

## COMMENTS BY DR. DANIEL PAGE PROVIDE TO ME TO ATTACHED TO MY NOTES.

### Minutes Corrections

**Corrections to be made to October 21st Meeting Minutes (page 2):** This is missing all specific policy recommendations, and the summary misses specific policy recommendations [e.g. notification policy recommendations], and makes remarks that did not occur. Immediately below is the original:

*Daniel Page spoke about the freedom of expression, transparency and the wording of the procedure by-law. He referred to the Charter Advocates Canada letter submitted at the previous council meeting. He supports the expansion of Question Period as it is the best place for residents to voice concerns and allows all of council to hear the information. He mentioned that the RM website is a poor tool for residents and council to engage with and that there should be more options for streaming council meetings. He noted that the draft agenda should be posted a week earlier to allow more opportunity to hear from residents on an item. The minutes should contain a summary of all interactions as they appear incomplete.*

Here is a recommended, fixed version:

*Daniel Page spoke about freedom of expression, transparency, and the wording of the procedure by-law. His delegation was separated into three parts, where each included specific policy recommendations:*

- 1. Daniel first commented on Section 16. He referred to his previous delegation on the matter and the Charter Advocates Canada letter submitted at the previous council. Daniel said not to introduce the phrase "harassment free" into the by-law, to make 16(c) more precise and limited as he said the phrase "other behaviours which may prove disruptive" is vague and ambiguous, and to completely remove Section 16(d).*
- 2. Daniel stated he did not support removing Question Period, and he supported an expansion of Question Period. He offered opposing arguments to the main justifications for removing Question Period, and said that e-mail is not a substitute for speaking to council in the chamber. Daniel also stated the chamber instead is the most appropriate place for residents to voice concerns to Council, as there is a record of it among all of council. For e-mails, he also offered a recommendation that common queries made by e-mail be called "community questions" and to publish these on an easy to find part of the website and link to these new posts using social media, regularly.*

*In Sections 7.0 and 7.2, Daniel recommended to increase times of releasing draft agendas, all items to be placed on the agenda, ignoring new changes to the Delegations section, to at least seven days instead of at least four days. Daniel then emphasised the importance of written notification for residents and a need for it, requesting a stronger requirement for written notification of residents for major policy items before they can appear on an agenda for third-reading vote/approval at a meeting. His specific policy recommendation was that direct, written notification must be sent to at least thirty days before a second reading, and a third reading of a major By-Law cannot be voted on without this written notification being sent to the sent date of at least thirty days.*

- (3) Daniel then commented on Section 15, to give recommendations to improve archiving and documentation. Daniel recommended that Section 15 should state that Minutes contain at least a detailed summary of all interactions to be recorded at the meeting, and that Section 15.9 should change wording "audio tape meeting proceedings" to instead "audio and video tape meeting proceedings". In addition to this, Daniel also recommended that a "hot" microphone should be present in the chambers to ensure all audio is recorded in the chamber, and that the RM can use its already existing technology to broadcast and archive video of meetings on multiple websites.*

There are later parts in the minutes, where details are missing [for completeness], these should maybe be considered too:

- Page 4, in the question Daniel posed. It does not document the response received for the first part. Daniel presented a specific instance where a lack of sufficient notice, which the Procedures By-Law can introduce, was a serious problem to his neighbourhood in April-May 2024. Daniel said this was a failure of the Procedure By-Law, and said Planning's notice was totally insufficient to protect his community.
- Page 5, in the question Daniel posed on why there was no public hearing. It does not document entirely the exchange, where it was concluded the critique was deemed fair by Councillor Fuhl. The issue was that this is an important By-Law, not that every By-Law needs a public hearing.

**Corrections to be made Nov. 5th Minutes:** Ambiguous sentence, as makes it also sound like Daniel Page made those statements.

*“Daniel Page spoke about the September 24th Special Meeting Minutes, and advised that his comments were inaccurate, contained false information, some omitted, and some contained errors.”*

This should read instead: (Replace “his” with “the minutes documenting his”)

*“Daniel Page spoke about the September 24th Special Meeting Minutes, and advised that the minutes documenting his comments were inaccurate, contained false information, some omitted, and some contained errors.”*