



STAFF REPORT

Title: Bylaw No. 653-BD-19 - Procedure Bylaw

Meeting Date: September 17, 2024

Executive Summary:

The City of Cold Lake is observing an increase in requests for delegation via outline meeting applications (e.g. Microsoft Teams). These out-of-town requests for delegations tend to have genres such as requests for funding, product presentations, and concerns with municipal services (out of town).

A good example is that the administration recently allowed a vendor to provide a presentation to City Council. There has also been requests for persons that reside in Edmonton to speak as a delegation to City Council, but don't want to make the trip to the community.

Although it seems to be a simple request, there are other considerations in this regard. This report has been generated to have some discussion with City Council on the exceptions associated with the use of virtual meetings during Council's regular or Corporate Priorities Committee Meetings for person(s) and organizations that are not Members, as defined in the Procedure Bylaw.

With the City's annual organization meeting approach, administration is also soliciting feedback on any other elements of the Procedure Bylaw it would like to consider.

Background:

The following are some perspectives:

1. Of interest, a request has been made that should one in the world (wherever in the world) may attend as a delegation to City Council to provide their perspectives on issues and tops. A request has also been made that anyone in the world (wherever in the world) may attend the City's statutory and non-statutory public hearings to give representations on initiatives.
2. The City administration is currently not highly trained in video production in hosting sophisticated meetings in a broader format. This becomes more profound in managing public hearings.



3. On one hand, opening accessibility can be seen as positive however there could be unintended consequences for broadening the definition. There have been requests for delegations from person(s) outside of the community that want to raise concerns with initiatives, programs, services, and/or political ideologies from another community, sometimes from a different province. Administration is not providing any specific examples in this report, as some of the topics can be very divisive.

In essence, does Council want to enable other elements to appear before Council via virtual meetings (and how should the accessibility be managed) Examples include:

- Delegations
- Public Hearings

Further, is Council satisfied with Webcasting Retention being limited to three (3) months. Administration has not received any feedback from the public in this regard.

In effort to give context to the discussion the following are statements in Bylaw No. 653-BD-19 - Procedure Bylaw:

Definition:

"Member" means a member of Council, or a member of a Committee

Electronic Meetings:

7.20 A meeting may be conducted by means of electronic or other communication facilities if:

7.20.1 notice is given to the public of the meeting, including the way in which it is to be conducted;

7.20.2 the facilities enable the public to watch or listen to the meeting at a place specified in that notice and a designated officer is in attendance at that place; and

7.20.3 the facilities enable all the meeting's participants to watch or hear each other;

7.20.4 there is a secure means by which the meeting participant can join and participate in the meeting.



7.21 Members participating in a meeting held by means of a communication facility are deemed to be present at the meeting.

7.22 A maximum of three (3) Members may participate in a meeting by electronic communication (provided that participation by three (3) Members is permitted by the technology and that there is a secure way to access the technology).

Temporarily suspended until January 31, 2022. Amended by bylaw 726-BD-21 September 14, 2021.

7.23 Members participating in a meeting by electronic communication may participate in any In Camera session provided that he or she swears or affirms an affidavit provided by Administration and satisfies all other procedural safeguards to ensure confidentiality.

7.24 Members may participate through electronic communication in any Meeting, Committee of the Whole Meeting, or Committee Meeting. Council encourages that electronic participation not exceed five (5) times over a one (1) year period. Temporarily suspended until January 31, 2022. Amended by bylaw 726-BD-21, September 14, 2021

The Procedure Bylaw No. 653-BD-19 was passed on November 26, 2019 which regulates the procedure and conduct at meetings of Council and committees established by Council. The Bylaw has been amended on three instances including:

- October 27, 2020 – Amendment to permit Livestreaming and Webcasting of Council meetings
- September 14, 2021 – Amendment to temporarily suspend the restriction of 3 members maximum attending meetings virtually and maximum of 5 times in a year
- February 8, 2022 – Amendment to add an Indigenous Land Acknowledgement

Bylaw No. 594-AD-16, Records Management and Retention Bylaw was passed on November 26, 2016, establishing the principles for records management and retention schedules establishing the time periods by which the City's official records shall be retained or destroyed.

When livestreaming and webcasting of Council meetings was introduced, an amendment was also made to Bylaw No. 594-AD-16, Records Management and Retention Bylaw to specify that webcast and livestream video footage of open meeting would be retained for three (3) months, and then destroyed. The intent was that the record of the meeting would be available to review for this time, but that the recording would not create a permanent record.



This report is provided to seek feedback from the Corporate Priorities Committee on whether they would like to see amendments made to the Procedural Bylaw, or the retention period assigned to livestream/webcast records.

Alternatives:

This report is provided to seek feedback from the Committee.

Recommended Action:

This report is provided to seek feedback from the Committee.

Budget Implications (Yes or No):

No.

Submitted by:

Kevin Nagoya, Chief Administrative Officer