

## Report to Governance Working Group

**To:** Chair and Members  
**Governance Working Group**  
**From:** Cathy Saunders, City Clerk  
**Subject:** Advisory Committee Review Final Report  
**Date:** November 15, 2021

## Recommendation

That, on the recommendation of the City Clerk, the following actions be taken with respect to the City of London Advisory Committee Review:

- a) the report dated November 15, 2021 entitled “Advisory Committee Review – Final Report”, BE RECEIVED and the current review BE CLOSED;
- b) the attached revised Terms of Reference for London Community Advisory Committees BE APPROVED for enactment in 2022; and,
- c) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to report back to the Governance Working Group with respect to an updated General Terms of Reference for All Advisory Committees, to support the structure approved in part b), above.

## Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to provide information related to the feedback with respect to a proposed new advisory committee structure previously provided to the committee, provide for a committee discussion with respect to the revised proposed structure, and to consider any additional recommendations related to a future state of advisory committees in London.

## Analysis

### 1.0 Background Information

#### 1.1 Previous Reports Related to this Matter

- Finance and Administrative Services Committee, February 27, 2012
- Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee, December 16, 2013
- Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee, March 17, 2014
- Civic Works Committee, June 19, 2018
- Corporate Services Committee, November 13, 2018
- Corporate Services Committee, March 19, 2019
- Governance Working Group, August 24, 2020
- Governance Working Group, November 10, 2020
- Corporate Services Committee, April 19, 2021
- Governance Working Group, May 17, 2021

#### 1.2 Previous Council Direction

That the following actions be taken with respect to the 3rd Report of the Governance Working Group from its meeting held on May 17, 2021:

- a) on the recommendation of the City Clerk, the following actions be taken with respect to the Advisory Committee Review:
  - i. the report dated May 17, 2021 entitled Advisory Committee Review - Interim Report VI", BE RECEIVED; and,

- ii. the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to report back to a future meeting of the Governance Working Group with respect to the feedback related to the draft Terms of Reference appended as Appendix A to the above-noted staff report; and,

b) clause 1.1 BE RECEIVED. (4.1/10/SPPC)

## **2.0 Discussion and Considerations**

### **2.1 Comments Received**

Attached to this report as Appendix A, are various submissions related to the proposed revised structure.

The following are comments that the Civic Administration noted during attendance at various meeting of the advisory committees when the above-noted report was reviewed:

- notation of the need for representation from specific sectors (i.e. Western University)
- the revised mandate is too broad
- the revised names of the committees create a hierarchy of committees
- concern that the removal of “advisory” from the name, removes the role of the group to provide advice
- want to keep the ‘status’ of being an advisory body
- there needs to be an advisory committee focused on housing; a larger committee needs to be created
- there needs to be an advisory committee focused on the city’s co-ordinated response
- the advisory committees need to have better interaction with each other
- the committees are too reactionary; staff need to better engage earlier [with projects]
- strict policies and procedures are oppressive; policies are barriers
- meetings should be a safe space for concerns to be raised; staff attendance can limit this
- combining committees creates too much work for a limited membership
- councillors should be attending, to hear discussions
- there should be monthly meetings regardless of whether there are agenda items
- there is not enough direction to the advisory committees to facilitate discussion; needs better co-ordination
- committees should continue in their current form, or revert back to form prior to the at-large appointments
- groups/organizations have been marginalized due to the ‘at-large’ appointment of members
- need to maintain a reporting relationship with council/standing committees, not a reporting relationship to staff

Some of the feedback from civic administration included the following:

- there are some efficiencies to be realized in combining like committees
- term limits are required and need to be adhered to in order to make room for new and different membership

In addition, there has been various commentary in (social) media, which is not summarized as a part of this report.

## **2.2 Potential Revisions Based on Feedback**

The following potential revisions do not apply to those committees that are provincially legislated.

The draft terms of reference and proposed committees were presented based on Council's direction to maintain public engagement and to promote citizen participation in Council decision making, with respect to specific matters. The formation of any such committees is intended to reflect the community in the ability to participate as members of the committees. While it is noted that the committee names were 'working titles', the observation that the differing titles does have the potential to create a hierarchy of importance is noted. To this end, the term "community advisory panel" is suggested for all of the committees; the attached Appendix B of revised Terms of Reference (ToR) reflect this proposed change (note: there are subtitles included for provincially mandated committees).

The revised ToR have been left as broad as possible with respect to mandates. It is intended that matters will be able to be brought forward to the committees as required and with less restrictions with these broad mandates. It is critical to keep in mind that while the scope of mandate may appear quite large, these committees are not required to engage on every matter within a specific sphere but rather be able to focus on projects, initiatives, etc. that may originate from the committee, civic administration or from Council.

All ToRs have been updated to reflect membership of upto 15 members, for consistency. To provide for the fullest community participation possible, specific membership requirements have been removed. In addition, the potential Resource members have also been removed. The resource/non-voting members are not appointed and therefore need not be specified. Resource participation can be sought as required by the committees at any time. In all cases, the membership is as permissive as possible and intended to reflect the London community.

## **2.3 Additional Considerations**

Recently, a standing committee endorsed the formation of a new Master Mobility Plan Community Advisory Panel. This will be considered by Council on November 16. The Council has also approved a recommendation from the current Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee with respect to the formation of a special advisory committee to actively participate in the Climate Emergency Action Plan development and implementation (September 2021). These committees are proposed to be outside of the current/proposed advisory committee structure. These committees will have significant, if not entire overlap, with committees proposed in this new advisory committee structure. At this time, it may be advisable to pause on the implementation of the following proposed committees: Ecological Community Advisory Panel, Integrated Transportation Community Advisory Panel and the Environmental Stewardship and Action Community Advisory Panel.

## **3.0 Next Steps**

### **3.1 Moving to a New Structure**

Following the Council direction related to the committees, it will be necessary to establish some additional terms of reference for all committees. To be addressed in these general terms of references will be matters such as term length, term limits, committee structure (parliamentary or otherwise), etc. These and other matters have been the subject of previous related reports. Some of the feedback included in this report will be addressed in the future report.

Advertising for applications can begin upon approval of the structure. There will be some time required to finalize the additional terms of reference noted above, but that does not need to limit the start of a recruitment process.

#### **4.0 Financial Impact/Considerations**

None at this time.

#### **5.0 Conclusion**

The proposed committees are not the only engagement opportunity with the City of London. As was previously reported, there are many committees/groups that exist and provide information to Council outside of this structure. The City engages with the public informally and formally in many ways including, but not limited to the options in the Council Community Engagement Policy, “Get Involved”, surveys, community meetings, social media, etc. Working Groups, Task Forces, and/or advisory committees can be created at any time by Council.

The responses received from current advisory committee members, and others, related to the previously considered structure varied significantly. This is not unlike the previous feedback that was provided in the report from March 2019, which included the previous advisory committee membership.

The proposed structure meets the general guidelines provided by Council to maintain engagement opportunities that can be achieved with new efficiencies.

#### **Prepared, Submitted and Recommended by:**

**Cathy Saunders, City Clerk**  
**Michael Schulthess, Deputy City Clerk**  
**Barb Westlake-Power, Deputy City Clerk**