



FONVCA AGENDA THURSDAY Mar 16th 2006

Place: DNV Hall 355 W. Queens Rd V7N 2K6

Time: 7:00-9:00pm

Chair: Eric Andersen, Blueridge Community Association, Tel: 604-6849 andersen@sagafc.com

1. Order/content of Agenda

2. Adoption of Minutes of February 16th

3. Old Business

3.1 Shirtsleeve Session with Council

Confirmed date: Wed April 19th/2006

Topics:

- Role/representation of Associations
- Conflict of interest legislation/interpretation
- Budget process (see financial reporting requirements at

<http://www.cserv.gov.bc.ca/lgd/infra/munfin/download.html>)

Cathy Adams update – see

<http://www.fonvca.org/agendas/mar2006/cathy.pdf>

3.2 Update on Secondary Suites in RM Zone - Corrie

<http://www.fonvca.org/agendas/feb2006/waive.pdf>

Legality of waving public hearing (under section 890 where zoning change is consistent with OCP)

Section 890 in

http://www.qp.gov.bc.ca/statreg/stat/L/96323_26.htm

http://www.civinfo.bc.ca/LocalGovernmentAct/data/qdoc150_1092.html

4. Correspondence Issues

4.1 Business arising from 6 regular emails:

Letter from FONVCA to Council on process of waiving a public hearing - http://www.fonvca.org/letters/2006/13feb-to/Brian_Platts_4mar2006.pdf

4.2 Non-Posted letters

0 this period.

5. New Business

Council and other District issues.

5.1 TRANSLINK to undergo review

Independent Panel to review Translink

http://www2.news.gov.bc.ca/news_releases_2005-2009/2006TRAN0006-000162.htm

with backgrounder attachment at

http://www2.news.gov.bc.ca/news_releases_2005-2009/2006TRAN0006-000162-Attachment1.htm

Response by Chair Malcolb Brodie

http://www.translink.bc.ca/About_TransLink/News_Releases/news03080601.asp

5.2 Management of Alpine Recreational Strategic Plan

Monica Craver brings up a number of concerns.

5.3 Development Cost Charges:

Question: Are the current charges adequate? –Corrie

DNV: <http://www.dnv.org/bylaws/7135.pdf?a=254>

<http://www.dnv.org/upload/documents/finance/dcc.htm>

<http://www.dnv.org/upload/documents/finance/dcc.htm>

Surrey fees recently upped 50%

[http://www.surrey.ca/Living+in+Surrey/Utilities+Transportation+and+Projects/10-](http://www.surrey.ca/Living+in+Surrey/Utilities+Transportation+and+Projects/10-year+Servicing+Plan+and+Development+Cost+Charges+Update.htm)

[year+Servicing+Plan+and+Development+Cost+Charges+Update.htm](http://www.surrey.ca/Living+in+Surrey/Utilities+Transportation+and+Projects/10-year+Servicing+Plan+and+Development+Cost+Charges+Update.htm)

Industrial rates for DNV ~ \$56K/acre, Surrey ~ \$67-74K/acre

Commercial rates for DNV \$3.5/sq-ft, Surrey ~ \$3 to \$16/sq-ft

Single Family rates for DNV \$18.5K/unit, Surrey ~ \$22-\$25K/unit

Answer: Likely NOT

5.3 Bigger is Worser

http://www.localgovernment.ca/show_library.cfm?id=173

or <http://www.fonvca.org/agendas/mar2006/bulletin-merging.pdf>

5.4 World Planners Conference- Vancouver

<http://www.wpc2006.com/index.html>

5.5 Core Values for Public Participation

<http://www.iap2.org/associations/4748/files/CoreValuesRevisionProcessSummary.pdf>

Feedback to FONVCA members ?

5.6 Budget Meetings (11) – 1 public input!

<http://www.dnv.org/upload/documents/CFO%20Budget%20Update.pdf>

<http://www.dnv.org/upload/documents/Finance/06budgetschedule.pdf>

ONLY 1 public Opportunity – 5 min–Tues March 28 6pm-9pm

6. Any Other Business

6.1 Legal Issues

Nice Handbook for Municipal Councillors

(worth a read by all FONVCA members!)

<http://www.sms.bc.ca/handbooks/mchandbook/MCHandbook2005.pdf>

7. Chair & Date of next meeting.

April 20th 2006

Attachments

*List of Email to FONVCA of last 37 months - **BUT**

ONLY FOR SUBJECTS WITH NEW ENTRIES

OUTSTANDING COUNCIL ITEMS

-Cat Regulation Bylaw

-Review of Zoning Bylaw

-Securing of vehicle load bylaw

-District-wide OCP

-Snow removal for single family homes bylaw

Correspondence/Subject Ordered by Date
13 Feb 2006 → 12 Mar 2006

http://www.fonvca.org/letters/2006/13feb-to/Elizabeth_James_13feb2006.pdf	TRANSLINK /NSTAC/ Transportation / RAV / Fuel Taxes /GVRD
http://www.fonvca.org/letters/2006/13feb-to/Bill_Maurer_18feb2006.pdf	Emergency Preparedness
http://www.fonvca.org/letters/2006/13feb-to/David_Dixon_27feb2006.pdf	Council Remuneration (Pay)
http://www.fonvca.org/letters/2006/13feb-to/Brian_Platts_4mar2006.pdf	On Council Motions / Procedures / Freedom of Speech / Ombudsman
http://www.fonvca.org/letters/2006/13feb-to/Monica_Craver_6mar2006b.pdf	Mountain biking/Parking issue/Alpine Plan /Pay Parking
http://www.fonvca.org/letters/2006/13feb-to/David_Dixon_27feb2006.pdf	Environmental Protection / Land Slides / Debris Flow

For details/history see

<http://www.fonvca.org/letters/index-letters-total-mar2006.html>

FONVCA

Minutes of February 16th 2006

Attendees:

Maureen Bragg(Chair Pro-Tem)
Save Lynn Canyon Park
David Knee Norgate Park C.A.
John Miller Lower Capilano C.R.A.
Diana Belhouse Delbrook C.A.
Hugh Murray Lower Capilano C.R.A.
Val Moller Lions Gate N.A.
Corrie Kost Edgemont C.A.
Cathy Adams Lions Gate N.A.
Eric Andersen Blueridge C.A.

Jenny Knee Notetaker

Meeting started: 7:10pm

1. ORDER/CONTENT OF AGENDA

Add: 6.2 Rental/lease of waterfront street-ends
Diana/Cathy moved/seconded adopting agenda –
carried unanimously

2. ADOPTION of Jan 19th MINUTES

Adoption of Minutes of Jan 19/2005 moved by Hugh,
seconded by Cathy – carried unanimously.

3. OLD BUSINESS

3.1 Shirtsleeve Session with Council

Discussed topics for confirmed date of Wed April
19th/2006. Possible subjects were:

- Makeup & funding arrangements (DNV vs CNV share) with rec. commission.
- Role/representation of associations
- Budget process

Due to prior commitment of Dan Ellis it was suggested
that Mayor Richard Walton chair meeting.

Val is to review list from last years and discuss with
FONVCA at March mtg.

3.2 Panorama Drive Street-End –

Alleged encroachments into street-end beside 2882
Panorama Dr. was discussed. Diana checked with the
land office if the part of the street end between 2788
and 2802 Panorama Drive, which is being occupied by
the adjacent owner, was leased from the district and
she was told there is no lease for that property.

Memorial to Bill Blakely has been moved from original
location – Deep Cove residents will have memorial re-
located to the new park (street-end) when it is
completed.

4. CORRESPONDENCE ISSUES

4.1 Business arising from 3 regular emails –
None.

4.2 Non-posted letters –0 this period.
No discussion.

4.3 FONVCA letter re: TRANSLINK Process:

There was a response from Mayor Walton – who will
investigate changing terms of reference. **ACTION
item:** FONVCA to review this in one year.

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1 Legality of Bylaw 7549 (BC Rail Lands)

The issue of “staff bias” has been taken to Mayor
Walton by David Knee. Mayor took this to James Ridge
who took appropriate action against staff member.

The alleged conflict declared by a councilor in
Feb/2005 on this issue was not felt to be appropriately
clarified by Mayor at the Public Hearing.

Community has 45 days (after alleged violations
became known) to file appeal to BC Supreme Court –
requiring signature of 10 electors.

Cathy and David have filed a complaint with the
Ombudsman on Feb 15th 2006 (in a meeting in West
Vancouver). As this is time sensitive it is likely to be
fast-tracked. The report handed in on this issue was
comprised of over 30 pages.

5.2 Council Meeting of Feb 13th 2006- Issue
was transportation of Dangerous Goods. There was
zero background information available to the public at
start of meeting. Some FONVCA members in
attendance raised questions and provided comments in
response to presentation(s). New regulations are being
introduced by the Federal Government.

5.3 To “Key” or not to “Key”?

After a background discussion a secret ballot was
taken on whether, in the opinion of those present, the
Key to the DNV should be bestowed upon recently
retired Council Crist. The vote was 8 for, 1 opposed.

5.4 Secondary Suites in RM Zone

After some discussion of this issue – in which the waiving of a public hearing was not indicated in the agenda (as well as being of questionable validity) – It was moved/seconded by Hugh/Eric and carried unanimously that a letter be sent to Council:

To allow proper participation by members of the public on issues that come before council:

“That prior notice be given to the public when council intends to waive a public hearing so as to allow the public to have input on the appropriateness and/or validity of such a motion” - ACTION ITEM

6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

6.1 Legal Issues to think about:

Ethics & Public Hearing References:

Corrie provided a list of (URL) references dealing with the issue of council members' conflict of interest and ethical conduct, as well as the Hubbard case of 2003 relating to new information provided to council after the close of a public hearing and how this has recently been made more pragmatic by the BC Court of Appeal in its judgment of Dec 21st 2005. However the key element remains - that if NEW information (the kind that should have been provided the public at the time of the hearing) is provided to council AFTER the close of a public hearing then a challenge could be made to the bylaw on the basis of a flawed public hearing process.

6.2 Rental/Lease of Waterfront Street-Ends

Diana reported that she had contacted land office and the street end (next to the one being now funded for opening by council) was not leased and has been used exclusively by the adjacent homeowner for 34 years with only a small footpath being available for public use. More information is needed on this issue.

7. CHAIR AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Next Meeting on the usual 3rd Thursday of month:

March 16th, 2006.

Pro-tem Chair will be **Eric Andersen** – Blueridge Community Association Tel: 604-929-6849 email: Andersen@sagafc.com

Meeting adjourned 9:25pm

Subject: P.S.

From: Cathy Adams <CathyAdams@Canada.com>

Date: Tue, 07 Mar 2006 10:22:06 -0800

To: Corrie@kost.ca, brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>

Just made a quick call to Lisa.

Council has been informed of the date of the shirtsleeve.

Council has been asked for ideas and input for discussion topics. She said "they" have thought maybe the issue of staff time used for questions, etc. from the community may be a good one.

So, that makes me feel better. It seems Richard has at least started talking to council, they should be thinking about it, and they should be in good shape to get something to us in a timely manner.

Unlike a certain other mayor ...

Cathy

Date: Tue, 07 Mar 2006 10:10:00 -0800

To: Corrie@kost.ca, brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>

From: Cathy Adams <CathyAdams@Canada.com>

Subject: Update: shirtsleeve-FONVCA/council

Hi Brian and Corrie

As discussed with Corrie last night, I'm sending the e-mail correspondence I have had with Agnes Hilsen, primarily, on this subject.

Brian - FYI - I will be unable to follow up on this later in the month. Richard Walton is away on vacation right now (I didn't know he was going away until just prior to him doing so). He gets back on the 15th, I believe. I leave on the 16th, (playing hookey from life) and get back on the 28th. In the meantime, you guys have a FONVCA meeting on the 16th.

After I return, Richard will be flying off to Hong Kong in early April, and by the time he returns, gets over the trip and comes up for air, it will almost be time for the shirtsleeve.

My suggestions on how to handle this, at this point:

Chair of Meeting - as I told Corrie, Richard and I had one brief conversation at the hall one night, after a meeting had ended. The issue of who would chair the shirtsleeve did not come up, and so I'm not sure Richard is even aware that we're happy with him or one of us as chair. Since Richard is away now, I would suggest a chair be selected at the FONVCA meeting. If FONVCA wants to "offer" it to Richard later on, that can always be done. I don't think Richard will mind if one of us chairs, and he may even be happy with that. With all the time away from the hall, then having some catching up to do, as well as debriefings about Hong Kong, it might be one less thing he has to deal with.

Discussion Topics - Richard suggested that he would talk to council about topics of interest, and that we could put forward ours. Then, we could see if there's overlap, and perhaps jointly choose which will be dealt with. (Think that's where he was going with this. I thought I'd have a chance for a follow up soon after! Don't know whether I made him fully aware that we want an agenda ahead of time, so people can prepare.)

So, I suggest FONVCA choose a topic or two, and that be sent to Mayor Walton - and perhaps Maureen as well, given the schedule he has in the next month. I would suggest this be done ASAP after the FONVCA

meeting. That communication to Richard should give a deadline for topics being put forward by council - maybe April 12th at the latest? - so that we can make any further adjustments of format and agenda, and get everything out to participants well ahead of time.

Others' Attendance - In the past, sometimes staff have attended, depending on the topic. When choosing topics, FONVCA should decide whether/which staff could or should be included, and send that suggestion to the mayor as well.

So, this hands it off to you guys. Sorry I did not have this all in place better prior to the FONVCA meeting. I guess the mayor doesn't think I need to be kept apprised of his plans!

Cathy

Subject: RE: FW: shirtsleeve-FONVCA/council
 Date: Tue, 7 Feb 2006 10:00:40 -0800
 X-MS-Has-Attach:
 X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:
 Thread-Topic: FW: shirtsleeve-FONVCA/council
 Thread-Index: AcYsCZVqrbQnAJ+wSjKgELyKIpw47AABqqUw
 From: "Agnes Hilsen" <Agnes_Hilsen@dnv.org>
 To: "Cathy Adams" <CathyAdams@Canada.com>
 Cc: "corrie Kost" <kost@triumf.ca>,
 "brian Platts" <bplatts@shaw.ca>,
 "Nathalie Valdes" <Nathalie_Valdes@dnv.org>,
 "Maureen Jones" <Maureen_Jones@dnv.org>
 X-Rcpt-To: <CathyAdams@Canada.com>
 X-Country: CA
 X-Received-Missing: CA
 X-NAS-Classification: 0
 X-NAS-MessageID: 3320
 X-NAS-Validation: {B4286E78-CB0E-45CF-A1A0-6687E633884A}

Thanks Cathy. I'll check with the Mayor regarding topics of interest for the agenda and get back to you.

Agnes

-----Original Message-----

From: Cathy Adams [<mailto:CathyAdams@Canada.com>]
 Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 9:11 AM
 To: Agnes Hilsen
 Cc: corrie Kost; brian Platts
 Subject: Re: FW: shirtsleeve-FONVCA/council

Good morning Agnes

Yes, I did in fact receive the email. Sorry you haven't heard from me since it was sent on Friday morning.

I double checked the date with a couple of people, to ensure it is likely to give us a good turnout. That process was completed yesterday

afternoon. I was going to let you know last night the date is fine, and follow up with an email today, but too much else was going on at the hall last night.

Anyway, yes I can confirm April 19th for a shirtsleeve. It should start at 7:00 p.m.. Would you please book the committee room?

As far as discussion topics, chairing the meeting and other details, the mayor may wish to contact me.

My plan would be to confirm the date with FONVCA members right away, and discuss some of these other details at our February meeting, which is next week. We would want the topic(s) to be agreed upon/confirmed prior to our March meeting, which is the last one prior to April 19th. I would really like to know whether council wishes to put forward a discussion topic.

By the way, you may have two email addresses for me. cathyadams@canada.com is my usual one, and the one I prefer to be used. cathyadams@shaw.ca is also valid, and emails sent there should have no problem getting to me. I don't know if that is the one you used - you shouldn't have any others.

Cathy Adams

At 08:22 AM 2/7/2006, you wrote:

>Cathy:

>

>Did you receive this email I sent last week? The first version was returned to me so I tried another email address which I suspect may not

>have gone through either.

>

>Agnes

>

>-----Original Message-----

>From: Agnes Hilsen

>Sent: Friday, February 03, 2006 11:48 AM

>To: 'Cathy Adams'

>Subject: FW: shirtsleeve-FONVCA/council

>

>

>Good Morning Cathy:

>

>I've had a chance to discuss this with Mayor Walton. How does

>Wednesday, April 19th sound? Also, can you confirm the time that

>FONVCA normally meets.

>

>Regards,

>

>Agnes

>

>Agnes Hilsen

>Municipal Clerk,

>District of North Vancouver, 355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver,

>B.C., V7N 4N5 604-990-2207, FAX: 604-984-9637, ahilsen@dnv.org

>

>

>-----Original Message-----

>From: cathyadams@canada.com [<mailto:cathyadams@canada.com>]

>Sent: Friday, January 27, 2006 9:50 AM

>To: Agnes Hilsen; Sue Mitchell; Cathy Adams

>Cc: James Ridge; Shana Burrows

>Subject: RE: shirtsleeve-FONVCA/council

>

>

>Thank you, Agnes.

>

>Sue, sorry to send the original message to you. For some reason I was

>thinking you had made the arrangements for the last shirtsleeve.

>

>Cathy

>

>

>> Good Morning Cathy:

>>

>> I'll discuss this with Council and get back to you shortly.

>>

>> Agnes

>>

>> Agnes Hilsen

>> Municipal Clerk,

>> District of North Vancouver, 355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver,

>> B.C., V7N 4N5 604-990-2207, FAX: 604-984-9637, ahilsen@dnv.org

>>

>> -----Original Message-----

>> From: Sue Mitchell

>> Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2006 10:04 AM

>> To: 'Cathy Adams'; Agnes Hilsen

>> Cc: James Ridge

>> Subject: RE: shirtsleeve-FONVCA/council

>>

>>

>> Good Morning Cathy:

>>

>> I am referring your message to the Municipal Clerk's Office

>> regarding Council's interest in holding a meeting for their response

>> to you.

>>

>>

>> Thank you.

>>

>>

>>

>> Sue Mitchell

>> Executive Assistant to the CAO

>> District of North Vancouver

>> Direct Line: (604) 990-2209

>> Fax: (604) 984-9637

>> Email: smitchell@dnv.org

>> Web: www.dnv.org

>>

>>

>>

>> -----Original Message-----

>> From: Cathy Adams [<mailto:CathyAdams@Canada.com>]

>> Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2006 9:38 AM

>> To: Sue Mitchell

>> Subject: shirtsleeve-FONVCA/council

>>

>> Hello Sue

>>

>> At last week's FONVCA meeting, the suggestion of trying to set up a
>> shirtsleeve for sometime this spring was discussed.

>>

>> We would like to know whether council is interested in holding such
>> a meeting. There would usually have been one during the fall, but
>> last year that didn't take place due to it being an election year.

>> So, the

>

>> last one held was last spring.

>>

>> Last year's shirtsleeve was not as well attended by FONVCA members
>> as we would have liked, due to several being out of town. We took a

>> quick poll, and found that the first half of April this year would
>> be problematic.

>>

>> In the past, sometimes both FONVCA and council have suggested a
>> discussion topic, and we have dealt with both.

>> Other times, there has been one issue everyone wanted to more
>> thoroughly delve into. Sometimes a shirtsleeve meeting has included

>> senior staff members, when a discussion topic warranted their
>> attendance.

>>

>> If the Mayor would like to contact me at some point about the
>> format, agenda, etc. he can do so.

>>

>> The first thing would be to get a date set.

>>

>> Thanks for your assistance on this, Sue.

>> My phone number is 604 987-8695.

>>

>> Cathy Adams
>> for FONVCA
>>
>>
>>



The **e-library** contains information about issues of local autonomy and local self government.

Those who visit the site are encouraged to suggest documents - speeches, research, legislative initiatives, news items, etc. - which might be added to the library. If you have material that you think should be part of the e-Library, please click 'suggest a resource' and follow the instructions.

[search](#) | [show all](#) | [suggest a resource](#)

A failure on almost all accounts

March, 2006 - Henry Aubin

Description:

A failure on almost all counts: The municipal mergers mean more spending and more bureaucrats, but diminished services
Montreal Gazette Friday, March 3, 2006

Page: A21

Section: Editorial / Op-Ed

Byline: HENRY AUBIN

Source: The Montreal Gazette

The public outcry over declining services - including snow removal and pothole repair - has been rising since the 2002 merger of Montreal Island.

This winter's wave of indignation raises a question: What do Montrealers have to show for the merger as a whole?

Let's compare the promised benefits of the merger with the actual results.

We'll look at changes during the four-year period beginning Jan. 1, 2002, when the Parti Quebecois government's amalgamation came into force, and Dec.31, 2005, the eve of the partial demerger.

Spending. The government said the operating costs of local government across the island would fall. Indeed, a 1999 study by SECOR Consulting Inc. for Montreal's pro-merger Bourque administration predicted a drop in spending of seven per cent.

Reality: According to the Montreal transition committee's recent report, operating expenses during the four years increased by 16.3 per cent.

Meanwhile, inflation in Montreal during that period was just 6.7 per cent.

The Quebec government's operating budget during this period went up by just 8.6 per cent. The megacity has, thus, spent at almost twice the rate as the province.

Labour. The much-touted SECOR study said the merger would cut the duplication of jobs in different municipalities and so reduce the need to replace retiring workers. It predicted the workforce would shrink by 1,260 people after five years.

Reality: Official figures show that during the four years, 330 more people (as measured in person years) work for the city. This includes at least 90 contract workers.

A breakdown by job category is revealing. Employees who serve the public directly - namely, blue-collars, police, firefighters and crossing guards - have declined by two per cent. Yet managers and supervisors have increased by nine per cent.

Taxes. The Bouchard government said most Montrealers would see lower taxes.

Reality: Taxes from all sources (mostly on property and water) have risen by 12.5 per cent, almost double the inflation rate.

Global competitiveness. One of Quebec's chief arguments for the merger was that a unified municipal apparatus would spur investments here.

Reality: According to Montreal International, the body that since 1999 has represented all the metropolitan region's municipalities in the hunt for investors, the island's unity has not been a factor in a single investment in the last four years.

As MI's president, Marc Fortier, told me, "For investors, it's not important whether there are 12, 25 or 50 municipalities so long as the whole region speaks with one voice" - that is, through an umbrella agency such as MI.

Social equity. The PQ government said the merger would enable well-off parts of Montreal Island to contribute more to disadvantaged areas.

This idea has had some bright spots. Montreal Nord Mayor Marcel Parent, for example, attributes \$5 million of his long-deprived borough's new \$37-million budget to the megacity's equalization policy.

But there's a flip side. Some boroughs - including Cote des Neiges/Notre Dame de Grace and the Plateau - say the system shortchanges them and that it needs changes.

Reality: It's far too early to assess the system's value.

Bear in mind that municipal mergers were not required to spread the wealth.

The old Montreal Urban Community provided a formula for richer municipalities to help poor ones. If inadequate, that system could have been recalibrated.

Environment. The Tremblay administration attributes several successes to the merger. One is a bylaw on pesticides across the island. Another measure safeguards "eco-territories" from development.

Reality: Each innovation could have been achieved without the merger. Quebec could have enacted a province-wide pesticide law (as, indeed, it did later).

And the regional body, the Communaute metropolitaine de Montreal, can protect green space. The MUC could have done this also.

Elected officials. The Parti Quebecois said the ending of 28 suburbs' mayors, support staffs and councillors would yield big savings.

Reality: The year before the merger, the salaries and benefits of elected officials across the island cost \$7.9 million. In 2005, they were \$8.7 million.

If you include political staff at both city hall and in the boroughs, the new cost is even greater. The number of these aides is growing like mad. Salaries go as high as \$95,000.

All in all, then, the merger has failed on virtually every count for four years. Deterioration of snow removal and other services - which the PQ said would improve - is a metaphor for the new system as a whole.

Indeed, defenders of the merger at city hall are hard-pressed to name one major achievement that could not have been realized without a merger. Even the ambitious overhaul of the water network could have been done under a strengthened MUC. (Just ask ex-MUC-boss Vera Danyluk.)

I don't blame the Tremblay administration for most of the dismal record: The mayor's team is of above-average competence on day-to-day matters. Rather, I blame the structure: It's inherently unmanageable and lacks a reason for being.

This record raises questions.

First, why are Premier Jean Charest, Municipal Affairs Minister Nathalie Normandeau and Tremblay so keen on punishing those suburbs that, via referendums, opted out of this nonsense?

And, more important, why is Charest in particular so dead set on maintaining the system that is producing higher costs, a declining quality of life and (as last fall's record-low voter turnout of 35 per cent shows) public disaffection? Not once has he justified his position.

That silence is telling. It suggests just how intellectually untenable this whole improvised adventure has become.

haubin@thegazette.canwest.com



International Association for Public Participation

11166 Huron Street, Suite 27 Denver, CO 80234-3339

Phone: 303-451-5945 800-644-4273 Fax: 303-458-0002 Email: iap2hq@iap2.org web: www.iap2.org

Core Values Revision Process Summary

In 2003, IAP2's board commissioned a task force to develop a process and lead an effort to review the Core Values to address comments received from members and others as they have used and trained the organization's Core Values. Lewis Michaelson, former IAP2 president, and Margie Harvie, board member, were named to lead this effort.

They, in turn, outlined a process to engage IAP2's members in a dialogue on the usefulness of the Core Values and sought ideas to improve them. They used a variety of forums to collect input and share views including e-mail, e-News, conference sessions and teleconferences. The results of this process were summarized and a recommendation was presented to the board in January 2005.

Recommendations from the Core Values task force ([Comments by Lewis Michaelson are shown in blue](#))

IAP2's Core Values for the Practice of Public Participation

1. **The public should have a say in decisions about actions that *could* affect their lives.** (The logic behind this addition is that PP should occur before the action, and sometimes the result is that the action is not taken. This change makes sense to me.)
2. **Public participation includes the promise that the public's contribution will *inform or influence the decision*.** (Given the different levels on the Spectrum, e.g., "consult," some reviewers felt it is promising too much that the public's contribution will always influence the decision so they wanted to add the word "inform." Some wanted to promise even less and substitute the word inform for influence altogether. Fundamentally, I disagree with attempts to water down this Core Value. We have always presented them as aspirational and inspirational, not absolutes. And I would submit that even under "consult", if the public's participation does not influence the decision, then there was no need to consult with them. Even an affirmation or validation of the decision the agency or proponent wanted to make in the beginning is an influencing of the decision. Influencing does not have to mean "changed." If there is no influence, then it ought not to be called public participation. It should be called public information, public education, public outreach or something else. Remember, "inform" is not considered a form of public participation just because it is included on the Spectrum. It is only included because it is a foundational aspect of any level of subsequent public participation)
3. **The public participation process acknowledges the needs of all participants (including decision makers).** (Reviewers generally applauded this rewrite because it eliminated the double-barreled and confusing nature of the original version and now it says explicitly what it had tortuously tried to imply before, i.e., that decision makers are also considered participants and their needs count too. Tisha suggested removing the parentheses around the decision makers and I would support that as well.)
4. **The public participation process seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected *by or interested in a decision*.** (This was also suggested by Tisha. Her point was that many people have a lot to contribute who are not necessarily directly impacted by a decision. I would support this change as well.)
5. **The public participation process *seeks input* from participants in *designing* how they participate *whenever possible*.** (This one was a lot tougher than I anticipated, given that it

was mostly the word “defining” that gave reviewers pause. Reviewers suggested various replacements, including “suggesting”, “choosing” and “requesting.” Going back to the original intent, however, I remember that what participants were talking about was the value to be gained by letting the participants themselves help you design the process so that it would be sure to meet their needs. Consequently, I tried to bring the element of “design” into the value. The other problem people had was, again, thinking about the “lower” end of the Spectrum, maybe it was too much to expect that the public would “define” their participation in a consultation process. As a result, although I hate adding a lot of qualifiers to the Core Values since I think one of their enduring strengths is that they don’t caveat themselves into meaninglessness, I relented in this case and tried adding “whenever possible,” recognizing that both timing and circumstance may make seeking participants’ input impractical in many cases. I would submit, however, that even if for the initial engagement of the public, the public has not been consulted on how it would participate, that is not an excuse for why you couldn’t seek their input after the process is underway and attempt to accommodate and take advantage of their suggestions on how to make the process easier and more meaningful for them. I also softened the language by replacing “involves” with “seeks input from.” With that additional change, if the Board can live without the “whenever possible,” I would recommend avoiding that kind of conditional language in the Core Values. Remember, the vast majority of people like the Core Values just fine the way they are so we should really have a compelling reason for making changes.)

6. **The public participation process provides participants with the information and resources they need to participate in a meaningful way and to understand the potential consequences of the decision under consideration.** (There were a couple of reviewers who suggested we should provide more than just information, but others worried that we were promising too much by adding this. Given that many agencies barely have enough resources for themselves to do meaningful public participation, I think there would be a pretty big push back from many of our members on this addition. Also, this value was originally created to deal with the serious problem that many found, particularly in newly democratizing nations, of opportunities to participate that were rendered meaningless by the deliberate withholding of pertinent information. Another reviewer thought it was not enough to simply provide information if the potentially affected stakeholders did not also understand the potential ramifications of the decision and different courses of action that were under consideration. While I don’t disagree with any of these sentiments, I would suggest we leave this one alone since we already have Value 3 that says we need to respect the needs of participants and Value 4 that says we should facilitate their involvement. Also, I would submit that it is implied enough that in order to participate in a “meaningful way” the information has to provide enough context about possible ramifications of the decision. One last suggestion was that this value be placed higher up in the list, possibly number 3. Other than the order of the first two and the last value, I think the order of Values 3 through 6 could be somewhat interchangeable. For the sake of continuity, I would leave this one where it is, but if the board wanted to move it up to third or fourth, I don’t think that would be too problematic.)
7. **The public participation process communicates to participants how their input informed or influenced the decision.** (The word that was replace was “affected.” This suggestion was made my the same reviewers that wanted to soften number 2, so this would of course make it more consistent if you made the same change to number 2. Personally, I think “affected” is a much more active and inspiring word. Most of the comments that tended to worry about promising too much seem to have come from people who were looking at it from the perspective of someone who is responsible for implementing a public participation program. I like to remind people that one of the greatest strengths of the Core Values is that they are written primarily from the perspective of the participant, not the practitioner. The Core Values are not what one or another professional thinks PP should be – rather, the Core Values represent what the public expects of a process that calls itself public participation. That is one of the reasons I resist diluting them. It seems to me that we ought not to shy away from being able to tell the public how they “affected” the outcome. “Informed or influenced” sounds just a little too much like we are trying to hedge our bets, rather than stand up for a simple, but powerful

value. Keep in mind too, that the Code of Ethics was designed to speak to the practitioner. The Core Values speak to the process and the participants.

8. **The public participation process fosters respect for diversity among stakeholders and the ongoing development of communities.** (As you can see, with the possible exception of number 3, no one had suggestions that made the core values any shorter. Having said that, this is the one case where I think the core value was materially improved by adding to it. The only other suggestion for this new value was to move it higher up in the list and make it the first one. I would suggest that the first two core values are still the linchpins and it is necessary that they come first because they explicitly ground public participation in decision making, which this one does not. I also think that while all the other values are primarily process values, this one is more of a social value and has more cultural relativity than the rest. For that reason, I would think we would want to shy away from elevating it that high in the pantheon. While I find it a very attractive social value and think it deepens the quality of what we have to offer, I think the most practical and political place to put it is at the end, since it was added to the original seven. I would also be okay with not adding it at all, because I think if we start adding social values, we could start down a slippery slope that has no end. Why not add values for environmental sensitivity and economic sustainability and world peace while we are at it? Personally, I love this value but it makes me very nervous about the precedent it sets.)

So where does that leave us? I am going to provide you with my personal recommendation based on the historical origins and intent of the Core Values, while recognizing the development since then of the Code of Ethics, Spectrum and the IAP2 Training and how they have "informed and influenced" the Core Values. I will state upfront as I have before that my bias is a conservative one. Unless there is a compelling reason to change, we are better off leaving a core value as is and not trying to wordsmith it. My other stated bias is that I am against watering down the core values, particularly if it is to assuage a practitioner's concern that sometimes it's hard to live up to the value. To me, that is exactly what the Core Values ought to be, and has been the source of their strength, i.e., they are inspirational and never fully attainable. They are what we aspire to and strive for, not what we settle for.

Here goes my recommendation:

1. The public should have a say in decisions about actions that could affect their lives.
2. Public participation includes the promise that the public's contribution will influence the decision.
3. The public participation process acknowledges the needs of all participants including decision makers.
4. The public participation process seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.
5. The public participation process seeks input from participants in designing how they participate.
6. The public participation process provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.
7. The public participation process communicates to participants how their input affected the decision.
8. The public participation process fosters respect for diversity among participants and for the ongoing development of communities.

My last word would be to consider carefully the ramifications and precedent set by adding number 8 since it is more of a social value than a process value

--Lewis Michaelson

IAP2 Board Action on Core Values Renewal Process

IAP2's Board agreed with the proposed recommendations as presented on five of the seven current Core Values and concurred with the task force recommendation to defer action on the proposed eighth Core Value. The board referred the two recommended changes on which they had not reached agreement to

two teams of board members for further consideration. These teams brought back further refinements to the board in March. These recommendations were agreed to in April and shared with the membership at large in the May e-News.

At the June 2005 board meeting, the board determined that while it fully supports the revisions to the Core Values, they believe we also need to seek the agreement of the membership at large by seeking ratification at the 2005 Annual General Membership meeting set for Oct. 18, 2005 in Portland, Oregon, USA.

Motion to the Membership

IAP2's board moves that the revisions to the Association's Core Values, as recommended by the Core Values Renewal team and supported by the Board, be ratified by the membership.

IAP2's Core Values as adopted by the Board of Directors in January 2000:	Proposed revised text as approved by the board in April 2005 [italics denote proposed changes to the 2000 version]:
1. The public should have a say in decisions about actions that affect their lives.	1. The public should have a say in decisions about actions that <i>could</i> affect their lives.
2. Public participation includes the promise that the public's contribution will influence the decision.	2. Public participation includes the promise that the public's contribution will influence the decision.
3. The public participation process communicates the interests and meets the process needs of all participants.	3. Public participation <i>promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and</i> communicating the needs <i>and interests</i> of all participants, <i>including decision makers</i> .
4. The public participation process seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected.	4. Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected <i>by or interested in a decision</i> .
5. The public participation process involves participants in defining how they participate.	5. Public participation <i>seeks input from</i> participants in designing how they participate.
6. The public participation process provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.	6. Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.
7. The public participation process communicates to participants how their input affected the decision.	7. Public participation communicates to participants how their input affected the decision.

Core Values Ratification Decision Process

1. In early October, notice is being sent to all members of the Board's recommendation for making changes to IAP2's Core Values with a summary of the member participation already undertaken.
2. The same information will also be posted on IAP2's Web site.
3. We will also include comments and responses received since the board's May announcement to members and any other relevant materials.
4. The ratification motion will be presented at the October 2005 Annual General Membership meeting. Discussion on the motion will be held and a vote will be taken. The vote will be by a show of hands. A simple majority is needed for a decision.
5. The decision will be reported to the members at the AGM, recorded in the meeting minutes, reported in the November e-News and posted on IAP2's Web site.