

Appendix A

The City Clerk's office was tasked to bring forward for consideration, potential structure changes to the advisory committees that may reduce the number of committees, combine committees with areas of overlap, and additional potential changes. Following this, additional direction was provided with respect to potential advisory committee changes.

At this time, we would like to request your comments and feedback on the following, noting that no decisions have been made about the future state of the advisory committee structure at this time. Please note that while there is the [staff report](#) available related to this direction, not all of the proposed actions were endorsed by Municipal Council. As such, we are requesting your commentary specific to the following:

Advisory committees whose responsibilities would generally include the following, within the City of London:

1. Matters identified in the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act
2. Matters identified under the Ontario Heritage Act, cultural heritage matters, heritage resources, agricultural and rural issues (including urban agriculture) and other land use planning matters; the consideration of these matters in the development of the Official Plan.
3. Mobility matters including policy, strategy and program development and initiatives
4. Environmental matters including conservation, climate change mitigation, tree planting/planning/protection and waste reduction
5. Childcare matters including intergovernmental information sharing and issues affecting early learning and child care
6. Matters related to diversity, inclusivity, equity and the elimination of discrimination
7. Matters related to animal welfare, excluding agricultural animals
8. Matters related to technical advice concerning natural areas, ESAs, environmental features and projects triggering environmental impact studies
9. Matters related to affordable housing, homelessness and issues affecting vulnerable populations

Noting that there is additional work that would define the terms of reference for the committees noted above, what are your comments and thoughts to this proposed structure?

I support the option to retain a modified version of the existing committee structure, however, the proposal that the Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC) and some mandates London Housing Advisory Committee (LHAC) be merged with the LACH is problematic. The terms of reference for the AAC and the LHAC seem to be quite different to those of the LACH and likely require a different set of skills by the committee members. This further complicated by the amendments to the Ontario Heritage Act arising from Bill 108 – More Homes, More Choices Act anticipated to be proclaimed on January 1, 2021.

The implications of the amendments to the Ontario Heritage Act will require additional effort of the municipal Heritage Planners as well as the LACH due to new or changes to existing processes, including additional items in the listing of properties on the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources, the mandatory contents for Heritage Designating Bylaws and minimum requirements for Heritage Alteration Permit Applications.

Additionally, the Mandates and member Qualifications of the LACH and the AAC are quite different and not compatible. The quality of the recommendations of the combined committee would be compromised with the mix of skills among the membership. It is not clear from the report, which mandates of the LHAC could be included in the proposed new committee.

It would seem that an advantage of this new approach would be to limit the interfaces with PEC. The committee would also be required to interface with the Community and Protective Services Committee under the current reporting structure.

I do not suggest that the AAC and some portion of the LHAC be merged with LACH to form a new committee.

What would you expect to see contained in committee terms of reference for the above-noted proposed structure?

I would expect the LACH Terms of Reference to be similar to the existing ones with any modification which may be required due to Bill 108.

How often do you feel that it is necessary for advisory committees to meet?

I can't comment on adequacy of the AAC nor the LHAC committees, but the current meeting schedule for the LACH seems adequate with the occasional need to hold a special meeting to handle special or urgent needs.

The recent staff report (noted above) proposed the elimination of the requirement for advisory committee work plans, in favour of having "assignments" from the civic administration and/or directly from Council. By way of additional context, it was not the intent that 'new' initiatives would not be 'permitted' from the advisory committees, rather to better allow focus of work. What are your thoughts around this proposal?

I think the work plans, maintained by each committee and reviewed once or twice a year, and which supports the Mandate, are a useful way for a committee to be reminded of their responsibilities and make changes as needed. In the case of LACH, much of the items in the plan are ongoing activities supporting the Terms of Reference. Of course, assignments from civic administration and/or from Council would be accepted, prioritized and completed as required.

The Municipal Council has suggested that the committees remain in the form of "advisory committees" as opposed to consideration of expert panels. There has also been the broader discussion in terms of eliminating barriers to participate on the advisory committees. As such, it is proposed that members be selected at random administratively, rather than through the Council appointment process (noting that in some cases there may be 'categories' of membership where applicants would be randomly selected from). What are your thoughts around this proposal?

I believe the committee structure is appropriate, at least for LACH to be able to have an ongoing, consistent perspective of the committee's mandate. Expert panels imply groups that are brought together for a specific purpose and the disbanded.

Are you a first-term advisory committee member?

No

What additional comments that you would like to provide for consideration?

Noting that there is additional work that would define the terms of reference for the committees noted above, what are your comments and thoughts to this proposed structure?

Reviewing the staff report, I believe that the Community Safety and Crime Prevention Advisory Committee mandate would be a help to the Committee on housing, homelessness and issues affecting vulnerable populations.

What would you expect to see contained in committee terms of reference for the above-noted proposed structure?

As this is my first year invited to an advisory committee, unable to give an answer.

How often do you feel that it is necessary for advisory committees to meet?

I believe 4 times a year for most committees. This gives time for work to be done and subcommittees to be more thorough in their reporting. However, when issues are ongoing (homelessness) then perhaps 6 times a year.

The recent staff report (noted above) proposed the elimination of the requirement for advisory committee work plans, in favour of having “assignments” from the civic administration and/or directly from Council. By way of additional context, it was not the intent that ‘new’ initiatives would not be ‘permitted’ from the advisory committees, rather to better allow focus of work. What are your thoughts around this proposal?

I believe it is important to have a collaborative approach. Both the Council and the advisory committees need a unified assignment plan. Council may present or advisory committees may present issues with the understanding that only 1 or 2 can be selected for the assignment. Alternatively, perhaps Council can present 1 or 2 assignments they would like the advisory committees to focus on and allow the committees to select.

The Municipal Council has suggested that the committees remain in the form of “advisory committees” as opposed to consideration of expert panels. There has also been the broader discussion in terms of eliminating barriers to participate on the advisory committees. As such, it is proposed that members be selected at random administratively, rather than through the Council appointment process (noting that in some cases there may be ‘categories’ of membership where applicants would be randomly selected from). What are your thoughts around this proposal?

Each committee should be comprised of community members who have some knowledge with respect to the issues. I do not believe random selection is helpful.

Are you a first-term advisory committee member?

Yes

What additional comments that you would like to provide for consideration?

None at this time.

Noting that there is additional work that would define the terms of reference for the committees noted above, what are your comments and thoughts to this proposed structure?

Climate change mitigation affects all aspects of our lives and in doing so it ideally is considered as part of more than just one committee. For example in the area of transportation, what impact would widening a road have on air quality related to increased vehicle traffic compared to providing a bus lane. Decreased air quality and noise levels also affect fauna and birds etc. that live near larger roads.

What would you expect to see contained in committee terms of reference for the above-noted proposed structure?

Clear terms of reference that outline the work of the committee, reporting structure to a city department and standing committee.

How often do you feel that it is necessary for advisory committees to meet?

As needed.

The recent staff report (noted above) proposed the elimination of the requirement for advisory committee work plans, in favour of having “assignments” from the civic administration and/or directly from Council. By way of additional context, it was not the intent that ‘new’ initiatives would not be ‘permitted’ from the advisory committees, rather to better allow focus of work. What are your thoughts around this proposal?

There are pros and cons to this. Ideally, the work of a committee would fit with the goals/plans of a department. At the same time one doesn't want to miss the opportunity

for citizen input that will maybe look at an issue from a different point of view or introduce a new issue.

The Municipal Council has suggested that the committees remain in the form of “advisory committees” as opposed to consideration of expert panels. There has also been the broader discussion in terms of eliminating barriers to participate on the advisory committees. As such, it is proposed that members be selected at random administratively, rather than through the Council appointment process (noting that in some cases there may be ‘categories’ of membership where applicants would be randomly selected from). What are your thoughts around this proposal?

I’m having trouble picturing this random selection process. It is important to have knowledgeable people on the committees. I’m not sure what the barriers are now. The application process looks pretty open to me.

Are you a first-term advisory committee member?

No

What additional comments that you would like to provide for consideration?

Noting that there is additional work that would define the terms of reference for the committees noted above, what are your comments and thoughts to this proposed structure?

N/A

What would you expect to see contained in committee terms of reference for the above-noted proposed structure?

N/A

How often do you feel that it is necessary for advisory committees to meet?

Depending if there is an urgent matter or not. Once a month is a decent amount of time if there are no urgent matters

The recent staff report (noted above) proposed the elimination of the requirement for advisory committee work plans, in favour of having “assignments” from the civic administration and/or directly from Council. By way of additional context, it was not the intent that ‘new’ initiatives would not be ‘permitted’ from the advisory committees, rather to better allow focus of work. What are your thoughts around this proposal?

Strictly in our committee, most of the committee member did not know how to create or use a work plan. If moving forward with a work plan, there would need to be more education on it.

The Municipal Council has suggested that the committees remain in the form of “advisory committees” as opposed to consideration of expert panels. There has also been the broader discussion in terms of eliminating barriers to participate on the advisory committees. As such, it is proposed that members be selected at random administratively, rather than through the Council appointment process (noting that in some cases there may be ‘categories’ of membership where applicants would be randomly selected from). What are your thoughts around this proposal?

It is important to have members of the general public participate so that we can hear what is happening at ground 0 however it is also extremely important to have an expert panel so that things can get accomplished. It is imperative to have the right skill set in order to be productive.

Are you a first-term advisory committee member?

Yes

What additional comments that you would like to provide for consideration?

N/A

Noting that there is additional work that would define the terms of reference for the committees noted above, what are your comments and thoughts to this proposed structure?

Lumping agricultural and rural issues with Heritage Act and cultural heritage matters, under the rubric of land use, seriously concerns me. They are fundamentally different issues and concerns and this structure conflates them and will dilute each. They don't overlap or intersect in any way (let alone any meaningful way). Environmental matters and nature areas are separated—so should agricultural and rural issues be from cultural and heritage issues.

Removing Agricultural Animals to a committee separate from agriculture is a mistake. The unique issues pertaining to agricultural raising and uses of animals will likely be overlooked, which will fundamentally alter the character of the advice being given to Council.

What would you expect to see contained in committee terms of reference for the above-noted proposed structure?

[Click here to enter text.](#)

How often do you feel that it is necessary for advisory committees to meet?

Monthly was a good schedule

The recent staff report (noted above) proposed the elimination of the requirement for advisory committee work plans, in favour of having “assignments” from the civic administration and/or directly from Council. By way of additional context, it was not the intent that ‘new’ initiatives would not be ‘permitted’ from the advisory committees, rather to better allow focus of work. What are your thoughts around this proposal?

So long as it is made crystal clear that this is not a one-way, top-down approach, it should be fine. Providing sound advice often includes expanding conversations and considerations and there should be room—and an expectation—for that. So time should be allowed and planned for for committees to bring forward information and initiative that are community driven, which is stronger than simply “permitting” committees to undertake such initiatives.

The Municipal Council has suggested that the committees remain in the form of “advisory committees” as opposed to consideration of expert panels. There has also been the broader discussion in terms of eliminating barriers to participate on the advisory committees. As such, it is proposed that members be selected at random administratively, rather than through the Council appointment process (noting that in some cases there may be ‘categories’ of membership where applicants would be randomly selected from). What are your thoughts around this proposal?

A random assignment is a bad idea. Committee members should bring a certain level of expertise and professionalism to their role. Barriers should be removed for residents and citizens to participate in the work and deliberation of committees in other ways; more could be done to include public voices without losing the valuable input of community experts in the areas.

Are you a first-term advisory committee member?

Yes

What additional comments that you would like to provide for consideration?

This survey, and consultations, should be shared with community groups and stakeholders other than just existing advisory committee members. There are some confusions in this structure that community experts in those areas can help to address.

Noting that there is additional work that would define the terms of reference for the committees noted above, what are your comments and thoughts to this proposed structure?

[Click here to enter text.](#)

What would you expect to see contained in committee terms of reference for the above-noted proposed structure?

[Click here to enter text.](#)

How often do you feel that it is necessary for advisory committees to meet?

[Click here to enter text.](#)

The recent staff report (noted above) proposed the elimination of the requirement for advisory committee work plans, in favour of having “assignments” from the civic administration and/or directly from Council. By way of additional context, it was not the intent that ‘new’ initiatives would not be ‘permitted’ from the advisory committees, rather to better allow focus of work. What are your thoughts around this proposal?

[In my short tenure on Advisory Committees, I developed an understanding that Advisory Committees would represent thoughts and ideas generate from the community \(constituency\) and provide advice to Council on these files. While it seems appropriate that Council also provide requests for advice, it should remain priority that the AC’s remain a public tool.](#)

The Municipal Council has suggested that the committees remain in the form of “advisory committees” as opposed to consideration of expert panels. There has also been the broader discussion in terms of eliminating barriers to participate on the advisory committees. As such, it is proposed that members be selected at random administratively, rather than through the Council appointment process (noting that in some cases there may be ‘categories’ of membership where applicants would be randomly selected from). What are your thoughts around this proposal?

[I agree with remaining as Advisory Committees. However, I disagree with randomization of appointment. While it’s important to have diverse Advisory Councils, members should still bring an expertise \(either professional or experiential\) to the committee they serve.](#)

Are you a first-term advisory committee member?

[Yes](#)

What additional comments that you would like to provide for consideration?

[Thinking practically about this review, it seems like an odd time to conduct such a survey. With Covid restricting meetings and participation of Advisory Committees, any first-term or newer AC member would not have much to contribute to these proposals and ideas from Council. In other words, only a few tenured AC members are having their knowledge/experience tapped for knowledgeable feedback.](#)

Noting that there is additional work that would define the terms of reference for the committees noted above, what are your comments and thoughts to this proposed structure?

[While I heard some criticism of the City of London having “too many” advisory committees \(i.e. newspaper opinion articles\), I’m not sure that reducing the number of](#)

committees is the best response. For one, when you combine multiple committees, the members of those committees are less likely to have knowledge pertaining to, or interest in, the issues being addressed. Also, as per the question below, I feel that meeting once per month was not sufficient to address the issues or accomplish anything. So, increasing the breadth of the committee would exacerbate this matter.

What would you expect to see contained in committee terms of reference for the above-noted proposed structure?

Well, if you're just combining some of the committees into larger, aggregated categories, you'd probably also combine the terms of reference. You'd probably then need to refine the information to reduce the length of the documents. However, that risks removing critical pieces of information.

How often do you feel that it is necessary for advisory committees to meet?

I feel that it would be beneficial for the committees to meet twice a month. The previous schedule of once per month did not seem sufficient to accomplish anything.

The recent staff report (noted above) proposed the elimination of the requirement for advisory committee work plans, in favour of having "assignments" from the civic administration and/or directly from Council. By way of additional context, it was not the intent that 'new' initiatives would not be 'permitted' from the advisory committees, rather to better allow focus of work. What are your thoughts around this proposal?

That may be an option. I feel the current work plan system is a bit cumbersome. It seems that the committee needs to spend a fair bit of time and energy on constructing the work plan every year, rather than on executing tasks relevant to the committee's mandate.

As noted in the question, I do feel that it is important for the committee to be able to put forward new initiatives, preferably at any time.

The Municipal Council has suggested that the committees remain in the form of "advisory committees" as opposed to consideration of expert panels. There has also been the broader discussion in terms of eliminating barriers to participate on the advisory committees. As such, it is proposed that members be selected at random administratively, rather than through the Council appointment process (noting that in some cases there may be 'categories' of membership where applicants would be randomly selected from). What are your thoughts around this proposal?

Selected at random from what pool? From all citizens? From applicants? (Are there enough applicant currently for that?) Would people be assigned to a committee at random, as opposed to assigned to one they are interested in?

I would not consider the committee I sit on to be an expert panel, and it does not make sense to consider it to be one.

However, rather than disregarding the advisory committees as citizen interest groups instead, why not construct them as an expert panel? I cannot imagine that there would not be ~10 people within the city who would have relevant experience and knowledge pertinent to the mandate of the committee.

If openings on the advisory committees were better promoted and the purposes of the committees was better explained, it should be possible to increase the number of applicants, and the number with relevant qualifications. While these individuals may not be the "top" experts in their field, it would be a good start to ensure that those serving on the committee have relevant knowledge and experience in the field.

Regardless of the strategy used in the future, I would suggest that individuals should only be able to apply to 1 committee. I recall seeing some of the applications submitted by others when I applied to the advisory committee I am on. Some applicants appeared to just want their voices heard somewhere so they applied to many different committees at the same time.

Are you a first-term advisory committee member?

Yes

What additional comments that you would like to provide for consideration?

Overall, I don't feel that it is wise to combine multiple committees into one (as I noted above). I feel that, particularly in the environmental fields, there is a wide range of subject matters that are very diverse. As also noted above, I feel that it would make more sense to switch the committees to expert panels, rather than disregarding the contributions of the advisory committees. To do so, you would need to advertise the openings more thoroughly and clearly explain their purpose and function, and then review the applicants properly.

8.

Matters related to technical advice concerning London's Natural Heritage System, (e.g. Significant Woodlands, Wetlands and ESA's, etc.) natural areas, ESAs, environmental features and projects triggering environmental impact and environmental assessment studies

Noting that there is additional work that would define the terms of reference for the committees noted above, what are your comments and thoughts to this proposed structure?

See piece highlighted in #8. I would hope that Council and staff would also list those areas they are interested in receiving advice. Right now, not all advisory ctes have that information. I believe EEPAC does.

What would you expect to see contained in committee terms of reference for the above-noted proposed structure?

Not sure I understand the question. In relation to EEPAC, the current terms of reference are good and reflect what is in #8. I do not have enough information to comment on the others. There should still be opportunities for working across Advisory Ctes as EEPAC, ACE and AWAC did in producing materials such as the Dogs in Nature brochure.

How often do you feel that it is necessary for advisory committees to meet?

I am most familiar with EEPAC and believe it should meet monthly in order to meet staff deadlines for comments on Environmental Impact Studies and other documents that require a timely response. I can't comment on the other advisory ctes.

The recent staff report (noted above) proposed the elimination of the requirement for advisory committee work plans, in favour of having "assignments" from the civic administration and/or directly from Council. By way of additional context, it was not the intent that 'new' initiatives would not be 'permitted' from the advisory committees, rather to better allow focus of work. What are your thoughts around this proposal?

I agree the work plans did not work well. From what I have been hearing, some advisory ctes have asked staff to do things, and they have not been batted down by the Standing Cte or Council when Council received the advisory cte report. If the Standing Cte were to review these asks and decide which are Ok, it would be a better process. There should be the opportunity for advisory ctes to advance ideas for Council review via the Standing Ctes, and for Council and staff to ask the advisory ctes for advice on matters they wish to send to advisory ctes.

The Municipal Council has suggested that the committees remain in the form of "advisory committees" as opposed to consideration of expert panels. There has also been the broader discussion in terms of eliminating barriers to participate on the advisory committees. As such, it is proposed that members be selected at random administratively, rather than through the Council appointment process (noting that in some cases there may be 'categories' of membership where applicants would be randomly selected from). What are your thoughts around this proposal?

Having selection administratively would take the politics out of the selection process. However, in the case of a technical advisory committee such as EEPAC or mobility for that matter, selection should not be random. As Chair, I have made it my job to get the message out to the University community that their expertise is needed on EEPAC. I believe I have been pretty successful in getting strong candidates with the expertise to serve on EEPAC (and a diverse committee too). I would not want to see that process change. The outreach to the university and Fanshawe should be the role of the outgoing chair each cycle. The outgoing chair could then recommend which candidates should be selected. Council will also have to accept that the people being recommended as qualified and should not spend committee time with ranked ballot selection and then assign people to committees who don't have the qualifications (which is what happened this term).

Within each term, it would be appreciated if vacancies were to be filled quicker. Having this done via a recommendation from the Chair to staff would speed up the process. Hopefully it could be done without the need for advertising the openings which seems to hinder the speed at which vacancies could be filled. Last term of Council, there were a number of vacancies that were never filled and I never got a clear reason as to why.

Are you a first-term advisory committee member?

No

What additional comments that you would like to provide for consideration?

I think it is important to provide some training / direction to committee chairs in how to run a meeting. I also think it is important to regularly remind the committees and chairs that the role of an advisory cte is just to provide advice and Council makes the decisions. I know that frustrates the professionals on EEPAC, but I remind them regularly the role is to provide advice and Council decides. This message can be delivered at the start of the term and annually by the Chair of the Standing Cte or by the outgoing chair or a grumpy old guy like me. It would also be helpful if the Chair of the Standing Cte met with the Chair of the Advisory cte and someone from the relevant staff (in the case of EEPAC, someone from Long Term Planning) from time to time during the term to ensure the Advisory Cte is in sync with the Standing Cte and staff. This might stop some problems from becoming big problems. I also think there should be more information for advisory ctes on what hasn't worked well (and what has). I am not sure all advisory committees are aware of how they are received by staff and Council. I think it is important that the chair appear at the Standing Cte at least once a quarter to get feedback from the Standing Cte as well as highlight work in progress and to get confirmation that work can continue or course corrections are needed. For example, I have appeared before PEC after each change in the composition of PEC so that the councillors are aware of the expertise of the members of EEPAC and what EEPAC does and has done.

If Council puts term limits on expert appointees, it will make it even harder to have an expert panel because experts are not a dime a dozen.

One EEPAC specific thing.... I wish our full comments on an EIS for a development/planning application or receipt of an ESR were included when the matter is on the agenda of PEC or CWC for consideration. Right now, EEPAC's comments can appear on an EEPAC report on the PEC agenda years before the matter is before committee.

I would be happy to further discuss my thoughts with you at any time.

Noting that there is additional work that would define the terms of reference for the committees noted above, what are your comments and thoughts to this proposed structure?

As a member of the Child care advisory committee I am in agreement with what is proposed.

What would you expect to see contained in committee terms of reference for the above-noted proposed structure?

That is also includes the Early On/On y va system and that representation for English, French and First Nations should always be at the table

How often do you feel that it is necessary for advisory committees to meet?

At least 3 times a year if not 4

The recent staff report (noted above) proposed the elimination of the requirement for advisory committee work plans, in favour of having “assignments” from the civic administration and/or directly from Council. By way of additional context, it was not the intent that ‘new’ initiatives would not be ‘permitted’ from the advisory committees, rather to better allow focus of work. What are your thoughts around this proposal?

Good question! As we have seen in recent months, the economy and child care system may change rapidly. I like the idea of getting assignments but I am concerned that if it is the only thing we are working on, that the pressing issues we see coming might not be addressed.

The Municipal Council has suggested that the committees remain in the form of “advisory committees” as opposed to consideration of expert panels. There has also been the broader discussion in terms of eliminating barriers to participate on the advisory committees. As such, it is proposed that members be selected at random administratively, rather than through the Council appointment process (noting that in some cases there may be ‘categories’ of membership where applicants would be randomly selected from). What are your thoughts around this proposal?

I disagree with the proposed suggestion. As a member of the child care system, the complexity, the constant change and the incredible amount of challenges need, in my opinion, to be discussed by professionals directly involved in the matter and by the clients they serve i.e. parents.

Are you a first-term advisory committee member?

Yes

What additional comments that you would like to provide for consideration?

As a member,

Noting that there is additional work that would define the terms of reference for the committees noted above, what are your comments and thoughts to this proposed structure?

I feel there is tremendous overlap with several of these structures, which could fragment discussions and lead to disconnect. Already, on ACCAC, we have fought for years to have a voice on the LTC advisory committee as many in our community face significant barriers that are exacerbated by our transit committees. While I agree with, for example, one committee looking at mobility, it is important to ensure that there is adequate representation from the accessibility community.

We also expressed concern two years ago with the additional layer of bureaucracy that the CDIS and its champions pool was creating. That concern has been borne out, as we see a lack of awareness of organizational history, duplication of efforts, and counter-productive efforts leading to wasted time and effort. To separate ACCAC-related content from #6 – matters related to diversity, inclusivity, equity, and the elimination of discrimination just reinforces the fact that the City does not view ableism in the same

light, despite the incredible negative impact our systemic ableist structures have created.

There should be less fragmentation and more pooling of resources. Committee members are volunteers, so there is a huge challenge adequately staffing existing structures. With this overlap, there would need to be an expectation of groups liaising, which is an additional barrier/burden on their time.

What would you expect to see contained in committee terms of reference for the above-noted proposed structure?

Clearly defined expectations to ensure effective meetings (currently some participants come unprepared, and that should be a minimum expectation); clearly defined behavioural outlines (currently we have a committee member who snaps and claps during meetings when issues relating to their personal advocacy comes up. Or engaging in side-bar conversations when there are other speakers with the floor). A better understand of what it means to be an effective committee member would be integral.

As well, clearly defined meeting dates, structures, and access requirements would help participants understand what they're in for. And, finally, a very clear purpose and mandate upon which we can vet discussions and ensure that the committee is aligned towards a common purpose.

How often do you feel that it is necessary for advisory committees to meet?

For ACCAC? Monthly, with subcommittee opportunities should they be needed. But ACCAC is a different beast than others, due to its provincial mandate.

The recent staff report (noted above) proposed the elimination of the requirement for advisory committee work plans, in favour of having "assignments" from the civic administration and/or directly from Council. By way of additional context, it was not the intent that 'new' initiatives would not be 'permitted' from the advisory committees, rather to better allow focus of work. What are your thoughts around this proposal?

It is an awful proposal. With all due respect, Council and civic administration cannot be reasonably expected to have the depth and breadth of knowledge that a well-structured and well-staffed advisory committee can bring forth. Our work plans are designed to be proactive and bring forth ideas that will help London be at the vanguard of issues (as evidenced by our FADS document that has been the model of communities around the province).

What this type of requirement does is not so much focus our work, but rather it forces us to align with their desires. Sometimes ACCAC's mandate means that it is not necessarily aligned with Council or staff. We are here to ensure that the legislation is followed and that we undertake initiatives that bring awareness and support the community. If we are to be rendered lapdogs, expected only to do council's bidding, instead of proactively bringing forth issues and initiatives that improve the city, then just do away with the advisory committee.

I know it can be uncomfortable or unwanted. Our committee, as part of its workplan, engaged in an outreach effort a few years ago to hear from the community, in the community. Instead of expecting them to come to us, we went to them, and asked what they needed/wanted from the City and what challenges they faced. It was hard to hear the pain and suffering. It was not an easy process. And it brought forth a number of issues, which were now better able to be discussed based on data and anecdotal reports.

I don't fear – I know that this type of initiative would never happen under the proposed new structure. Based on the dismissiveness of a segment of council already to the findings, I can't imagine that they'd proactively seek that out.

This is part of the value of advisory committees. As members of the community of which we represent, we are better positioned to bring missives from the front line. Absent that mandate, we will be directed by a top-down approach that runs the risk of completely missing the actual needs and challenges that these communities face.

The Municipal Council has suggested that the committees remain in the form of “advisory committees” as opposed to consideration of expert panels. There has also been the broader discussion in terms of eliminating barriers to participate on the advisory committees. As such, it is proposed that members be selected at random administratively, rather than through the Council appointment process (noting that in some cases there may be ‘categories’ of membership where applicants would be randomly selected from). What are your thoughts around this proposal?

I think the council appointment process is flawed. The process, as it stands now, is a glorified patronage appointment. If I may be brutally honest, it is essentially the Urban League appointment process, wherein only friends and sympathizers with that type of political rhetoric are selected for committees. It’s why we see the same privileged few recycled over and over.

My impression of some of the committees is that they’re not actual experts, but rather advocates with a specific point of view. Cycling is pro-cycling to the extreme with no willingness to compromise. That is not helpful. Heritage is 100 per cent pro-keep everything and those are the only people who are selected/recruited. But nowhere are issues counter to preservation discussed. Nowhere are there those who would advocate, for example, about promoting accessibility.

That said, a random group of people with no affiliation to a cause is no better. Do I want someone who is only a vehicle driver on mobility? No. Do I want people with perspective of multiple forms of transportation on it? Yes. Do I want people from all across the political spectrum participating? Yes. Is that what happens? No.

The biggest barrier to participation is timing. Committee membership is a privilege, but it’s also exclusive to the privileged. We are getting the same people who have the luxury of leaving work or participating during the day (often, in some cases, because their affiliation and work is aligned with this type of glorified lobbying). But where are we hearing those who live outside the chosen areas of Woodfield and Old South? When we talk transportation, why do we not have people from the community who are working retail at White Oaks?

Why? Because they can’t leave work to come to a meeting mid-day during the work week.

Remote access is also something that needs to be sensitively handled. Yes, online access to meetings would be great, but that’s assuming people have high-speed Internet and appropriate technology. That could be a barrier to those of limited financial means – though I would argue their input would be incredibly valuable.

Committees should have more input into who joins. Right now it is a small group that chooses appointments and that’s a tremendous amount of power and influence consolidated in a very small group of people. We need to do better about increasing the diversity of these groups – not just of gender, race, colour, and ability, but also diversity of thought to ensure we develop well-rounded groups.

Are you a first-term advisory committee member?

No

I’m actually in my “third” term as my second has been extended.

What additional comments that you would like to provide for consideration?

We have to do a better job of opening up access to the committee structure to more people in the City of London. We hear the same voices, the same narrow advocacy, the same political perspective both by design and through systemic barriers. If we really

want to make this accessible to the City of London, it can't be just the people who have the privilege that allows them to do it, or a vested interest in political careers and influence.

I would not be opposed to more targeted approaches at filling advisory committees. If council is concerned that the level of expertise is inadequate (a sentiment that I find abhorrently insulting, considering our mandate is to have over half the participants with lived experience), then more of an effort needs to go to reaching out to those experts to volunteer their time.

However, I caution council to not discount the value of citizen expertise. Perhaps because you're hearing the same voices, with the same perspective, from the same pool of people, you're not getting the benefit of a broader representation and actual debate.

We don't need people who are zealot adherents to a cause. That's one thing I try to stress on our committee – we are not here to only further our own ideas. Sometimes you're going to have to make tough decisions or support mandates that don't align exactly with what you believe. We do this for the greater good. I have tried to promote understanding and appreciation – yes, we want more investment in accessibility, but we also realize that there are financial factors beyond our control. We are willing to compromise for better, but it seems too many are out there just arguing for their version of perfect – and no compromise will be accepted.

We need more diversity of thought, experience, and affiliation. We need to make accessing an advisory committee more easy – even if this means meeting in the evening. Our political process can't only be for those with privilege.

Noting that there is additional work that would define the terms of reference for the committees noted above, what are your comments and thoughts to this proposed structure?

[Click here to enter text.](#)

What would you expect to see contained in committee terms of reference for the above-noted proposed structure?

[Click here to enter text.](#)

How often do you feel that it is necessary for advisory committees to meet?

[monthly](#)

The recent staff report (noted above) proposed the elimination of the requirement for advisory committee work plans, in favour of having “assignments” from the civic administration and/or directly from Council. By way of additional context, it was not the intent that ‘new’ initiatives would not be ‘permitted’ from the advisory committees, rather to better allow focus of work. What are your thoughts around this proposal?

[Negative. I believe the committee is best to identify the issues they need to address and bring to the attention of city staff.](#)

The Municipal Council has suggested that the committees remain in the form of “advisory committees” as opposed to consideration of expert panels. There has also been the broader discussion in terms of eliminating barriers to participate on the advisory committees. As such, it is proposed that members be selected at random administratively, rather than through the Council appointment process (noting that in some cases there may be ‘categories’ of membership where applicants would be randomly selected from). What are your thoughts around this proposal?

[by city staff does not sound good. People with an interest and issues they want addressed should apply and be vetted by a committee with knowledge of the issues.](#)

Are you a first-term advisory committee member?

No

What additional comments that you would like to provide for consideration?

ACAC is mandated by the province, must have people with disabilities on the committee and the biggest barrier to us is getting city staff and council to listen to what we have to say, without getting stonewalled by the political process and bureaucracy.

Noting that there is additional work that would define the terms of reference for the committees noted above, what are your comments and thoughts to this proposed structure?

It seems like a bit of overlap when the ODA is separated from #6 (inclusion, equity). Otherwise, the proposed structure is sound.

What would you expect to see contained in committee terms of reference for the above-noted proposed structure?

[Click here to enter text.](#)

How often do you feel that it is necessary for advisory committees to meet?

Monthly

The recent staff report (noted above) proposed the elimination of the requirement for advisory committee work plans, in favour of having “assignments” from the civic administration and/or directly from Council. By way of additional context, it was not the intent that ‘new’ initiatives would not be ‘permitted’ from the advisory committees, rather to better allow focus of work. What are your thoughts around this proposal?

The proposal to shift to “assignments” provides more clarity and actionable items for the members of the committees.

The Municipal Council has suggested that the committees remain in the form of “advisory committees” as opposed to consideration of expert panels. There has also been the broader discussion in terms of eliminating barriers to participate on the advisory committees. As such, it is proposed that members be selected at random administratively, rather than through the Council appointment process (noting that in some cases there may be ‘categories’ of membership where applicants would be randomly selected from). What are your thoughts around this proposal?

Are you a first-term advisory committee member?

Yes

What additional comments that you would like to provide for consideration?

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Noting that there is additional work that would define the terms of reference for the committees noted above, what are your comments and thoughts to this proposed structure?

I really like the proposed structure, particularly the issue-focused structure of the list above. I think this will allow for specialized attention to issues that is needed and make the committees more effective.

What would you expect to see contained in committee terms of reference for the above-noted proposed structure?

Guaranteed youth representation. Having >1 youth obviously should be encouraged but ensuring that there is at least 1 guaranteed spot should be included. Additionally, an

emphasis on selecting a diverse group based on age, experience, ethnicity, gender diversity, etc. should be at the forefront of selection.

How often do you feel that it is necessary for advisory committees to meet?

Once every 2 months is more than enough for typical duties (except in the first month they should meet twice or more in order to be onboarded). Committees were onboarded far too slowly last year. It wasn't until our 4th month did we finally move on specific things rather than just having presentations.

The recent staff report (noted above) proposed the elimination of the requirement for advisory committee work plans, in favour of having "assignments" from the civic administration and/or directly from Council. By way of additional context, it was not the intent that 'new' initiatives would not be 'permitted' from the advisory committees, rather to better allow focus of work. What are your thoughts around this proposal?

I think this is far better. Workplans are effective but not in the case of new committee membership. Having assignments allows committees to have immediate direction but still being able to develop their own initiatives means we don't lose the most important part of advisory committees.

The Municipal Council has suggested that the committees remain in the form of "advisory committees" as opposed to consideration of expert panels. There has also been the broader discussion in terms of eliminating barriers to participate on the advisory committees. As such, it is proposed that members be selected at random administratively, rather than through the Council appointment process (noting that in some cases there may be 'categories' of membership where applicants would be randomly selected from). What are your thoughts around this proposal?

I think that sounds fine. Just reiterating the aforementioned emphasis on diversity of age, ethnicity, experience, etc because that is how London's ACs will thrive.

Are you a first-term advisory committee member?

Yes

What additional comments that you would like to provide for consideration?

I think there is fantastic value in this change if implemented correctly.

Noting that there is additional work that would define the terms of reference for the committees noted above, what are your comments and thoughts to this proposed structure?

I am concerned that important projects may be lost when some of the committees are expanding their responsibilities

What would you expect to see contained in committee terms of reference for the above-noted proposed structure?

We need a committee that is focused on Crime Prevention. This should be one of the most important criteria for the City of London. This is an expanding problem and unless controlled could destroy any community.

How often do you feel that it is necessary for advisory committees to meet?

If the Committee has expanding projects, they should meet once a month

The recent staff report (noted above) proposed the elimination of the requirement for advisory committee work plans, in favour of having "assignments" from the civic administration and/or directly from Council. By way of additional context, it was not the intent that 'new' initiatives would not be 'permitted' from the advisory committees, rather to better allow focus of work. What are your thoughts around this proposal?

A lot of work goes into preparing, designing and administering projects. These projects should be allowed to develop without being overruled by others.

The Municipal Council has suggested that the committees remain in the form of “advisory committees” as opposed to consideration of expert panels. There has also been the broader discussion in terms of eliminating barriers to participate on the advisory committees. As such, it is proposed that members be selected at random administratively, rather than through the Council appointment process (noting that in some cases there may be ‘categories’ of membership where applicants would be randomly selected from). What are your thoughts around this proposal?

Whether it is advisory committees or expert panels, it should be made up of members who are willing to work and not be for publicity purposes.

Are you a first-term advisory committee member?

Yes

What additional comments that you would like to provide for consideration?

I am willing to sit on the committee where my background and experience would be useful for the betterment of the City of London. My knowledge and background is in Crime Prevention

Please see attached a response to the questionnaire circulated by the City Clerk’s Office to members of the City’s Advisory Committees.

Let me start by thanking the Clerk’s Office for the opportunity to participate in this review. As a first-time member of your Agricultural Advisory Committee and London Advisory Committee on Heritage, it has been an honour and an education to be a member of these committees. My cover letter is intended to set some context for the questionnaire response. As a retired CAO and long-time Clerk, my working life was devoted to public service. This experience included governance and organizational reviews aimed at ensuring that statutory obligations could be met and services could be delivered in an efficient and effective manner.

From a high-level perspective, the assessment set out in the Council Report provided is correct. There are few statutory requirements for advisory committees. This is only one of the many ways to engage with the community. Individuals who have time to serve on a committee may not reflect the community as a whole. There are costs associated with the staff support as well as incidental costs such as supplies, memberships and refreshments. Given these limiting factors, Council needs to answer two primary questions when designing its governance structure – what purpose does an advisory committee serve? and in what areas?

As advisors, this group is not intended to be a polling mechanism. In the Internet age, there are much better ways to engage directly with the public and obtain feedback on topical matters.

Neither is an advisory committee the best way to address a targeted, time-sensitive issue and/or spearhead a new initiative. For this, Council might consider a special purpose working group or task force.

While citizens serve on advisory committees, only limited community engagement happens around a committee room table. Your Mayor, ward councillors and communications team - as well as City staff at public information sessions and community events - are much better positioned to give and receive timely information and input from residents.

The City is also fortunate to have many neighbourhood associations and community groups. Information can be gathered or shared through the NeighbourGood program or entities like the Urban League to help inform Council’s decision making.

Within a governance structure, the purpose of an advisory committee is to assist Council and Administration in the carrying out certain functions (statutory or otherwise) within a set mandate. Council entrusts this body to research, to review reports, to consider options, and then to prepare sound recommendations through a Standing Committee. To fulfill its role, advisory committee members need to have a level of expertise - be it academic credentials, professional qualifications or lived experience. To provide well-considered advice, members should bring to the table a diversity of backgrounds and a variety of perspectives. But to be effective, an advisory committee also needs to have focus. Tasking a committee with too many items or too wide a range of issues, may result in too much effort with too little in results.

Thank you, once again, for the opportunity to submit comments as part of this governance review.

Noting that there is additional work that would define the terms of reference for the committees noted above, what are your comments and thoughts to this proposed structure?

The strength of an Advisory Committee system is the ability to tap into citizen expertise within a particular area. This singular focus compliments the overall perspective provided by members of Council who – whether sitting together or as a Standing Committee – are tasked with the responsibility of weighing all of the various priorities of the municipality at large.

The proposed combination of heritage with rural and agricultural matters would not be incompatible. While barns and farmhouses do occasionally come up for discussion at LACH, this is generally in the context of proposed development within the urban boundary (not the rural area). Having grown up on a farm and worked in rural communities, it is true that many agricultural properties have old farmhouses and other structures accumulated over the years. However, agri-business owners generally favour policies that make it easier, not harder, to either sever surplus buildings and/or demolish unwanted structures.

Likewise, while both the Agricultural Advisory Committee and Urban Agriculture Steering Committee has agriculture in their names, these two groups can be world's apart in their view of the food system requirements.

Here are my suggestions for consideration.

Agriculture Advisory Committee

My understanding as a member of the Agriculture Advisory Committee is that this committee was established at the time of annexation to provide a voice from the farm and rural community. The meetings of this group are few and far between, with little agenda content. The occasion land use planning application or other matters circulated to this group occur on a timeline that does not coincide with the meeting schedule. Although members are circulated individually with the option to provide personal comments, this rarely happens.

From my perspective, this committee has outlived its original mandate and I recommend that the City consider disbanding this group. It is suggested that when advice is needed from the rural and agricultural community City planning reach out to the representatives of agricultural organizations such as the Western Fair Board, Ontario Federation of Agriculture, Middlesex Soil & Crop Improvement and/or the Middlesex County Agricultural Advisory Committee. By engaging directly with these groups, the City would receive a reliable source of feedback on agricultural matters in a timely manner. This open communication channel might also be used to apprise the City of issues in the rural area not otherwise on Council's radar (copied to Ward Councillors who represent the rural areas as appropriate).

In addition, the London Economic Development Corporation and London's Green Economy would have established connections with groups active in supporting and

advising on agri-business in the City (and beyond). These economic forums should be able to provide input to Council on the City's strategic initiatives to grow the local agri-food sector with insights into any aspects of London's policies facilitating – or hindering – the retention and expansion of food producers and processors, both large and small.

Combined with citizen engagement efforts in the rural area when and where needed, this approach could enhance the City's connection to its rural and agricultural area without the need for an advisory body.

Urban Agriculture Steering Committee

Working Groups like steering committees are an invaluable tool for “hot topics” and/or where a municipality is implementing a new plan. The City of London Urban Agriculture Strategy is a good example of where progress can be made when a group of highly motivated individuals with a “mission” work on a set of specific tasks. As the strategy appears to be still in its initial implementation stage, it is suggested that the City continue with the Urban Agriculture Steering Committee reporting to PEC for the balance of this Council term.

If this proposal is rejected, I would further suggest that “urban agriculture” would be more closely aligned to matters of food security, economic opportunity, cultural expression and social justice rather than land use planning. This topic could potentially be placed within the mandate of an advisory group dealing diversity, inclusivity, equity and the elimination of discrimination.

LACH

While the establishment of an advisory committee for heritage matters is optional, there are statutory notification and other requirements under both the Ontario Heritage Act and Planning Act (and regulations) for an established heritage committee. I agree that the mandate of LACH needs to be broadened so that its advisory role is set into the context of the overall objectives of the Strategic Plan, Official Plan/London Plan and Archaeology Master Plan. Pending changes to the Ontario Heritage Act regulations make it necessary for the City to be proactive rather than reactive. Heritage resources must be identified early in the land use planning process within strict deadlines. It would be helpful for the Advisory Committee (or a Working Group) to work directly with City administration **and** the proponents at the pre-consultation and/or application stage to help identify and address any potential heritage-related issues.

What would you expect to see contained in committee terms of reference for the above-noted proposed structure?

The following items would be expected in the terms of reference:

Committee mandate: specific list of items tied to statutes, regulations, City Strategic Plan, Official Plan or other; how other items can be delegated to Committee such as a Council or Standing Committee resolution

Committee structure: number/type/criteria for members; electing chair/vice chair; recording secretary; voting/non-voting members; term limitations if any

Subcommittees/working groups – how formed; membership, reporting etc.

Reporting structure: to what Standing Committee; delegated responsibilities if any

Meetings: frequency of meetings, who/how called, agenda, etc. (this could be reference to Council/Committee procedure bylaw); determining quorum

Role and Responsibility of Members: attendance, declarations of conflict of interest, decorum, respect for decision of majority, serve at pleasure of Council

How often do you feel that it is necessary for advisory committees to meet?

To meet its statutory and other obligations, it will be necessary for the Advisory Committee responsible for heritage matters to meet monthly given the tight timelines set

out in the pending regulations. Any working group such as the Stewardship Subcommittee would only need to be as required based on workload.

The recent staff report (noted above) proposed the elimination of the requirement for advisory committee work plans, in favour of having “assignments” from the civic administration and/or directly from Council. By way of additional context, it was not the intent that ‘new’ initiatives would not be ‘permitted’ from the advisory committees, rather to better allow focus of work. What are your thoughts around this proposal?

The annual review of the workplan is an opportunity to check in and see what is, and is not getting accomplished. Whether this is a formal workplan or a list of assignments is neither here nor there as a Committee member. What is important is that the priorities set by Council for the Advisory Committee are clear.

My observation would be that there is a missing link between the agendas and the workplans. Items on the agenda are based on incoming matters, be they applications, reports or meeting notes. The format does not specifically relate back to the workplan and so it is easy for tasks to be “forgotten”.

In the case of LACH, there is a Stewardship Subcommittee that functions very much like a working group. It tends to be this group rather than the Advisory Committee as a whole that meets to carry out specific tasks. There are two other subcommittees: Policy and Education but as these groups meet only on an as- needed basis, only one meeting has been held this term.

The Municipal Council has suggested that the committees remain in the form of “advisory committees” as opposed to consideration of expert panels. There has also been the broader discussion in terms of eliminating barriers to participate on the advisory committees. As such, it is proposed that members be selected at random administratively, rather than through the Council appointment process (noting that in some cases there may be ‘categories’ of membership where applicants would be randomly selected from). What are your thoughts around this proposal?

The purpose of an advisory committee is to provide Council with advice and to augment the time and perspectives available through City staff. The members appointed should have some level of experience or expertise in the area where they are asked to serve.

If members of the public are randomly selected and come to the table with no background or understanding, there would a steep learning curve experienced at the beginning of each term. Committee and staff time and effort will be devoted to orientation and explanation.

Also, how would a random appointment method result in an equitable or diverse structure around the Committee table (age, gender, profession, cultural or other background, neighbourhood, organization, etc.)? This is an important factor when establishing an Advisory Committee.

If this option is considered, it is recommended that there be some form of rotation between the retention of existing members and the addition of new members to an advisory committee. For example, if an Advisory Committee has 10 members, then 5 appointees be returning members and with 5 new members and provide some continuity from one term to another. This would also suggest a two-term limit.

Are you a first-term advisory committee member?

Yes

What additional comments that you would like to provide for consideration?

See cover letter.

We are sending along these points for consideration to all environmental AC chairs. Please feel free to not pass along to the Clerk's office - we just wanted to send along our thoughts.

Here are our feedback points:

- a. Recommend a minimum of 4 meetings a year for each Committee
 - b. City Council and Standing Committees assist in the development of AC work plans, but that AC's are able to bring forward items not included in the official work plans for AC review and deliberations
 - c. AC members are made aware of the AC Code of Conduct regularly
 - d. Orientation is developed and delivered for Chair and Vice Chair members of the AC's
 - e. Improve clarity of the various ways citizens are able to engage with the City of London (ex. Make the different methods of engagement readily accessible on the City's website)
 - f. Pilot other ways to engage the City that provide staff different options depending on project, for example time sensitive items could be brought to a general citizen's panel for feedback
-

Noting that there is additional work that would define the terms of reference for the committees noted above, what are your comments and thoughts to this proposed structure?

Support proposed structure that includes the Community Safety & Well-Being Advisory Committee. An expectation to have at least 2 members from each Advisory Committee to attend City Council meetings.

What would you expect to see contained in committee terms of reference for the above-noted proposed structure?

The following explained: Role, Mandate, Composition, Working Groups, Project Assignments and Deadline Dates, Term of Office and Appointment Policies, Qualifications, Conduct, Meetings, and Remuneration (if any). Expectation to have at least 2 members attend City Council Meetings.

How often do you feel that it is necessary for advisory committees to meet?

I think it is important to have guidelines for the numbers of 'advisory committees' meetings to ensure they happen in a timely fashion and meet specific deadline dates. I also think it is important to note that additional meetings may be required to ensure the assigned work gets finished.

The recent staff report (noted above) proposed the elimination of the requirement for advisory committee work plans, in favour of having "assignments" from the civic administration and/or directly from Council. By way of additional context, it was not the intent that 'new' initiatives would not be 'permitted' from the advisory committees, rather to better allow focus of work. What are your thoughts around this proposal?

To improve the focus of the 'advisory committee' work is a terrific idea as it allows us to better serve the citizens of London. I whole-heartedly endorse the idea of assignments from civic administration and/or given directly from Council as the driving force of the 'advisory committee' work to be accomplished.

The Municipal Council has suggested that the committees remain in the form of "advisory committees" as opposed to consideration of expert panels. There has also been the broader discussion in terms of eliminating barriers to participate on the advisory committees. As such, it is proposed that members be selected at random administratively, rather than through the Council appointment process (noting that in some cases there may be 'categories' of membership where applicants would be randomly selected from). What are your thoughts around this proposal?

It is important to encourage the citizens of London to be actively engaged in their community. It is also important for the citizens of London to feel that they have a voice, they are being listened to and services and supports are accessible to them. This includes participation in "advisory committees". If the proposed structure of 'random selection' for advisory committee participation eliminates barriers to participation and

promotes justice and fairness in the membership selection process then I wholeheartedly support it.

Are you a first-term advisory committee member?

Yes

What additional comments that you would like to provide for consideration?

It is a rewarding experience to be able to contribute to the betterment of our local communities and the city of London. Thank you for the opportunity.

Noting that there is additional work that would define the terms of reference for the committees noted above, what are your comments and thoughts to this proposed structure?

The structure reflects critical priorities of the municipality and makes sense for civil engagement.

What would you expect to see contained in committee terms of reference for the above-noted proposed structure?

Clear mandate, clear role and how the involvement ultimately impacts council decisions.

How often do you feel that it is necessary for advisory committees to meet?

Possibly six times a year.

The recent staff report (noted above) proposed the elimination of the requirement for advisory committee work plans, in favour of having “assignments” from the civic administration and/or directly from Council. By way of additional context, it was not the intent that ‘new’ initiatives would not be ‘permitted’ from the advisory committees, rather to better allow focus of work. What are your thoughts around this proposal?

Having timely, relevant assignments makes sense and is an efficient use of the advisory committee’s time and expertise.

The Municipal Council has suggested that the committees remain in the form of “advisory committees” as opposed to consideration of expert panels. There has also been the broader discussion in terms of eliminating barriers to participate on the advisory committees. As such, it is proposed that members be selected at random administratively, rather than through the Council appointment process (noting that in some cases there may be ‘categories’ of membership where applicants would be randomly selected from). What are your thoughts around this proposal?

This can work if the advisory committee truly reflects the community-at-large. Using a diversity and inclusion lens is important and having community members who are skills-based and subject matter experts is also key to an effective advisory committee.

Are you a first-term advisory committee member?

No

What additional comments that you would like to provide for consideration?

The advisory committee structure may be beneficial to the City of London, especially from the lessons we’ve all learned from the COVID-19 pandemic. Hearing directly from community members on the most impactful issues may help shape respective policy from the City Council.

Noting that there is additional work that would define the terms of reference for the committees noted above, what are your comments and thoughts to this proposed structure?

Reducing the number of advisory committees means that fewer people will have the opportunity to get involved, participate and contribute. Some of the advisory committees that have been merged should therefore have a larger number of members.

What would you expect to see contained in committee terms of reference for the above-noted proposed structure?

[Click here to enter text.](#)

How often do you feel that it is necessary for advisory committees to meet?

Ten times per year: monthly except for August and December.

The recent staff report (noted above) proposed the elimination of the requirement for advisory committee work plans, in favour of having “assignments” from the civic administration and/or directly from Council. By way of additional context, it was not the intent that ‘new’ initiatives would not be ‘permitted’ from the advisory committees, rather to better allow focus of work. What are your thoughts around this proposal?

The “work plans” were a top-down idea that smacked of paternalism. They were a distraction and were given too high a priority. Too much time at meetings was spent discussing the work plans. They wasted time, reduced enthusiasm and resulted in absenteeism from meetings.

The Municipal Council has suggested that the committees remain in the form of “advisory committees” as opposed to consideration of expert panels. There has also been the broader discussion in terms of eliminating barriers to participate on the advisory committees. As such, it is proposed that members be selected at random administratively, rather than through the Council appointment process (noting that in some cases there may be ‘categories’ of membership where applicants would be randomly selected from). What are your thoughts around this proposal?

Random selection will not reduce barriers. The better solution would be to identify the barriers to participation, then seek ways to reduce or eliminate those barriers.

Are you a first-term advisory committee member?

No.

What additional comments that you would like to provide for consideration?

There is too much effort to control the advisory committees. They should have free rein to look at any issue and make any recommendation they deem advisable, with the understanding that city council can accept or reject the recommendation in whole or in part. That would be the best use of the expertise of advisory committee members.

Noting that there is additional work that would define the terms of reference for the committees noted above, what are your comments and thoughts to this proposed structure?

Noted that further work and additions are to take place, would appreciate a structured meeting outline to be included as it relates to the former Roberts Rules of Order for structure of meetings, and positions, as well as permanent links on the Agendas, Minutes of the meetings as they relate to submissions, ie Bylaw’s, social organization information etc.as it applies, or is requested by members.

What would you expect to see contained in committee terms of reference for the above-noted proposed structure?

Referenced above.

How often do you feel that it is necessary for advisory committees to meet?

Once a month, unless otherwise directed by an emergency or special meeting issued by Council.

The recent staff report (noted above) proposed the elimination of the requirement for advisory committee work plans, in favour of having “assignments” from the civic administration and/or directly from Council. By way of additional context, it was not the intent that ‘new’ initiatives would not be ‘permitted’ from the advisory committees, rather to better allow focus of work. What are your thoughts around this proposal?

In order for congruence to be maintained, both working plans as they relate to larger City of London Plans and the others as they apply to each committee, I also adaptability for assignments to be included and structured to fit known deadlines.

The Municipal Council has suggested that the committees remain in the form of “advisory committees” as opposed to consideration of expert panels. There has also been the broader discussion in terms of eliminating barriers to participate on the advisory committees. As such, it is proposed that members be selected at random administratively, rather than through the Council appointment process (noting that in some cases there may be ‘categories’ of membership where applicants would be randomly selected from). What are your thoughts around this proposal?

The suggestion that the committees remain in the current form is agreed, random lotteries based on categories could result in the opposite outcomes from having positive effects. Better outcomes could be made by adding categories without the random lottery selection to the applications and a broader media marketing to call out and select broader samples from the population.

Are you a first-term advisory committee member?

Yes

What additional comments that you would like to provide for consideration?

It would be prudent to retain the current members of the Committees in order to retain the report and beginning steps that already have taken place at the end of last year, to maintain momentum within the Committees, and the efforts that City Council has already made regarding the selection process last year.

Noting that there is additional work that would define the terms of reference for the committees noted above, what are your comments and thoughts to this proposed structure?

Climate change **mitigation** is not enough. We need to consider climate change **adaptation**. How is London going to adapt its infrastructure and natural heritage to perform essential functions under changing environmental conditions? This is a monumental task that will require expert input over the coming years.

Under item 4, perhaps “conservation” should be clarified. Conservation of what? If the responsibility is to conserve Species at Risk, biodiversity or other natural resources such as fresh water or wilderness land, the mandate for the committee(s) should indicate so clearly.

What would you expect to see contained in committee terms of reference for the above-noted proposed structure?

I am not clear what this question is asking, nor am I sufficiently familiar with the existing ToR for advisory committees to comment on how they should be modified. Please consult the committee Chairs directly for feedback.

How often do you feel that it is necessary for advisory committees to meet?

Monthly, as before, with committee working groups meeting more regularly as prescribed by the Chairs or group leads.

The recent staff report (noted above) proposed the elimination of the requirement for advisory committee work plans, in favour of having “assignments” from the civic administration and/or directly from Council. By way of additional context, it was not the intent that ‘new’ initiatives would not be ‘permitted’ from the advisory committees, rather to better allow focus of work. What are your thoughts around this proposal?

I disagree with this proposal. The implications of a shift to assignments are not clear, in part because the nature of “assignments” vs. new initiatives has been poorly described. I can envision a top-down model (akin to committees receiving assignments from council) constraining the scope of work undertaken by advisory committees to the demands and expectations of council members, which may not ultimately serve the City’s interests. For example, I serve on EEPAC with subject experts who know far more about matters concerning natural heritage conservation and climate change than do members of council. Having these experts be committed to working on projects as they are defined by council (i.e. non-experts), rather than being involved in developing work plans directly, would not take full advantage of the expertise being volunteered to the City. Therefore, I believe the council ought to recognize that their relationships with advisory committees should consist of two-way communication, particularly around the design of work plans, and that this dynamic serves to ultimately strengthen the quality of committee output and the value of advisory committees for planning and democratic decision making.

In the last year of deliberation about advisory committees, which has occurred without direct input from the committees themselves, I have yet to read a single piece of evidence brought forward to support the claim that the existing advisory committee model using work plans is ineffectual. If council has concerns about specific committees, they should indicate so and not paint all advisory committees with the same broad brush. From my experiences serving on EEPAC I observed the committee to be very efficient and organized, to produce high-quality, expert-informed feedback on projects and to generate strong new ideas for council’s consideration. If the City intends to shift away from the existing work plan model, justification for the change should be clearly provided in the form of evidence, merit and consensus, including feedback from advisory committee Chairs.

The Municipal Council has suggested that the committees remain in the form of “advisory committees” as opposed to consideration of expert panels. There has also been the broader discussion in terms of eliminating barriers to participate on the advisory committees. As such, it is proposed that members be selected at random administratively, rather than through the Council appointment process (noting that in some cases there may be ‘categories’ of membership where applicants would be randomly selected from). What are your thoughts around this proposal?

As a graduate student volunteering (unpaid) time to serve on a municipal advisory committee, I don’t believe the random selection model will be very effective for recruitment. I was recruited to EEPAC from the university by word-of-mouth (through an existing member) at the discretion of the Chair because I offered relevant subject expertise on matters related to the work of the committee. There is nobody else in London that could offer equivalent expertise to my own. Therefore, if a random selection model were used, I would have been placed in a category with others who could not provide equivalent value to the committee.

There is little to no incentive for citizens to participate in advisory committees – rather, participation is driven by an individual’s passion as well as interest in issues or public service, but these traits are not randomly distributed in the population. The work of committees would be better served by fielding applications for new membership on the basis of their merit, and not simply conforming applications to random selection. Furthermore, diversity, equity and inclusion must also be prioritized in the composition of committees but would be difficult to achieve under a random selection model.

The question indicates there are “barriers” to participate in advisory committees but these have not been defined anywhere. If barriers pose a problem, for the composition of committees or for the committees’ work, those barriers should be identified clearly so that solutions can be explored on an informed basis.

Are you a first-term advisory committee member?

Yes

What additional comments that you would like to provide for consideration?

In my opinion, London’s advisory committees function at their best when allowed to engage in group discussions. The expertise offered by individual members is of greatest value when applied in a collaborative setting. Indeed, many of the discussions I’ve participated in through EEPAC were made possible by the complementary background knowledge offered by members.

If the City wants to ask advisory committees for feedback on changes to their structure, these discussions should be had at a group level, not by tasking individual committee members to fill out a form online with no meaningful opportunities to engage with the committees. I am a first term advisory committee member and my knowledge of historical work by the committees is incomplete. I would have benefited by being able to discuss committee structure with the Chair and other members but have not found an opportunity.

I strongly encourage City staff to: 1) consult the committee Chairs directly for feedback about the proposed structural changes; 2) add proposed changes to advisory committee structure as a discussion item for inclusion on advisory committee meeting agendas when they resume in February 2021.

Noting that there is additional work that would define the terms of reference for the committees noted above, what are your comments and thoughts to this proposed structure?

Create new Advisory Committees with Different Linkages to Corporate Work

Examine the needs for engagement or expertise based on existing governance structures (e.g. London Plan, Climate Emergency Plan, Community Energy Plan) and/or the Council Strategic Plan. This could establish an advisory body for each standing committee of council ensuring reporting relationships and areas of jurisdiction are clear. Sub-committees (or working groups, or other like body) could be developed from each on project-specific matters, as included in the Strategic Plan.

What would you expect to see contained in committee terms of reference for the above-noted proposed structure?

RE: ‘Terms of Reference clearly identify that the work of the advisory committees will filter to them from ~~the civic administration and/or~~ from specific Municipal Council direction.’

TOR for committees should include specific mandated reference to staff priorities for the implementation of municipal plans & strategic planning objectives, with user-friendly evaluation and implementation measures for Civic Oversight through committee monitoring of staff actions, and consequences for poor staff performance.

For example, re: Climate Change Advisory Committee monitoring environmental matters including conservation, climate change mitigation, tree planting/planning/ protection and waste reduction & Matters related to technical advice concerning natural areas, ESAs, environmental features and projects triggering environmental impact studies.

Climate action implementation and promoting in practice the implementation of the London Plan sustainability objectives & sub-priorities (e.g. Community Energy Action Plan; Climate Emergency Action Plan) and the enforcement of related London Plan policies, necessitates bylaw amendments and committee monitoring of municipal council practices and municipal planning strategic objectives as implemented in practice by staff.

Staff are accountable for promoting environmentally sustainable upwards and inwards growth & land use & related environmental sustainability practices through mainstreaming in existing planning policy and practice vs. no- consequence sustainability planning rhetoric and the unabated continuation of outwards and upwards land use development practices.

Staff and Council need to be both held accountable for the implementation of sustainability objectives and priorities identified in the London Plan (and related plans) through oversight monitoring by Council supported by rigorous, efficient Committee oversight, and specific salary and employment related penalties attached to poor staff performance on implementation and advancement of City planning goals and objectives.

How often do you feel that it is necessary for advisory committees to meet?

Quarterly, minimally

The recent staff report (noted above) proposed the elimination of the requirement for advisory committee work plans, in favour of having “assignments” from the civic administration and/or directly from Council. By way of additional context, it was not the intent that ‘new’ initiatives would not be ‘permitted’ from the advisory committees, rather to better allow focus of work. What are your thoughts around this proposal?

See above. Council should consider a focus on mandatory Staff work plans and Committee assignments related to the implementation of strategic policies and priorities. Council could require staff to draft mandatory Committee measures to promote rigorous Civic oversight of strategic planning, policy and implementation objectives via staff accountability structures and Committee evaluation frameworks for Council to better monitor the advancement and implementation of City priorities with greater efficacy and efficiency towards linking implementation of City actions to strategic planning goals and objectives.

The Municipal Council has suggested that the committees remain in the form of “advisory committees” as opposed to consideration of expert panels. There has also been the broader discussion in terms of eliminating barriers to participate on the advisory committees. As such, it is proposed that members be selected at random administratively, rather than through the Council appointment process (noting that in some cases there may be ‘categories’ of membership where applicants would be randomly selected from). What are your thoughts around this proposal?

RE: utilize as many channels as possible to reach all sectors of the community.

SUPPORT

RE: In some cases it may be necessary to target recruitment, particularly in terms of populating the expert panels.

POOLED APPLICANTS, RANDOMIZED SELECTION

In all cases, the membership will be in accordance with any revised Terms of

Reference for the committees.

SUPPORT

Ecological and Environmental Review Panel – former EEPAC *existing in the form of an ‘expert panel’ not citizen engagement.

SUPPORT

Are you a first-term advisory committee member?

Yes

What additional comments that you would like to provide for consideration?

Municipal Committees are the means for ensuring democratic oversight and civic responsibility for the administration of local government strategic implementation of policies and planning priorities. Elected Councils are held accountable by the electorate. Appointed Staff should be held accountable to Council and Community through civic committee structures that directly link the implementation of civic priorities (e.g. climate mitigation /adaptation; poverty reduction etc.) to staff job descriptions with mandatory evaluation and oversight through Staff - Committee reporting responsibilities. Linking staff performance for tangible implementation of planning and policy strategies and priorities creates an efficacy measure & accountability framework for Council and Community to monitor and ensure democratic oversight and City implementation of policies and priorities by Staff, with salary and employment penalties and consequences for Staff failing to meet or implement City plans and priorities efficiently or effectively.

Noting that there is additional work that would define the terms of reference for the committees noted above, what are your comments and thoughts to this proposed structure?

What would you expect to see contained in committee terms of reference for the above-noted proposed structure?

All committee areas will or can choose to comment on planning policy and proposals as all issues raised above impact the broader community and collectively across the city. This includes wildlife policy, mobility, housing etc. All planning should be viewed from these filters.

Advisory Committees are not true advisors as they do not present a series of 'options' to council. They present 'views' of best practices. In this sense they are more advocates than advisers. This should be better defined in the Terms of Reference.

How often do you feel that it is necessary for advisory committees to meet?

Monthly

The recent staff report (noted above) proposed the elimination of the requirement for advisory committee work plans, in favour of having “assignments” from the civic administration and/or directly from Council. By way of additional context, it was not the intent that ‘new’ initiatives would not be ‘permitted’ from the advisory committees, rather to better allow focus of work. What are your thoughts around this proposal?

Both but "Assignments" from civic administration or council should not dominate Advisory Committee "work" as Advisory Committees should be independent and should be free to be critical of council direction.

The Municipal Council has suggested that the committees remain in the form of “advisory committees” as opposed to consideration of expert panels. There has also been the broader discussion in terms of eliminating barriers to participate on the advisory committees. As such, it is proposed that members be selected at random

administratively, rather than through the Council appointment process (noting that in some cases there may be 'categories' of membership where applicants would be randomly selected from). What are your thoughts around this proposal?

Advisory Committee members should have some expertise or related experience.

Are you a first-term advisory committee member?

Yes

What additional comments that you would like to provide for consideration?

I feel council does not respect Advisory Committees and it is difficult to attract new members when the committees are symbolic only to Council - hence the idea that they should not have expertise and members should be chosen randomly. Advisory Committees should have a sense of purpose, expertise and activism in their role and not just simple advisory as this just maintains the status quo when in many cases advice should be fresh, free, proactive and non-political - as council is a political entity. Advisory Committees should be free of political bias and simply advocate a good approach going forward. Advisory Committees are not there to advise in the traditional sense but advocate based on their informed knowledge of paths going forward.
