated in each of the reports, they appear to be in stark contrast and contain conflicting details.

The CETF is of the hope that Council finds this and the following information helpful as there has been a significant disconnect in the information flow between Council and the CETF, which the CETF believes is a primary reason for the mixed messages that have been received by the CETF and that may have been the result of misunderstandings and incorrect assumptions being made as a result of having insufficient information available.

KEEPING IT SIMPLE

The CETF recognizes the importance of keeping things simple as possible in practice, and that is top-of-mind during its work. However, keeping the outcome simple necessitates significant planning and processes to ensure that sessions are efficient, meaningful and effective, meet initiative goals, are not overwhelming to participants, run as smooth as possible, and have constructive positive outcomes that extend beyond the session.

Both the 71-page analysis of the open house consultations and the 5-page analysis of the initial session are based directly on what the community has expressed about its wants and needs around community engagement. Combined, the documents provide a good inside view of what the CETF utilizes towards its work and the challenges it faces; it's time consuming and not simple – but the CETF helps makes it simple and easy to participate, and that is a primary benefit of having the CETF complete work on the initiative.

WHAT'S NEXT

The CETF has a significant amount of foundational work to finish completing. With the support of Council to continue completing the work on this valuable initiative, the public engagement pilot program will benefit considerably from the application of ongoing efforts and continued support.

Moving forward, the following areas have been identified as being of significant importance towards completing foundational work on the initiative:

- Review and incorporate elements from the 5-page Initial Event Feedback Analysis
- Review the community consultation table notes from the initial event and apply relevant elements towards the initiative
- Continue to incorporate elements from the 71-page Open Houses and Online Survey Feedback Analysis
- Determine whether to enhance the current meeting format into a hybrid model, or apply efforts towards a different meeting format
- Determine which complementary elements should be introduced into the 2nd session, and which elements should rollout during the remainder of sessions
- Determine how to implement the new elements that are to be incorporated into the 2nd session

STAFF SUPPORT

Up until December 2017, Staff was supporting the initiative in a variety of forms, as Staff does for every City of Nanaimo committee and task force. Staff provisions meeting space and resources, handles administrative tasks which include but are not limited to the taking of minutes, serving as a conduit between the group and members of Staff and City Leadership, assisting with questions towards achieving desired outcomes, and accomplishing a myriad of other tasks that are essential and integral with completing committee and task force objectives.

With this in mind and in consideration of the significant amount of volunteer time that the CETF has applied and continues to apply towards this valuable initiative, the CETF has determined that without continued Staff support, the resulting increase in the scope of work and additional resources required to offset the deficiency, is not something that CETF volunteers will support.

There were a variety of reasonings expressed by the CAO around why Staff was no longer being permitted to support the task force including the topic of respectful workplace policy, citing large amounts of overtime, legal consultation, and that the upcoming election puts Staff in an uncomfortable position.

The CETF members are unsure where the reasonings have stemmed from and why certain actions have been taken, and overall, feels there has been some unwarranted, incorrect, and negative connotations cast on the good work and solid steps forward that the CETF has taken. Therefore, the CETF addresses some of the reasonings below to the best of its understanding, in order to try and provide clarification.

- **Respectful Workplace Policy:** The CETF was not aware of nor has it ever been notified that it was potentially infringing into areas of concern regarding respectful workplace policy; there has been no indication at any time of there being a concern of that nature.

The CETF has conducted itself with complete poise, integrity, and respect throughout this process. The CETF has expressed constant support of Council with this initiative, and functioned well with Staff and all who have participated, in positive meaningful ways.

- **Overtime:** The CETF is unaware of any excess overtime that has been incurred by Staff as a result of the CETF's work that is beyond what would be considered standard for any City of Nanaimo committee or task force.

However, in considering this factor along with the amount of time the CETF itself has spent towards this initiative, the CETF recognizes that emails between members of the CETF may (or may not) have consumed additional Staff time; Staff had requested to be included in email exchanges, and the CETF was happy to do so. Since emails were referenced in the discussion around Staff support, for purposes of this clarification the CETF makes an assumption that the overtime relates to this and provides the following explanation:

The CETF is a communicative group that is quite active via email, and because the CETF meetings have been scheduled to occur monthly, to roll out the initial session in such a short amount of time the CETF recognized the importance of carrying out some of its work via email in the form of working groups focused on specific tasks. The working groups then bring the results of the tasks to the CETF meetings so that the CETF can debate upon and further the business at hand.

- **Legal Consultation:** The CETF was unaware that legal counsel was being consulted around the CETF, and stands firm that it has conducted itself in an ethical manner.
- **Upcoming Election:** The CETF was unaware that Staff felt they were put in an uncomfortable position due to the upcoming election and is unsure whether this expression was specifically about the CETF or City of Nanaimo committees and task forces in general.

The CETF is sensitive to the needs of staff and encourages any suggestions to help make Staff feel more comfortable if this is a concern directed at the CETF.

INITIATIVE DIRECTION

In recognition of the considerable dialogue that has taken place within previous Council meetings around this initiative, if Council determines that it is unsatisfied with the direction of the initiative and/or the CETF recommendations towards moving forward, Council could supply alternate direction.

Discussions by Council members during debate at the 2018-JAN-08 Committee of the Whole meeting involved a variety of potential changes to the initiative including:

- Cancellation of the public engagement pilot program and/or the CETF
- Changes to the focus, scope, and/or work of the CETF
- Changing the initiative from open topic to closed topic where someone other than participants determine the topics which will be engaged upon
- Changing who will plan and design the remainder of the pilot program sessions, whether it be the CETF, Staff, Council, or an external contractor
- Other alterations to the mandate and implementation of the program

The CETF does not recommend that Council direct alterations to the public engagement pilot program that will significantly change its direction from what the CETF has recommended. However, if Council wishes to make significant alterations to the program, the CETF encourages Council to openly provide alternative direction via motions in order to ensure that:

1. There is complete clarity and consensus with a majority of Council on the changed direction and expectations that Council has of the public engagement pilot program and its implementation
2. Staff and the CETF are able to act directly upon the changed direction as applicable
3. Participants in the public engagement pilot program can be aware of the directional changes

RECOMMENDATIONS

The CETF is enthusiastic to continue onwards with its work on this valuable initiative and would like to proceed forth with renewed support of Council and Staff. The following recommendations are provided along with rationale for each. The CETF requests that Council provide alternative direction if not in support of the recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION 1

“That Council support the Community Engagement Task Force in its ongoing work on the public engagement pilot program, and direct the Community Engagement Task Force to continue its work”

Rationale

The methodology that the CETF has applied to date with its work helps to build a stronger bridge between the citizens and leadership and strengthen community bonds. Progress to date has produced a significant amount of satisfaction with the initiative and participants are supportive of the initiative’s continuation. Supporting the CETF in its ongoing work will allow the initiative to grow and improve as it progresses which benefits citizens, leadership, and the community as a whole.

RECOMMENDATION 2

“That Council direct Staff to continue providing Staff support to the Community Engagement Task Force in the same capacity as other City of Nanaimo Committees and Task Forces, and, if Staff determines that it is unable to fulfill this directive due to conflicting procedural requirements, to direct Staff to provide Council with recommendations on how to remedy the procedural conflicts in order to fulfill this directive”

Rationale

Staff support is considered essential and integral towards the viability of the CETF and ongoing success of the initiative. The CETF does not wish to work under conflicting procedural requirements if any exist.

RECOMMENDATION 3

“That Council direct Staff to re-engage the 2018 Community Engagement Task Force Key Date Calendar and direct the Community Engagement Task Force to continue with its meetings as adopted at the 2017-NOV-28 Community Engagement Task Force meeting”

Rationale

The CETF adopted the key date calendar as presented by Staff on 2017-NOV-28 and made arrangements to accommodate its schedule. Consideration for the time and effort the CETF contributes towards this initiative as volunteers which are not compensated, should be valued equally with other City committees and task forces.

If changes to the CETF key date calendar are desired, the CETF will need to make alternate arrangements, and as such would request that a new key date calendar be presented to the CETF for consideration, as per other City of Nanaimo standard committee and task force procedures.

RECOMMENDATION 4

“That Council direct the Community Engagement Task Force to continue its planning for three more public engagement sessions and hold the next session in March 2018, followed by two sessions at three-month intervals”

Rationale

There are no further public engagement sessions currently scheduled, and the CETF is unable to continue its work on the initiative without Council’s direction.

Council and the CAO have raised concerns around the “season of politicking”. If Council determines this to be of significance, one option Council could consider is to hold two of the three remaining sessions at three-month intervals, and schedule a pause of the task force and the fourth engagement session until after the next election. If pausing operation of the CETF during that time due to those concerns, Council may want to consider applying that broadly to the other committees and task forces.

RECOMMENDATION 5

“That Council direct Staff to provide Council and the Community Engagement Task Force with draft minutes after each Community Engagement Task Force meeting in as timely of a manner as possible, prior to adoption of the minutes by the Community Engagement Task Force”

Rationale

There is currently a communication barrier due to bureaucratic procedures. This barrier is highlighted when dynamic time sensitive decisions need to be made by either Council or the CETF. By having untimely and infrequent updates which at times are also incomplete and/or inaccurate, it has repeatedly resulted in misunderstanding and confusion, which introduces unnecessary assumptive decision making by Council and the CETF, which affects the initiative itself.

This recommendation of providing draft minutes allows Council to be able to stay current with the progress and actions that the CETF is taking towards this initiative, and provides Council with the ability to request clarification or further communication from the CETF and vice-versa around all aspects of this initiative in a timely manner. With this in place, the CETF would be able to ensure that various requests and responses are reflected in the draft minutes for Council to have a better understanding of key elements and as well have the ability to provide further direction as necessary.

RECOMMENDATION 6

“That Council approve a budget of up to \$18,000 in total, in support of the three remaining Public Engagement Pilot Program sessions, and direct Staff to determine the best suited sources from which to allocate the approved budget and commit that funding”

Rationale

Having a sufficient budget available to hold the three remaining sessions of the pilot program is necessary to fulfill the initiative. This recommendation accommodates the planning and design of sufficient operational components for the remaining sessions that are both cost effective and best suited to fit within defined budgetary constraints. Directing Staff to determine where the funding should be allocated from and to commit that funding, enables the next session to be held in a timely manner without incurring further delays.

RECOMMENDATION 7

“That Council participate in each of the remaining 2018 public engagement pilot program sessions when possible”

Rationale

The CETF was under the impression that all of Council were aware of the initial session and intended to attend. Having as many members of Council as possible participating at each of the sessions, helps ensure that maximum value can be achieved from this initiative. With Council and citizens participating together in informal open topic dialogue, it delivers valuable opportunities for Council to connect with the citizenry and vice versa, and accomplishes the communicative objectives that were expressed during Council’s deliberations on the unanimously supported motion made on 2016-SEP-12 which resulted in this public engagement pilot program.

RECOMMENDATION 8

“That Council direct the Community Engagement Task Force to submit a final report with recommendations to Council upon completion of the remaining public engagement pilot program sessions”

Rationale

Upon completion of the pilot, the CETF will provide Council with a report which details the pilot program’s successes and failures, provide recommendations on whether to continue the program, and if it is recommended to continue - to provide recommendations on how to proceed forth in a way that continues to nurture and grow the initiative. It is with that final report, in conjunction with the others

developed on the way, that the CETF's mandate will have been fulfilled and the initiative can continue successfully beyond the span of the pilot program.

SUMMARY POINTS

- The CETF has provided its recommendations and rationales for the recommendations
- The CETF has clarified the subjects of Pre-Session Planning, Meeting Format, Topic Selection, Post-Session Actions, Keeping it Simple, What's Next, Staff Support, and Initiative Direction
- The CETF has provided Reference Materials as supplementary information on the initiative
- The CETF is enthusiastic to continue onwards with its work on this valuable initiative and would like to proceed forth with renewed support of Council and Staff

REFERENCE MATERIALS

2017-DEC-13 Recommendations from Staff on the Public Engagement Pilot Program – See pages 4-6
https://www.nanaimo.ca/meetings/pdf/2017_Committee_Agendas/FA171213A.pdf

2018-JAN-08 Recommendations from Staff on the Public Engagement Pilot Program – See pages 9-11
https://www.nanaimo.ca/meetings/pdf/2018_Committee_Agendas/COW180108A.pdf

Community Engagement Task Force 2018 Key Date Calendar – See page 6
https://www.nanaimo.ca/meetings/pdf/2017_Committee_Agendas/CE171128A.pdf

2017-NOV-23 Initial Session Results of Conversation Tables – Flip Charts Notes See pages 83-94
https://www.nanaimo.ca/meetings/pdf/2018_Committee_Agendas/COW180108A.pdf

2017-NOV-23 Initial Session Results of Conversation Tables – Video Summary
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LhnkSKr0LSA&t=6s>

2017-NOV-23 Initial Session Feedback Analysis – See pages 8-12
https://www.nanaimo.ca/meetings/pdf/2018_Committee_Addendums/COW180108ADD.pdf

2017-NOV-23 Initial Session Raw Feedback – See pages 7-10
https://www.nanaimo.ca/meetings/pdf/2017_Committee_Agendas/FA171213A.pdf

Community Engagement Consultations (July/Aug 2017) – Open Houses and Survey Feedback Analysis
https://www.nanaimo.ca/meetings/pdf/Supplemental/CE171011SCommunity_Engagement_Consultations_Feedback_Analysis.pdf

City of Nanaimo Local Government Facebook Page (Notes Section) – CETF Community Updates
<https://www.facebook.com/pg/cityofnanaimo/notes>

Community Engagement Task Force Page
<https://www.nanaimo.ca/your-government/boards-committees/community-engagement-committee>

Council Debate and Motion which initiated the creation of the Public Engagement Pilot Program
<https://www.nanaimo.ca/meetings/VideoPlayer/Index/C160912V?start=12253>

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Staff recommended options from the agenda of the cancelled Finance and Audit Committee meeting scheduled for 2017-DEC-13.

Attachment B: Staff recommended options from the agenda of the Council meeting on 2018-JAN-08.

ATTACHMENT A

Staff recommended options from the agenda of the cancelled Finance and Audit Committee meeting scheduled for 2017-DEC-13:

OPTIONS

1. That the Finance and Audit Committee recommend that Council:
 1. Provide direction on the mandate for the Community Engagement Task Force, including clarification regarding the involvement of Council in the 2018 public engagement pilot program sessions; and,
 2. Approve a \$20,000 funding request in support of the three public engagement events, spearheaded by the Community Engagement Task Force, in 2018.
 - **Budget Implication:** A budget of \$20,000 would ensure resources are available for the three public engagement sessions in 2018, and enable an online component to be incorporated.
 - **Engagement Implication:** Supports Council's motion made on 2016-SEP-12 to encourage community engagement and public conversation through informal, open topic, facilitated sessions.
 - **Strategic Priorities Implication:** Supports community wellness, by facilitating discussions on topics of strong community interest.
 - **Political Implication:** Clarifies the role of Council in the public engagement pilot program sessions.
2. That the Finance and Audit Committee:
 1. Recommends that Council direct Staff to proceed in an alternate direction with the Community Engagement Task Force.
 2. Not recommend that Council approve the funding request in support of the three 2018 public engagement pilot program events.
 - **Engagement Implication:** Not supporting the original Council motion made on 2017-SEP-12 or providing adequate funding for the three 2018 public engagement pilot program events could jeopardize the success of the program and call to question Council's commitment to the mandate set before the Community Engagement Task Force.
 - **Political Implication:** Not supporting the work of the Community Engagement Task Force by changing their direction partway through the public engagement pilot program or denying funding for future public engagement sessions could be politically detrimental to Council.

ATTACHMENT B

Staff recommended options from the agenda of the Council meeting on 2018-JAN-08:

OPTIONS

1. That Council:

1. receive the Community Engagement Consultation Report;
2. agree to regularly schedule public engagement sessions every three months starting in February 2018, with Council determining the topic for discussion at each engagement session;
3. allocate \$20,000 in funding to be used for the public engagement sessions; and,
4. agree to use the various methods of public engagement recommended in the Community Engagements Consultations Report.
 - **Budget Implication:** requires budget addition of a minimum of \$16,000.
 - **Policy Implication:** City staff will plan and run public engagement on multiple master plans in 2018.
 - **Engagement Implication:** alternative public engagement forum for Council.
 - **Strategic Priorities Implication:** public engagement should be linked to Council's approved strategic priorities for the community.
 - **Political Implication:** public engagement by Council should be driven by Council.

2. That Council receive the Community Engagement Consultation Report; and provide further direction to staff.