

# Social Media Discussion

November 2021 Council Staff

## Social Media Presence

Facebook (~ 5 posts per week)

• 3,846 followers

Instagram (~5 posts per week)

• 477 followers

Twitter (~5 posts per week)

• 343 followers

#### YouTube (as needed)

• 72 subscribers



# Past Approach

- Informal, without clear Council guidance on social media usage and objectives
- Broad staff discretion on social media interactions and engagement
- Lack of clarity on the role of social media comments within the formal Council comment process



## Concerns with Managing Comments



Consistency: staff responded to some comments but not all, and had to choose which comments justified a response



Confusion: not always clear to commenters that social media posts are not part of the official comment record



Time: monitoring and engaging through multiple posts over multiple platforms can require significant effort

Current Approach to Address Concerns Allow comments on all relevant platforms

Staff do not respond to comments on posts

When staff post content that has an associated official public comment opportunity, the post will include information on how to provide official public comment and note that comments on social media platforms will not be included in the official administrative record.

# Social Media Policy

- Should the Council develop a social media policy?
- If so, what should be included?



## Social Media – Benefits & Risks

- What are the benefits of the Council being on social media?
- Why should the Council engage in social media?
- What can the Council expect to gain?
- What are the risks of commenting and engaging on social media?
- What are the risks of not participating in social media?



### Expectations

- What is expected of agencies like the Council when it comes to social media presence, including content and managing comments on posts?
  - Fisherman Perspective?
  - Partner Agency Perspective?
  - Media Perspective?

