

Additional Feedback from Current Advisory Committee Members

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?

[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?

[Click here to enter text.](#)

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?

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Are you a first-term advisory committee member?

Yes

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

Having only attended one Advisory Committee meeting before the pandemic, I do not have enough experience to offer an opinion to the questions above. I look forward to continue to participate in meetings in the future.

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?

Combining the CAC and TAC makes no sense and will undoubtedly result in a loss of voice for cycling in this city. The concerns of CAC and TAC are vastly different. Cycling is an underserved group in the City of London and needs a separate voice, with experts in this area. I have personally attended TAC meetings (as a CAC member) and can confidently assert that they do not have adequate knowledge to advise on matters relating to cycling. If this proposal were to be accepted, and these two committees merged, I would have no choice but to offer my immediate resignation.

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

Terms of reference need to be less constrained. It is well-understood that staff time is required to make advisory committees run. However, I believe that their structure could be modified in such a way that the AC members could undertake work that they are passionate about without imposing on staff as much. For example, rather than having staff attend all meetings, ACs could provide memos to staff about what was discussed.

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

Monthly. Any less and momentum cannot be maintained.

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?

If I were to be "assigned" work I would offer my prompt resignation. AC members are not free labour to be exploited. We have free will and should be allowed some autonomy. I am an extremely busy professional and I choose to donate my valuable time to something that I feel passionate about. This debate does not respect the fact that I am a volunteer who is generously spending my time in hopes of building a better city.

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?

ACs are much better than expert panels. Again, expert panels appears to me to be an exploitation of the generosity of volunteers. I strongly oppose random selection of AC members. There must be a vetting of candidates to ensure they have relevant expertise to bring to the committee. That being said, I do believe that an Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion lens should be included in the selection process. As a large employer, I am certain that city staff is already familiar with how to do this.

Are you a first-term advisory committee member?

Yes

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

I find this entire debate about ACs to be disingenuous. You have so many skilled individuals donating their time, while city councillors are complaining about the fact that \$60k needs to be spent to support the ACs. I run a consulting business and I can tell you that you do not want to be receiving a bill for my services. The city is getting an amazing bargain from their volunteers. They should be thanking each of us for our service, not insulting us in this manner. This whole process has left me sour on the whole experience.
