

**6TH REPORT OF THE**  
**2013 COUNCIL COMPENSATION REVIEW TASK FORCE**

Meeting held on September 12, 2013, commencing at 5:00 PM, in the Council Chambers, Second Floor, London City Hall.

**PRESENT:** B. Orr (Chair), S. Levin, M. Parkinson and J. Tozer and L. Rowe (Secretary).

**ABSENT:** V. Junior, J. Macoun and S. Toth.

**ALSO PRESENT:** T.L. Dobbie, M. Ribera, C. Saunders and G. Saylor.

---

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

1. Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest

Recommendation: That it BE NOTED that no pecuniary interests were disclosed.

**II. CONSENT ITEMS**

None.

**III. SCHEDULED ITEMS**

2. Public Participation Meeting – Compensation for the Mayor and Council Members

Recommendation: That the following written submissions BE RECEIVED:

- a) a communication dated August 6, 2013 from J. Kennedy, President, London Development Institute and L. Langdon, Executive Officer, London Homebuilders' Association, providing input to the 2013 Council Compensation Review Task Force; and,
- b) a communication from M. Ross, Executive Director, London Youth Advisory Council, providing input to the 2013 Council Compensation Review Task Force;

it being noted that the Chair provided the attached overview presentation at the public participation meeting regarding compensation for the Mayor and Council Members;

it being pointed out that the following individuals made oral submissions at the public participation meeting held to receive public input on the matters before the 2013 Council Compensation Review Task Force:

- B. Brock, constituent – advising that he made a presentation before the 2010 Council Compensation Review Task Force where he talked about a blue print and model and asked that the attached document be resubmitted; noting that four years later there has been no change and no questions regarding his 2010 presentation; questioning what “qualified” means when referring to Members of Council as the only qualifications that are necessary are those that fulfill the requirements of provincial legislation to run for municipal office; stating that you can’t and shouldn’t think you can come up with qualified people and in, in any event, “qualified” is in the eye of the beholder; indicating that the monies saved through the elimination of the Board of Control was redirected to the Members of Council Members to hire additional staff, which begs the question why should Members of Council get a raise when they can afford to hire more staff to do their work for them; expressing the view that compensation for Members of Council should not be raised as they do not deserve it, which is demonstrated in the annual budget document which benchmarks number of hours and number of meetings; noting that in January 2013, the Council Meeting was approximately 4 hours long, including the time taken for a dinner recess and 20 minutes for presentations to the public, and there were about 80 motions for the 400 page agenda, which means that each Member of Council would have spoken for 4 minutes each, on average; stating that there is a need to

work smarter and separate Council and Administrative roles and citizens should control what Members of Council do; stressing the need for accountability guidelines and suggesting that the Task Force look at Windsor's role descriptions for Members of Council; expressing concern that the City denied him the right to sit on this Task Force and Council should have no right to say no to his democratic rights; indicating that the City is the way it is because of politicians and professionals; relaying that some years ago he was advised to not join clubs when serving in a municipal office so that he was not influenced by any particular group; questioning why the Urban League of London, the London Chamber of Commerce and the London District Labour Council are members on everything as are environmental groups; emphasizing that responsibility needs to be placed on Members of Council and noting that in Quebec Members of Council were removed from office for only being charged with illegal acts and not yet convicted; indicating ReThink London has a component on land use, but it is not his role as a citizen to interpret the discussion—all parties need to come to the table and lay everything out without playing any games, and compare apples to apples; and summing up his comments by saying that compensation shouldn't be looked at in isolation of accountability, otherwise don't make any changes...and don't ignore input from the trenches as the people in the trenches need to feel part of the decision-making process.

- Judy Potter, constituent – indicating she has been making noise on anti-poverty and social justice since 1994; stating that “compensation” is the wrong message, it should be “salary”; indicating her belief that Council and staff are of vital importance, but London's current economic position makes this topic distasteful; noting that \$103,000 in compensation for the Mayor is not unreasonable and the 1/3 tax free break is a good deal; indicating that sometimes she does not feel listened to and that the City can't be operated as a business as constituents are human beings; noting that she calculated her own personal income and expenses and realized she is living on a deficit and she hasn't had a raise in her pay on disability and ODSP for some time; sharing that she is heartbroken that politicians are looking for a raise when she, and others like her, do not have sufficient income to meet their basic living expenses; expressing her fear that this is a stepping stone to full time, and that Members of Council agreed to put time in when they ran for office; emphasizing that everyone deserves a fair shake and compensation is what you get when you earn it, though it is not being suggested that Council Members don't earn their pay; questioning why, in this economic climate in London, are we having this conversation; indicating that Council compensation has been the subject of discussion since 1994, and it doesn't make sense why there should be an additional stipend to act as Chair of a standing committee; and summarizing that the citizens want to trust their government and if compensation were to be increased then there wouldn't be trust anymore, so don't increase the compensation.
- Stephen Turner, constituent: indicating he is appearing before the Task Force as an individual who has previously run for elected office and may have an interest in doing so again in future; suggesting there is a need for the mechanism for change to be depoliticized as there is an inherent conflict of interest; noting that Council compensation is a hot potato, especially in a “zero budget” climate, so having any discussion about increasing compensation can't be good; suggesting that perhaps the decision-making body should be by a body independent from Council and once a decision is made, the compensation should be tied to any increases for municipal non-union staff; in terms of benchmarking, consideration should be given at looking at the internal human resources grid and for comparators such as level of decision-making, breadth of stakeholder liaison, regulatory responsibility etc.; also suggesting that single tier municipalities with over 200,000 people be considered, together with workload responsibilities and those with annual budgets over \$500 million; he indicated that in terms of full time versus part time, there is an advantage to keeping the ability to serve open to the broadest cross section of the population; he indicated his belief that when compensation requires a concurrent career, that lends itself to conflict of interest, but if the City were the sole employer conflict of interest would be almost entirely eliminated; he also noted that municipal employees couldn't be on Council, but if they were they could offer insight on many matters; he also suggested that compensation should reflect the level of

workload, but not so much meetings as constituency work;

- David Winninger, constituent – indicating he previously served on Council and was paid similarly to the current Council Members and that he believes Council Members are adequately paid for their work, recognizing they may compare well to some other municipalities and not as well to others; noting that some Council Members, like himself, held down full time jobs outside of their Council responsibilities; stating that Council support increased from 1 to 3 staff during the time he held office and that Council Members' expense allocation has moved from \$3,500 per year to \$15,000 per year, which allows the current Council Members to hire their own administrative support to assist them; questioning what compelling reason there would be to increase Council compensation when they have more resources to assist them and the economy is not good; suggesting that Council Members do not need to attend all meetings, the most important ones would be meetings with constituents; indicating his agreement with Professor Sancton, Western University, that if there was a lot more work and London Council Members were falling way behind others in their compensation then perhaps an increase would be in order; stating that as a taxpayer he wants to see his tax dollars spent wisely and if services have to be cut for higher salaries, he would rather have the services maintained; indicating that if Council Members made good use of their additional assistance then they should not have to spend extra hours doing their work, noting he put in about 12 hours per week as a Council Member and was able to get the majority of his Council work done; advising he does not see a Council Member's position at City Hall as a career, if you get elected you are fortunate, and he never felt under compensated; stating that if there is to be a substantial increase in compensation or a Council Member's position was to be considered "full time", then that should be justified; and urging the Task Force to remember that many others have not seen pay increases.
- Professor A. Sancton, Western University – indicating that he had not intended on speaking, but as he was referenced by others, he thought he should say something; noting that he only knew about the meeting because the local newspaper called him; and stating he thought the 1/3 tax free allowance should be discontinued for transparency, but that if it is removed, the net effect would be sending in a cheque from the City to the federal and provincial governments.

#### **IV. ITEMS FOR DIRECTION**

None.

#### **V. DEFERRED MATTERS/ADDITIONAL BUSINESS**

##### **3. Next Meeting Date**

Recommendation: That it BE NOTED that the 2013 Council Compensation Review Task Force will hold its next meeting on September 18, 2013; it being noted that T.L. Dobbie will be providing the Task Force with information on the City of Windsor's role descriptions for Council Members, as well as the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing's information on the role of Council Members, at its next meeting; it being further noted that the Task Force Secretary was asked to place Mr. Brock's submission from 2010, the brainstorming worksheet and survey results on the next meeting agenda.

#### **VI. CONFIDENTIAL**

None.

#### **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 6:26 PM.