



# MOUNTMILLIGAN

## Community Sustainability Committee (CSC) Meeting Minutes

**Date/Time:** November 18th 10:00am-12:00pm **Project:** Mt. Milligan

**Location:** Teleconference **Date Issued:** November 19, 2011

**Prepared by:** Catherine Rockandel

**Subject:** Notes from Teleconference  
Catherine Rockandel, Rockandel & Associates

**Facilitator:** T (604) 898-4614 E: cat@growpartnerships.com

### Attendees:

Name	Organization	Present (P)
Emily Colombo	Fort St. James, EDO	P
Brenda Gouglas	District of Fort St. James, Councillor	P
Ann McCormick	College of New Caledonia - Fort St. James	P
Bruce Muir	West Moberly First Nation, Land Use Manager	
Trish Jacques	District of Mackenzie, Councillor	P
Diane Smith	District of Mackenzie, EDO	P
Fraser Deacon	Northern Interior Mining Group	
Rosemary Sam	Nak'azdli Band Council, Representative	P
Evan Prince	Nak'azdli Band, Natural Resource Worker	P
Jenine Solonas	McLeod Lake Indian Band, Councillor	
Kathie LaForge (KLF)	District of Vanderhoof, EDO	P
Dustin Renaud	Initiatives Prince George, Executive Coordinator	P
Leslie Lax	Min of Regional Economic and Skills Development	P
Jocelyn Fraser (JF)	TCRK (did not participate in polls)	P
Wes Carson (WC)	TCRK (did not participate in polls)	P
Scott Morrison	TCRK	
Christy Smith (CS)	TCRK	P
Jodi DuBois (JD)	TCRK	P

### Distribution: Attendees + Community Sustainability Committee distribution list

Description: Summary of Action Items	Resp.	Due Date	Item
Develop a membership policy that includes a revised membership statement based on the input for review prior to the Dec 9 <sup>th</sup> CSC meeting.	JF	Dec 2 2011	2

### Discussion Items:

#	Topic
1	<p><b>Introduction:</b> Overview of Teleconference Overview, Participant Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In advance of the meeting the facilitator had prepared an online survey to poll members on their perspectives for each of the Terms of Reference Criteria. The poll results and comments were included in the agenda that was sent to members in advance of the teleconference.</li> </ul>
2	<p><b>Terms of Reference: Criteria Review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The facilitator suggested the group use the Gradient of Agreement process as it had done at September 18<sup>th</sup> CSC meeting to review and get input on TOR guidelines. The process is as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Read the proposed guideline under discussion, check to see everyone understands the proposal. Discuss on line survey results and comments. If the group is able to confirm a proposal then poll the group again. If the group is unable to confirm a proposal for polling then identify actions to be taken.</li> <li>Take poll and capture everyone’s position on the scale. The poll is not a decision it is just an indicator of the extent to which the members support the statement or proposal.</li> </ol> </li> </ul> <p><b><u>TOR Membership Criteria</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Original Criteria:</i></b> Members of the CSC will be: Residents of the region</p> <p><b>On Line Poll</b></p> <p>4 = I really like it  1 = Not perfect but good enough  4 = More discussion needed  0 = Serious disagreement, don’t count on my support</p> <p><b><i>Revised Draft Criteria Guideline:</i></b> CSC members would be representatives of the region</p> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was Fraser Lake included in original EA document? Yes, they are referred to in footnote</li> <li>There is a general reference in footnote from EA to other First Nations. Can the seven be listed by name?</li> <li>This criteria needs to be more narrowly defined</li> <li>Residents is a singular reference – could we say regional representatives or resident representation</li> <li>Concerned that CSC members are defining the terms by which individuals can be members</li> <li>What about regional district participation?</li> <li>Discussion about the difference between membership and participation in committee. Could the membership be a core group of people similar to the current committee whereas participation could draw from the larger EA region</li> <li>Action: Jocelyn to re-write the criteria statement based on this suggestion and resubmit to group</li> </ul>

**Teleconference Poll:**

5 = I really like it

5 = Not perfect but good enough

1 = More discussion needed

0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**Action:** The poll was taken and it was agreed that JF would develop a revised statement based on the input for review prior to the Dec 9<sup>th</sup> CSC meeting

**Original Membership Criteria:** Willing to participate regularly at scheduled CSC meetings. CSC members will make a case-by-case determination of how to address those who wish to remain members but have missed three or more of the meetings in the previous year

**On Line Poll**

4 = I really like it

4 = Not perfect but good enough

0 = More discussion needed

1 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**Revised Draft Criteria Guideline:** After the words "meetings in the previous year" add the words "as defined by the policy".

**Discussion**

- The on line survey comment "need to defined region case-by-case" is related to the concern that the CSC needs a structured process and policy to address members that miss more than three meetings.
- The case-by-case consideration would take into consideration the challenges of participating
- What is definition of membership? How do we determine individual name that goes with membership position?
- How do you keep seat alive? Concern about who is representing members, who decides who represents what communities?
- If a letter is sent to an individual that misses three meetings, what policy will it refer to? What would be the function of the letter? For example: would it be sent to the member to assess their interest in participating in the committee.
- We need to develop a policy regarding membership.

**Action:**

- JF to develop a membership policy for review by the members and discussed at the Dec 9<sup>th</sup> CSC meeting. The poll was deferred until Dec 9<sup>th</sup>, 2011.

**Original Membership Criteria:** Prepared to invest time and energy to learn about the various aspects Mount Milligan operations

**On Line Poll**

7 = I really like it

1 = Not perfect but good enough

1 = More discussion needed

0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**Revised & Adopted Draft Criteria Guideline:** CSC members would be prepared to demonstrate a commitment to CSC by attending meetings and thereby investing time and energy to learn about the various aspects of Mount Milligan operations.

**Discussion**

- Pretty difficult to put a time line on learning aspect so criteria should speak to commitment
- Investment of time and energy happens within the meetings

**Teleconference Poll**

11 = I really like it

0 = Not perfect but good enough

0 = More discussion needed

0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**Original Membership Criteria:** Members of the CSC would be prepared to work constructively and collaboratively with members of CSC and TCM to address areas of mutual concern; and to respect differences of opinion

**On Line Poll**

7 = I really like it

1 = Not perfect but good enough

2 = More discussion needed

0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**Revised & Adopted Draft Criteria Guideline:** Members of the CSC would be prepared to work constructively and collaboratively to discuss interests, concerns and opportunities; and to respect differences of opinion

**Discussion**

- Integrate TCM into committee by not referencing these members separately
- Not all concerns will be mutual so suggestion was to replace with "interests, concerns and opportunities"
- The committee may not be able to address all concerns but it can certainly discuss them

**Teleconference Poll**

11 = I really like it

0 = Not perfect but good enough

0 = More discussion needed

0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**Original Membership Criteria:** Members of the CSC will be able to self-manage their level of commitment for CSC participation by indicating how long they would like to serve: a specific term is not mandatory. Members will be given an annual opportunity to renew their commitment to the group

**On Line Poll**

5 = I really like it

4 = Not perfect but good enough

0 = More discussion needed

0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**Revised & Adopted Draft Criteria Guideline:** CSC members will self-manage their level of commitment to the CSC and provide one months notice to terminate their involvement.

**Discussion**

- Although more discussion was not indicated in the online survey, the members raised concerns about the contradiction between a specific term not being mandatory and the members being given an annual opportunity to renew commitment.
- After some discussion a draft criteria statement as outline above was suggested. The members were polled on this statement. The results of which are as follows:

**Teleconference Poll**

- 11 = I really like it
- 0 = Not perfect but good enough
- 0 = More discussion needed
- 0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**Original Membership Criteria:** Both CSC members and TCM will actively promote the CSC in the community as a way of broadening both knowledge of and participation in CSC. This will help keep a sense of ongoing renewal as current members choose to leave or others take some time out.

**On Line Poll**

- 5 = I really like it
- 2 = Not perfect but good enough
- 3 = More discussion needed
- 0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**Draft Revised Membership Criteria:** CSC members will actively promote the CSC in the community as a way of broadening both knowledge of and participation in CSC. This will help keep a sense of ongoing renewal as current members choose to leave or others take some time out.

**Discussion**

- Significant discussion focused on who decides who represents their community? The members suggested that it could be Chief & Council or Mayor & Council, or it could be related to the employment position an individual holds such as: Economic Development Officer, Natural Resource Officer; and or related to the organization one works for such as a representative from the College on New Caledonia (CNC)
- It was suggested that the committee could identify gaps and invite sector representation
- It was suggested that Nak'azdli has concerns that their perspectives around decisions are represented moving forward. This was probed further to determine whether there was concern about their perspectives not being represented as part of the TOR discussion. EP said that the concern was not in relation to the TOR process.
- Members suggested that a membership policy could be developed to incorporate these issues.

**Action:**

- The members asked Jocelyn Fraser, TCM to draft this policy for review by the members in preparation for the Dec 9<sup>th</sup> board meeting. The poll was deferred until a draft policy is prepared

**Note:** Member Rosemary Sam existed the call.

**Adopted Membership Criteria Guideline:** Prospective new members will be provided the opportunity to be oriented to these Terms of Reference, CSC functioning, and a history of CSC discussions in order to facilitate their ability to become an active member

**On Line Poll**

- 8 = I really like it
- 1 = Not perfect but good enough
- 0 = More discussion needed
- 0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**Teleconference Poll**

- 9 = I really like it
- 1 = Not perfect but good enough
- 0 = More discussion needed
- 0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**Discussion:** Members had no additional concerns.

**TOR: Area of Focus Criteria**

**Adopted Area of Focus Criteria:** Education and training to maximize direct, indirect and induced employment in the region

**On Line Poll**

- 8 = I really like it
- 1 = Not perfect but good enough
- 0 = More discussion needed
- 0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**Teleconference Poll**

- 9 = I really like it
- 1 = Not perfect but good enough
- 0 = More discussion needed
- 0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**Discussion**

- Members said no additional discussion was required.

**Adopted Area of Focus Criteria:** Business development to maximize contracting and supply service opportunities at Mount Milligan for companies within the region

**On Line Survey Poll**

- 5 = I really like it
- 3 = Not perfect but good enough
- 1 = More discussion needed
- 0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**Discussion**

- How do I facilitate communication between TCM and community?
- Need to understand my role as a communicator, how do I bring CSC responses back to community?
- Does CSC speak with one single voice or can we respect differences of opinion? Yes we respect differences of opinion

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TCM’s expectation is that the committee operates with mutual respect, so if there is an area of concern members would bring it to the CSC first before discussing it openly in a public forum</li> </ul> <p><b>Teleconference Poll</b>  7 = I really like it  3 = Not perfect but good enough  0 = More discussion needed  0 = Serious disagreement, don’t count on my support</p> <p><b>Adopted Area of Focus Criteria:</b> Health and safety to facilitate regional partnerships and to support best practices.</p> <p><b>On Line Poll</b>  6 = I really like it  3 = Not perfect but good enough  0 = More discussion needed  0 = Serious disagreement, don’t count on my support</p> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with statement but wonder if we should include information sharing and feedback processes in this statement</li> <li>• This is included in TOR purpose statement and applies to all focus areas. If we include it in this statement it would be repetitive as it would need to be in all focus area statements</li> </ul> <p><b>Teleconference Poll</b>  7 = I really like it  3 = Not perfect but good enough  0 = More discussion needed  0 = Serious disagreement, don’t count on my support</p>
3	<p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>The teleconference ended with the members agreeing to bring forward the following items for the December 9<sup>th</sup> meeting at the Coast Inn of the North, Prince George.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review TOR focus Area Criteria for Environment and Community Development</li> <li>• Review TOR Meeting Schedule Criteria</li> <li>• Review draft membership policy developed by JF</li> <li>• CS asked that the Donation Guideline Evaluation be added to the Dec 9<sup>th</sup> agenda</li> </ul>