

Find messages, documents, photos or people Advanced ▾

Delegation status for Gov. Task Force



To Woolsey Heather

Cc Bcc

Delegation status for Gov. Task Force

Anastasia Bush, Admin. Asst. ||
City Clerk's Office,
Legal Services
City of London.

Re: Delegation Status for Gov. Working Committee on June 24, 2024 at 10 AM

Apologize for method to have presentation for June 17, 2024 by 9 AM. Because of several things in progress the package I have put together covers a lot of factors in getting to this.

Summary of submission:

Application to Advisory Committes change May 15, 2024
Delegation status for Gov. Working Group June 24 at 10 AM guidelines etc..
Request to be put on agenda subject to Chair approval (denied)

Compensation Task Force Brief reference to Heather Woolsey, Jan. 21. 2024. including copy of Feb. 1, 2022
"Unsolicited Brief on Councilor Compensation" to Mr. Dan Ross Chair of task force.

Background data for FYI:
Councilor role, January 31, 2022, Notes to file)
SP&P meeting 11/30/21 areas of overlap with compensation task force.
Compensation Meeting #13 April 13, 2017
Compensation meeting #12, Feb. 22,, 2017
Dec. 9, Cheryl Miller, copy of Compensation Task Force unsolicited report sent to Linda Rowe, secretary, September 9th, 2016.
5th report of 2016 Council Compensation Task Force May 12, 2016
Email from Councilor Virginia Ridley May 12, 2016
email to Mayor Matt May 2, 2016
Compensation Task Force notes meeting #1, April 21, 2016
Compensation task force meeting #3, April 21, 2016
B. Brock notes April 17, 2016 (comments to Phil McLeod)
Memo from Cathy Saunders; city clerk, Dating back to B. Brock request to join task force.
Note: Final Report of Council Compensation Review Task Force 2016 -- July 2017.

Free Press "We need guidelines for councillors 1/13/ 2010. by Bill Brock"

Consideration to be appointed to task force under consideration.
A major part should be clear identification of roles for staff, councillors , public.
Note that this debate started away back in 2010 with my first 40 minute presentation and dialogue!

William H. Brock

Re: Application to Community Advisory Committees

From: bill brock (Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14)

To: hwoolsey@london.ca

Date: Wednesday, May 15, 2024 at 12:11 p.m. EDT

Ms. Woolsey, City Clerk,s Office

Re: Application for ITCAC

To start with you have my permission to put ob public agenda!

I wish to withdraw my application givem the events with Compensation Task force in whatever format comes out of Gov. Task Force discussions.

In addition to that matter I ask the following for clarification on the Gov. working group meeting

I was advised when I arrived for meeting that because I was late (Chair and Clerk were advised) I wouldn't be able to speak (Unless chair allowed).

Howeve the Chair brought up Horac former member of Compensation Group to speak today but couldn't so rescheduled for June meeting.

This was not any part of meeting agenda before my request?

Also on Feb. 1, 2022 I sent to city clerk (M. Schuihess) an unsolicited brief for the Compensation Task Force. Dhould be on file!

On Jan 21st, 2024 on the Council Agenda 8.4, 3rd report. On this letter was detailed my background and details to this matter.

As a footnote in 2022 the members of the task force D. Ross (Chair),D Bryant,J Lyons, C. Scrvengeour (?),J. Tadhope.

Horac was on previous task force.

On Wednesday, May 15, 2024 at 08:47:19 a.m. EDT, Woolsey, Heather <hwoolsey@london.ca> wrote:

Good morning,

Please be advised that at the Council meeting held on May 14, 2024, Council referred all of the applications for the Community Advisory Committees to the Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee meeting that will be held on May 28. All recommendations from that Committee will be vetted through Council in June. Once the appointments from Council have been confirmed you will be notified either way.

Governance Working Group - delegation request


From: Bush, Anastasia (abush@london.ca)
To: Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14
Cc: ehunt@london.ca
Date: Tuesday, May 14, 2024 at 08:28 a.m. EDT

Good morning, Bill.

I am writing to confirm that you will have delegation status for the next Governance Working Group, to be held at 10 AM, June 24, 2024, in Committee Room #5.

If you have any written communication for this agenda, please could you forward that at your earliest convenience and no later than Monday, June 17, at 9 AM?

Thank you kindly. Please contact me with questions.
Anastasia

 **Anastasia Bush** (she/her)
Administrative Assistant II
City Clerk's Office
Legal Services
City of London

PO Box 5035, London ON N6A 4L9
P: 519.661.CITY (2489) x 5422 | Fax: 519.661.4892
abush@london.ca | www.london.ca

The City of London is situated on the traditional lands of the Anishinaabek, Haudenosaunee, Lūnaapéewak and Attawandaron. We honour and respect the history, languages and culture of the diverse Indigenous people who call this territory home. The City of London is currently home to many First Nations, Métis and Inuit today. As representatives of the people of the City of London, we are grateful to have the opportunity to work and live in this territory.

From: Woolsey, Heather <hwoolsey@London.ca>
Sent: Sunday, May 12, 2024 6:22 PM
To: Bush, Anastasia <abush@london.ca>; Hunt, Elizabeth <ehunt@london.ca>; Corman, Sarah <scorman@london.ca>
Subject: Fwd: [EXTERNAL] Governance meeting

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: bill brock <^{Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14}>
Sent: Sunday, May 12, 2024 3:43:08 PM
To: Woolsey, Heather <hwoolsey@London.ca>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Governance meeting

Ms. Woolsey, City Clerk office.

Re; Governance Working Group Meeting May 13, 2024 at 10:am.

Sorry for lateness however request delegation status.

I plan in attending.

Permission to put in public agenda as a delegation subject to approval by committee
Sincerest appreciation

Bill Brock

Fw: Compensation Task Force Brief

From: bill brock (<Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14 >

To: mike@am980.ca

Date: Monday, January 22, 2024 at 11:04 a.m. EST

Mike,

This was sent to city to add to agenda for tomorrow!

Also Joanie Bechler was former acting mayor and councilor on task force with Councilor Trosow and me!

FYI.

Bill Brock

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: bill brock (<Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14 >

To: Woolsey Heather <hwoolsey@london.ca>

Cc: Bill Brock (<Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14 >

Sent: Sunday, January 21, 2024 at 10:16:17 p.m. EST

Subject: Fw: Compensation Task Force Brief

January 21, 2024.

City of London,

Ms. Heather Woolsey; city clerk office,

Please add to agenda.

Re: City Council Agenda Section 8.4 3rd report Report of under #8 (4.4) Mayor J. Morgan Deputy Mayor and Budget Chair positions.

I am asking Council to pause and address the attached brief presented to Dan Ross ; compensation task force in February 2022..

The concerns have not changed! There needs to be accountability for both Councilors and administration.

Given the misinformation about elimination of Board of Control to proceed based on comments just made is wrong! Board of Control was gone because Councilors had more votes (14-4). Get the facts!

There is more support for this view on file even though ignored by Council in the past! Councilors are supposed to ask staff (if any questions on upcoming agendas); Examine actual meetings and it would appear the answer is if they will do it I don't have to do as much!

This is not a private company with 14 directors each getting their share and you get the minutes! You are directors of a public body and are responsible for ensuring public is part or process from start to finish.

It appears because of Mayor getting strong powers the public could be removed from being able to influence councilors; noting 8 needed to get your way but you must go through your ward councilor!

Governance meeting

From: bill brock (Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14)

To: hwoolsey@london.ca

Date: Sunday, May 12, 2024 at 03:43 p.m. EDT

Ms. Woolsey, City Clerk office.

Re; Governance Working Group Meeting May 13, 2024 at 10:am.

Sorry for lateness however request delegation status.

I plan in attending.

Permission to put in public agenda as a delegation subject to approval by committeeSincerest appreciation

Bill Brock

Is it more possible to dictate outcomes if Councilors (chairs as noted) can go to anyone at any time on any matter?

Change means nothing if processes aren't more open and staff held accountable for being the "EXPERTS" not the politicians!

As of today my referral by Council to integrity Commissioner still hasn't been answered which was confirmed by previous city clerk while in office!

Bill Brock

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: bill brock <Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14 >

To: Michael Schulthess <mschulth@london.ca>

Cc: Bill Brock <Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14 >

Sent: Tuesday, February 1, 2022 at 08:55:18 a.m. EST

Subject: Compensation Task Force Brief

Mr. Mike Schulthess; City Clerk
Brief for Compensation Task Force as noted.
February 1, 2022.

To: Mr. Dan Ross, Chair
Council Compensation Review Task Force

Re: Unsolicited Brief on Councilor Compensation

The start of this review came in the fall of 2021 when Council decided to have a review of councilor compensation as part of the policy previously adopted by Council. Although the membership changed the same procedure of hand picking panel members was again used. I was advised of this by city clerk's office; noting I applied in both cases with same response!

According to City Council minutes of Council Oct. 26, 2021 meeting under "Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest" both councilors Morgan and Helmer disclosed a pecuniary interest with appointments to the Council Compensation Review Task Force, by indicating one of the appointees is their supervisor at their employment.

For information; there was a conflict with last task force which was ultimately addressed by changing person Councilor reported to! Also as a citizen records will show I presented a brief to the task force as well as discussed same with them at a meeting. (available).

In closing out reference to the first group I will also advise that City Council refused to hear input on report presented by Mr. Ross by anybody!

In the second task force I was welcomed to the meetings (2&3); took part in discussions after committee voted to allow me to do so!

In reviewing the approximately 3 hours of tapes I didn't see or hear much talk about accountability but the last meeting was mostly to assemble questionnaires for the public and Councilors. I was advised by staff that responses would be anonymous.

According to the report it appears 150 public responses and 9 Councilor responses resulted. The common thread at both meetings was the City Clerk indicated they could discuss and recommend anything. As part of the process the task force decided to address salary and exclude other areas as of this date. Please note that on Jan. 18, 2022 the Strategic Priorities & Policy Committee under 4.3 had topic "Full-time Compensation Determination" had topic "Full-time Compensation Determination". This then appeared on Council Agenda minutes from 1.08 to 1.18. As a note to review; it appears there was 2 surveys of councilors going to Governance and to task force. Were they both anonymous!

The major concern I have is as follows:

The reference to anonymous holds nobody accountable! The reasoning "Purpose of receiving feedback that would be informative and accurately reflect their thoughts on questions posed". Accountability is when you stand by your feelings. The Chairperson dismissed a reference I made to an email received from a councilor because it was hearsay!

Level the playing field in that; contrary to Councilor Lewis view Councilors can speak to anybody none have spoken to members of the task force?

Over ten years ago I made a presentation to a compensation committee that lasted 15-20 minutes resulting in my sending them a "Compensation Accountability Model" the day after. This was totally ignored! (copy available).

How can you make an informed decision based on some councilors and only 150 or so public responses! There is 14 wards; each having a voting number of 2581 to 6117. How many from each ward? The analytical data must be adequate to be valid?

You need to know (factually) what Councilors do and their role: you need to know role of staff (experts)? Are they just implementers of Council direction or guides to making the best interest of the city. According to the last report to Council the indication was neither the task force members or the community really knew what councilors do.

I close with "If you not prepared to measure the accountability of each and standards to meet things will not change" and the public record will show that staff and 2 councilors knew the whole deal about BRT (Bus Rapid Transit) in May of 2015 and kept a secret until Budweiser in 2017.

Thank you for letting me participate; London can be better served with accountability even for politicians! Accountability model essential!

William H. Brock, C.I.M.
London Transit Management 38 years,
London / Thames Valley Trustee 20 years,
Children Safety Village 16 years,
Several city committees, task forces 20 + years,
Compensation Task (3 times)
Partial list of municipal involvement.

Compensation Task Force Brief

From: bill brock (Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14)

To: mschulth@london.ca

Cc: Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, C.M.65, s.14

Date: Tuesday, February 1, 2022 at 08:55 a.m. EST

Mr. Mike Schulthess; City Clerk
Brief for Compensation Task Force as noted.
February 1, 2022.

To: Mr. Dan Ross, Chair
Council Compensation Review Task Force

Re: Unsolicited Brief on Councilor Compensation

The start of this review came in the fall of 2021 when Council decided to have a review of councilor compensation as part of the policy previously adopted by Council. Although the membership changed the same procedure of hand picking panel members was again used. I was advised of this by city clerk's office; noting I applied in both cases with same response!

According to City Council minutes of Council Oct. 26, 2021 meeting under "Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest" both councilors Morgan and Helmer disclosed a pecuniary interest with appointments to the Council Compensation Review Task Force, by indicating one of the appointees is their supervisor at their employment.

For information; there was a conflict with last task force which was ultimately addressed by changing person Councilor reported to! Also as a citizen records will show I presented a brief to the task force as well as discussed same with them at a meeting. (available). In closing out reference to the first group I will also advise that City Council refused to hear input on report presented by Mr. Ross by anybody!

In the second task force I was welcomed to the meetings (2&3); took part in discussions after committee voted to allow me to do so!

In reviewing the approximately 3 hours of tapes I didn't see or hear much talk about accountability but the last meeting was mostly to assemble questionnaires for the public and Councilors. I was advised by staff that responses would be anonymous. According to the report it appears 150 public responses and 9 Councilor responses resulted. The common thread at both meetings was the City Clerk indicated they could discuss and recommend anything. As part of the process the task force decided to address salary and exclude other areas as of this date. Please note that on Jan. 18, 2022 the Strategic Priorities & Policy Committee under 4.3 had topic "Full-time Compensation Determination" had topic "Full-time Compensation Determination". This then appeared on Council Agenda minutes from !.08 to 1.18.

As a note to review; it appears there was 2 surveys of councilors going to Governance and to task force. Were they both anonymous!

The major concern I have is as follows:

The reference to anonymous holds nobody accountable! The reasoning "Purpose of receiving feedback that would be informative and accurately reflect their thoughts on questions posed". Accountability is when you stand by your feelings. The Chairperson dismissed a refence I made to an email received from a councilor because it was hearsay!

Level the playing field in that; contrary to Councilor Lewis view Councilors can speak to anybody none have spoken to members of the task force?

Over ten years ago I made a presentation to a compensation committee that lasted 15-20 minutes resulting in my sending them a "Compensation Accountability Model} the day after. This was totally ignored! (copy available).

How can you make an informed decision based on some councilors and only 150 or so public responses! There is 14 wards; each having a voting number of 2581 to 6117.

How many from each ward? The analytical data must be adequate to be valid?

You need to know (factually) what Councilors do and their role: you need to know role of staff (experts)? Are they just implementers of Council direction or guides to making the best interest of the city . According to the last report to Council the indication was neither the task force members or the community really knew what councilors do .

I close with "If you not prepared to measure the accountability of each and standards to meet things will not change" and the public record will show that staff and 2 councilors knew the whole deal about BRT (Bus Rapid Transit) in May of 2015 and kept a secret until Budweiser in 2017.

Thank you for letting me participate; London can be better served with accountability even for politicians! Accountability model essential!

William H. Brock, C.I.M.

London Transit Management 38 years,

London / Thames Valley Trustee 20 years,

Children Safety Village 16 years,

Several city committees, task forces 20 + years,

Compensation Task (3 times)

Partial list of municipal involvement.

Councilor role

From: bill brock (Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14)

To: Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14

Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 at 03:11 p.m. EST

For the record

Current Compensation Task Force

Has had two meetings Nov. 12 and Nov. 26th, 2021

3rd meeting scheduled for Dec.3, 10am

D. Ross, D. Bryant, J. Lyons, C. Scrimgeour, J. Tudhope (absent #2)

1st meeting lasted about 43 minutes with a 10 minute mid meeting pause!

2nd. meeting lasted about one hour..

End of first meeting city clerk indicated they could make recommendations on any thing. Committee indicated they were only going to adress salary and other areas not addressed.

Note from original report of 63 pages in 2017 there was several areas recommendations were not acted on!

From both meetings the same procedure was being followed! Salary only.

However the questions asked suggest something else!!!

Note: group notes the same pay but that each one operates differently!

Note: Why was Board of Control done away with?

Forgone conclusion remembering 19 votes and ward councilors had 14.

As member of task force It was a one sided

SP&P Committee meeting 11/30/21

From: bill brock (Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14)

To: csaunders@london.ca

Cc: abush@london.ca

Date: Tuesday, November 30, 2021, 09:34 p.m. EST

Ms. Saunders; city clerk

Tonight SP&PC is addressing some areas that overlap with Compensation Task Force currently in place.

According to minutes this group is only able to look at compensation (\$52,725. annually) and terms of reference doesn't allow discussion of benefits and other expense accounts.

According to Governance Working Group; reports 4/5 the following issues are in the works with staff:

Nov. 4, 2021 #3 Items for discussion - Councilor Members Expense Account Policy (a-e)

Note 3.2 Operations of Municipal Council covering some councilor surveys.

What is the purpose of questions to citizens and confidential responses from councilors; noting for the most part very few people

follow and numbers monitoring general meetings are less than 20. The task force has clearly stated if someone is really interested they will study the information (all 60plus pages).

If indicated to the general public that compensation is not just salary but this task force is not allowed to address others issue such

as benefits and expense accounts is wrong!

Please note at the end of first meeting of Compensation task force the City Clerk indicated you could recommend anything!

You have chosen to not do so; just salary!

Without knowing impact of current changes being asked for tonight at Council Committee this is a reality check:

Salary \$52,725.

Benefits \$10,500. (est.)

Expenses Acct. \$15,000.

Other expenses covered by other budgets?

Total real compensation \$78,225.

Also, what is the role and authority of Councilors over staff?

Who does the Councilors and the public consider the "Experts"?

Is there a separation of roles?

Fuel for thought!

Note: If possible I will hope to participate on Friday?

Bill Brock

Compensation notes meeting #13

From: bill brock (Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14)

To: Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14

Date: Saturday, April 15, 2017 at 03:06 p.m. EDT

Compensation Meeting #13 of April 13, 2017

Focus group and public meetings were in addition to these meetings.

Items 1,2,3,5,6, no action passed as needed.

#4 (a) Summary of Data

Horak - pay with job they are doing; misunderstanding

Retty - have to understand the issue

L. Rowe provided report for panel (I got after meeting)

Numbers on chart of 1200 + doesn't match the fact only 475+ took the survey

Maximum on any line can only be 475

needs to be interpretation of answers,

Horak need individual medium income data

Consideration of following in report: 1) compensation 2) eliminate 1/3 tax free 3) support services

direct to address and make recommendation to Council 4) Benefits 5) expense acct. 6)

any patterns from Councillors focus group responses (Note: not discussed until today - BB)

consensus is different between groups from our view

Dan; we are making recommendations ; personal opinion each member guide

BB note shown to Chair Free press survey vs Panel Survey

BB note other surveys: Free Press March 22, 2017 raise no 2356 90%; yes 263 10% total 2619

Full time 12/4/ 16 58% No 1271; 42% Yes Total 2192

Rapid Transit 3/10/ 17 hate it 71% - 2136 ; love it 9% -268; like needs change 20% -610

Dan pertinent to question verses volume; brief document will have 6 areas.

thoughts of public input and organization

Dan there appears to be a common theme ; April 20th feedback on draft of today

Public participation session comments:

any gaps or missing pieces?

Horak; very little comment; survey interesting no demographic bias; assume cross section; enough responses to use (a) low in rating retention & other municipalities.

Horak produced a 2014 paper which appears to imply local solution (b) attracting & retention is low noting number who ranked this look at it as a public service priority.

Dan: statement of importance of primary service. How much input does Councillor have? (BB note this depends on Councillor). Note Councillor Van Holst came into meeting and provided info? (BB left for minute don't know what was purpose; look at minutes?)

Retty how strategic level ;higher level of thinking works

Horak; relationship between Councillor and fiscal ; buck stops at Council; it is not administration independence; Councillors are locked in by previous Council(legal &

fiduciary) Councillor more strategic in presentation 4 year budget; constituents and budget priority

Dan: 17th salary, 5th budget is their a comparative. Are we trying to force a certain focus?

Horak: based on time 25%; available 9-5 & all the time

Greg: response time seems to be one day. 400 comments isn't many; lacks credibility?

Dan: you don't have compensation comparative public expects councillors to work hard

Horak - public service on a scale should be concentrated (to attract better people)

Retty: when does pay become a barrier Horak when does pay offered affect job

Retty - part time assumes another job Horak can't elect some one because they do a good job

Greg: assumption they are going to do a good job Dan: what do you do to be successful

(BB check time issue from last survey) Reid: patience has been lost with advent of emails; immediate response

Dan: complexity if job social media and 4 year budget (BB using during meetings)

Retty: very anecdotal? Horak expert kind of issue political culture has changed with strategic priority; London growing bigger (BB really?).

Dan to frame work add trends and assumptions / recurring themes from feedback; expense account shouldn't be used for staffing councillor needs. Performance not part of evaluation ; use of data different feedback than knowledge of councillor. Linda format in point form using bullets.

Compensation shouldn't be so high they become dependent on it. Support services impact on how well can do job. (BB this issue not about pay). Dan should look at base system to allow them to do their job

(BB ignore what staff does now really). Principle good idea to through back to councillors

NOTE: BB The discussion was around a frame work model; as before, and their opinions how feedback should be interpreted. Given feedback the shortfall means they are required to express "their expertise"

as what compensation should be with rationale. View point today BB they don't know and have not examined factual data to conclude appropriateness. To apply a standard means no accountability . The unigenes was removed on first meeting!

Compensation Meeting #12

From: bill brock (Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14)

To: Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14

Date: Sunday, February 26, 2017, 12:22 p.m. EST

Notes:

These are notes taken at the Compensation Task Force Meeting of Wednesday February 22, 2017.

This was meeting #12 and first meeting since the 11th meeting of October 14, 2016.

Four members present noting M. Moffatt resigned from task force. Including today it appears M. Moffatt has missed 4 of 12 meetings. Resignation accepted and no changes will be made to task force.

Dan and task force members all agreed with reasons for delay; noting key role of Linda Rowe in events happening at city hall.

Open house would occur on Saturday March 25, 2017 at the North London Optimist Club on Cheapside Street between 2-4pm. Martin may not be available; not an issue because after Dan's 30 minute introduction meeting will be covered by Cheryl Smith and facilitators. Two more meetings after to prepare final report.

Dan Ross; chair, indicated that during break he reviewed the previous report of 2013 as a refresher; material from other cities; legislated and mandated some covered in 2013 report. Linda Rowe indicated survey would be posted on webpage; questions to be determined with Cheryl Smith.

Note Cheryl is doing this along with ranked ballot (Mar. 8/9). Will have Ipads to use; some hard copy and focus group interaction. Web page will be up with interactive site & add relevant information week before and week after public meeting. Dan to see questions before they go up.

General comments:

D. Ross Categories, tax impact, stipend for chairs, benefits councillors receive, support system adequate, what & why for adjustment one time, local economy, adjustment timing; define role & responsibilities i.e. social media as changed by city hall users; expectations of electorate.

Horak: Where I am at; 1/3 tax free, nature of Council Service; full time or part time; nature of job; should be viewed as public service; kind of compensation & support staff; what they do and how much; all kinds of data;

majority of time should be public service; **SHOULD BE PRIMARY COMMITMENT** of councillor (over job); compensation recommend amount be city of London data on average income which in 2010 was \$48,000..

Support system changes where each would work with constituents and have an intermediary for city staff;

Horak viewpoint was Council should design support system (Brock note this is already in place).

Greg: about Councillors; Linda response: function depends on Councillor; two levels required; one for constituency and one for research (Brock note about precise); have added one employee; in response to Greg question about structure the following response: 4 administrators & 1 co-op; have maintained 1 admin. asst.. some do it themselves while others use help.

Horak: Key Role to make public service priority & enable that to happen.. There is an implied you can do the job; subjective seen as expectation that you can to job; (Brock note; you don't know if sufficient unless you know what they do!)

Dan Ross: "Best Person We can Get!"; (BROCK same as 1st meeting which is called social engineering).

Dan: How to get right person sitting in chair: City is growing up. (Brock note they have totally ignored my brief and not even shown in minutes). Dan claims Councillors face community pressure every day!

Time table: Committee April 12/ 18 &/or 20th . Workshop April 25th.

Linda to draft report;

Brock note: Task Force eliminated "Uniqueness from direction of Council to task force.

Discussion at 12th meeting goes away above and beyond what Council directed

(Pay only).

Note: CTV Darryl Newcombe attended the 1st meeting; came to 2nd & left almost immediately. Darryl returned for the 12th meeting . Meetings were not openly advertised unless you go into a calendar of events /meetings. Doesn't show up on task forces and special committees.

Mayor dropped in at meeting #12 (nobody there yet but me); note last April Mayor comment "How busy committee was working".

Fw: Brief for Compensation Task Force

From: bill brock <Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14>

To: cheryl <Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14>

Date: Friday, December 9, 2016 at 12:06 p.m. EST

Cheryl,
Task Force included on agenda and I spoke to it!
Bill B.

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: bill brock <Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14>

To: Linda Rowe <lrowe@london.ca>

Cc: Bill Brock <Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14>

Sent: Friday, September 9, 2016 9:21 PM

Subject: Brief for Compensation Task Force

Please advise of next meeting and location.
Would like them to have before public sessions.
Bill B.

Compensation Task Force Brief: unsolicited report
c/o Linda Rowe; secretary
Attention: Mr. Dan Ross; Task Force Chairperson

This brief is presented as a follow up to my involvement in the evolution of task force, task force public meetings and focus group session of August 16, 2016. Starting with the striking of the task force five members independently selected City Clerk as Council wanted them to be independent and go in a different direction. Process was different than seeking applications; noting, two members have close working relationships with Councillors and two members live outside London. This matter is not reflective of task force members but reflective of Council decision to approve them. The difference in this task force; all meetings public, was the first time a citizen was engaged in 90% of meetings and the focus group as a spectator. The spectator role was invoked after the second meeting when clarity was given as to the way task force was to function (no public input). At this point there was two issues made clear; one that the only issue task force could consider was compensation (\$33,465 Councillor pay) excluding any reference to staff, expense accounts, other benefits, staff role and the second was that the task force wanted to use the process to elect better Councillors. The latter classified as social engineering noting legislation restricts qualifications to age and citizenship!

The task force met in total for some 20 hours in 11 meetings excluding focus group session noting previous reports were discarded as having no value and the next several meetings were around assembling data comparing other cities as to annual budgets, population and Councillor compensation. An anonymous survey returned by present Councillors (number unknown) was accepted at face value and never discussed as to factuality or understanding as to comments. The decision to have a focus group; using responses as a guide; using role of Councillor as a reference, comparative compensation data but excluding distinction of Councillor role and staff role were supplied. There was four questions to be addressed at session. The people attending; from special interest groups (list on file) surprised the task force members as to how little they knew about how Councillors function. These groups are "silos" dealing with a particular funding or policy group with City. At follow up meeting all members of task force expressed surprise at the lack of understanding by everybody. History shows that all the books written about Councillor accountability and how to measure a Councillor go for naught! In the last election Councillors were elected because of wanting to throw out current; selection of someone who promised more transparency; openness and accountability; former Mayor endorsed or best of new with no incumbent running.

The assumption that the public needs to be educated about how Council works because they don't know is wrong! The general public expect; as with any organization, that there is rules. procedures and regulations to follow to ensure the public is well served with accountability and integrity! In London it is expected the expertise staff will provide full and non-political reports with all the options; noting politicians will set policy and direct staff to follow.

I raise four concerns: This task force to date has no fact based data on recommending compensation changes and raising issues of staffing etc. is beyond their mandate.

This was repeated at Council meeting of April 18, 2016. There was no discussion on separation of roles of staff and Councillors which appears to allow Councillors to exercise power they don't have as individuals. The public workshops; if following same as focus group will be based on perception failing to recognise Councillors are not a party like Federal or Provincial; not a block of 8/10 controlling city hall but 14 individuals given to act in the best interests of all Londoners and not just their ward.

Finally citizen engagement is two way dialogue (questions and answers) not a process based on 5 minute presentations will become the new form of accountability. In closing I point out that task force members directed questions to Chair and Chair wouldn't discuss unless shared with all members; Mayor or City Manager wouldn't respond or directed to go elsewhere.

Thus, this brief based on view as of today.L

**5TH REPORT OF THE
2016 COUNCIL COMPENSATION REVIEW TASK FORCE**

Meeting held on May 12, 2016, commencing at 12:11 PM, in Committee Room #3, Second Floor, London City Hall.

PRESENT: Dan Ross (Chair), M. Moffatt, P. Relty and G. Watterton; and L. Rowe (Task Force Secretary).

ABSENT: M. Horak.

I. DISCLOSURES OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

1. That it BE NOTED that no pecuniary interests were disclosed.

II. CONSENT ITEMS

None.

III. SCHEDULED ITEMS

None.

IV. ITEMS FOR DIRECTION

2. Adoption of the 4th Report of the CCRTF

That it BE NOTED that the 4th Report of the 2016 Council Compensation Review Task Force, from its meeting held on April 28, 2016, was adopted.

3. Review of Reference Materials

That it BE NOTED that the 2016 Council Compensation Review Task Force postponed further consideration of the current inventory of reference data until the additional information that is being sought is available, so that the data can be reviewed in a comprehensive manner.

4. Potential Survey of Current Councillors

That it BE NOTED that the 2016 Council Compensation Review Task Force agreed that the Chair would prepare a cover letter for the Council Member Questionnaire and the Task Force Members would advise the Task Force Secretary, by May 16, 2016, if they had any further edits to the draft Questionnaire. It was further agreed that the Questionnaire would be circulated to the Council Members for response by May 24, 2016, in order to consider the responses at the May 26, 2016 meeting of the Task Force.

5. Public Education and Engagement

That it BE NOTED that the 2016 Council Compensation Review Task Force requested that the Task Force Secretary obtain some contact names and biographical information on potential Focus Group leaders in order to identify one or two appropriate individuals to assist with the Focus Group sessions.

6. Municipal Council Resolution - CCRTF Terms of Reference

That it BE NOTED that the 2016 Council Compensation Review Task Force received a Municipal Council resolution, from its meeting held on April 19, 2016, with respect to an amendment to its Terms of Reference as it relates to the exclusion of the Mayor's compensation from the Task Force's mandate.

7. Future Meeting Dates

That it BE NOTED that the 2016 Council Compensation Review Task Force set the following future meeting dates, subject to further refinement as may be necessary:

Thursday, June 9, 2016, 12:00 PM
Thursday, June 23, 2016, 12:00 PM

V. DEFERRED MATTERS/ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

None.

VI. CONFIDENTIAL

None.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:48 PM.

Re: Compensation Task Force

From: Ridley, Virginia (vridley@london.ca)

To: [Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14](#)

Date: Saturday, May 14, 2016 at 10:52 p.m. EDT

Mr Brock,

I do not support councillors involving themselves in the process. Only if asked for specific input as to what I do etc. Would I be willing to provide that information to the task force. If they are looking for a 'what do you think compensation should be' I am not interested in having that discussion, but I will clarify aspects of my role, or questions that they may have that are factual and not opinion based. I have been out of town so have not checked in with the clerks as to what is being asked of councillors. I will clarify before the meeting. It is my intention to support their recommendation, without modification, and to stay out of the process entirely.

Sent from my iPad

On May 14, 2016, at 9:46 AM, bill brock <[Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14](#)> wrote:

Virginia,

At the Strategic Priorities & Policy Committee there was a discussion on what Compensation Task Force was doing. You made it very clear; supported by most of those present, you were looking for the outcome from their independent review. Today on the agenda of SP&P under items for direction there is a progress report dated April 20, 2016 from Task Force. Under the second paragraph there is a lot of engagement with Councillors and public. These are public meetings does that mean responses public? Does this support your statement of independence being influenced by a Councillor survey. The supported statement "Don't bother them , let them do their job". I'm not clear on your view?
Please advise?

Compensation Task Force

From: bill brock Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14

To: mbrown@london.ca

Date: Monday, May 2, 2016 at 08:40 p.m. EDT

Mr. Mayor; Matt

London Council on April 18, 2016 voted 13-0 on the report and approval of changes to Compensation Task Force. One of the benefits of the task force was the independence of their task. Councillor Ridley stated she wanted Council to approve the compensation recommendation from the task force and not rehash all the matters from last year. This intent was supported by Council. However, Councillor Helmer made it clear that Councillors could contact at any time and in any manner the members of the task force; regardless of independence because you are Councillors.

Would you clarify this for me please! Webcast would confirm text as noted in this email. Appreciate your response.

Thanks

Bill B.

Compensation Task Force notes meeting #1

From: bill brock (Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14)

To: Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14

Date: Thursday, April 21, 2016 at 08:43 p.m. EDT

Introduction: The 2016 Compensation Task Force was created on the direction of City Council; although membership was to be approved by Council (5) the selection was left exclusively to the City Clerk. This was not done by application but hand picked by the staff (City Clerk). Details of process to be added.

The first public meeting was held on March 24 in Committee Room 3, 12 noon to 1:45pm.

Formal minutes will be provided next meeting March 31, 2016.

Members: D. Ross (chair), M. Horak, P. Retty, G. Watterton, M. Moffatt (absent)

Resource: C. Saunders; City Clerk, L. Rowe; asst. City Clerk

Notes from meeting:

Members received package ahead of meeting; first time met each other.

Chair co-ordinates meeting with staff; primary contact; presents report to Council.

Clerk 5 people picked by Council wants independent thought!

Clerk discussed with Governance Committee (note: majority of Council)

Dan Ross about 1/3 tax free; Stays Council decided off table for change . Any reference use both.

Section 4.4.Guiding Principles #4 deleted "or should be" not needed.

Past Compensation Review task Force reports including public input (very little) no further use (4 agreed)

Horak; what is unique defined? No clear understanding of role.

Petty: lack of education to understand

Questions of effectiveness? Compensation left up to us according to Clerk; Linda Rowe indicated "Council Will listen to Task Force". Horak % of budget way less than 1%..

Effective / politically sensitive. Attract kind of Councillor city needs! Dan Ross looking for business intelligence. Ref. whether input was ever considered.

Hurak as a guide don't use legislation as a guide each brings different skill sets; busy not always productive.

Ross demeaned previous reports and public input (included in package).

Questions left: What is role of Councillors? What is role of staff?

Horak referenced volunteer fire fighter not seen as professional used as a step to go somewhere else. Becomes full time fireman.

Discussion what does professional mean and being business driven.

Dan Ross raised issue of questionnaire for Councillors

Note: I raised issue of social engineering to pick better council candidates wrong after meeting with Horak.

Is there an outline of who is responsible for what? Clerk not relevant /

Is there on analysis of meeting lengths etc.. Productivity from past budget deliberations.

Compensation Task Force Meeting #3

From: bill brock (Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14)

To: Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14

Date: Thursday, April 21, 2016 at 10:13 p.m. EDT

Meeting commenced with all members present for 1st time; at 12 noon.

Note: Before meeting started I was advised by Dan Ross that after I left last meeting members and Clerks discussed that my participation was unacceptable because I was not part of task force. Wouldn't be able to do so again. When meeting started he indicated to all those present that I had been spoken to>

Questions from data; noting Horak had 6 questions already to go.

The only factor can be used is the basic compensation; nothing else; city clerk

Consider 3 stage strategy survey of Councillors; staff and focus groups,

Moffatt raised issue of benefits and day care (conflicts with direction compensation only)

Consider outside expert for public engagement.

Note: Horak comment heads back to social engineering.

Mike payment to improve talent pool.

At end of meeting I again indicated to Horak about talent noting social engineering.

Members of task force made it clear not to correspond with them directly.

Note: At Council meeting changes about Councillor and deputy mayor was made.

Jesse Helmer indicated Councillors could talk to Task Force members if they wished (check webcast).

No changes made to process .

Compensation Task Force

From: bill brock (Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14)

To: (Redacted MFIPP) philipmcleod (Redacted MF)

Date: Sunday, April 17, 2016 at 09:12 p.m. EDT

Phil,

In the past you have written articles on governance and Council Compensation. (approx. 6 hours including 1/2 hour lunch) so far with this panel.

The "Expert Panel" hand picked by Clerk have had 3 meetings. They have no knowledge of how Council works

and it appears don't care. Within 5 minutes of 1st meeting they disposed of all previous committees on the subject for background information. This was their prerogative and they did it. This is not shown in minutes.

Secondly, disposed of legislation on qualifications and discussion even boarded on social engineering to get better candidates.

There is a major issue (in addition to lack of knowledge) is the issue of compensation.

Linda Reid and Cathy Saunders indicated it was wages only and nothing else was a factor such as pensions, benefits, added staff or expense accounts. Mike Moffat attended (first time 3rd meeting) raising issue of baby sitting etc. and talent issue. Also, the Governance Task force has 9 members which is a majority and could informally guide direction of Task Force depending how involved. Task force is supposed to be totally independent?

Do you have an outline as to what such a review should be?

Note: Blog #1054 Dec. 1, 2014.

Haven't seen your blog for awhile hope things are going well.

FYI . Bill B.

RE: Council Compensation Review Task Force

From: Saunders, Cathy (csaunder@london.ca)

To: [Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14](#)


Date: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 at 01:28 p.m. EST

Good Afternoon Mr. Brock:

I apologise for the delay in responding to your inquiry. Thank you for the offer of your time to participate on the Council Compensation Review Task Force. Council has decided to undertake a different approach with 5 members being appointed with a wide variety of experience in business, non-profit and municipal experience. As such, although we appreciate the knowledge that you have in local government, the makeup of the Committee, as noted previously, will be different from previous Task Forces.

Thank you for taking the time to email us on this matter.

Cathy


Cathy Saunders, MPA, RPP
City Clerk
City Clerk's Office
City of London

P.O. Box 5035, London, Ontario N6A 4L9
P: 519.661.2500 x 4937 | Fax: 519.661.4892
csaunder@london.ca | www.london.ca

From: bill brock [mailto:[Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14](#)]
Sent: Friday, January 08, 2016 1:20 PM
To: Saunders, Cathy
Subject: Fw: Council Compensation Review Task Force

Saunders, Cathy,

Just as follow up I have not heard back about opportunity to apply for special task force.

Bill B.

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "Saunders, Cathy" <csaunder@london.ca>
To: 'bill brock' <Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14>
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2015 12:33 PM
Subject: RE: Council Compensation Review Task Force

Thank you for your email. I am in the process of working on this matter and will get back to you on it.

*Cathy Saunders, MPA, RPP
City Clerk
City of London
300 Dufferin Avenue
London, Ontario N6A 4L9
519-661-2500 x 4937*

From: bill brock [<mailto:Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14>]
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2015 11:58 AM
To: Saunders, Cathy
Subject: Fw: Council Compensation Review Task Force

Ms. Saunders,
Reviewing files did not find a response to request.
Bill B.

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: bill brock <Redacted MFIPPA, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56, s.14>
To: Cathy Saunders <csaunder@london.ca>
Sent: Thursday, November 5, 2015 12:15 AM
Subject: Re: Council Compensation Review Task Force

Ms. Saunders,
In looking at the 7th report of Governance Working Group under Appendix "A" there is to be five members selected by City Clerk. I would be interested in serving on this group and ask for process to apply.
Appreciation Bill Brock