

Based on our Goals and Purpose, I thought I would draft an outline of our approach and some principles we could use to determine our recommendations. I am following some of the original format from 2003 for consistency.

The CCCR should recognize the importance of considering both the unique circumstance of public office within the region of Niagara, and the review of compensation as it relates to municipal public office in a manner that reflects the duties, responsibilities, skill, effort, authority and decision making.

Citizens' Committee Principles

- These principles are intended as an overall preference and not absolute rules to be adhered to. Specifically, the current remuneration arrangement could be used as a default. That is, there would be no recommendations to change current practices in the absence of compelling reasons to do so.
- Any recommendations would be guided by evidence-based information and conducive to *transparency, simplicity, and fairness*.
- The policy recommendations attempt to strike a balance between *the work that is required of a public official* and *the call to serve one's community*.
- Members of Regional Municipality of Niagara Council will be provided with *fair and reasonable remuneration* for performing the duties of their office.
- The CCCR should recognize the importance of considering both the unique circumstance of public office within the region of Niagara, and the review of compensation as it relates to municipal public office in a manner that reflects the duties, responsibilities, skill, effort, authority and decision making.

Broader General Principles that we have already discussed –

1. Remuneration must be *transparent, fiscally responsible, and easily understood by the electorate*;
2. Fair relativity with comparable positions;
3. The need to be fair to the individuals whose pay is being set, and to the taxpayer and other related individuals;
4. The requirements of the job;
5. The need to attract and retain competent individuals as councilors;
6. The economic conditions.

Goals & Purposes of the Committee –

Four goals outlined are as follows; however, there are really only two deliverables –

Goal #1 – Review the current council approved methodology used for annual council remuneration increases (i.e. percentage increase)

Goal #2 - Review the current external comparator group of municipalities and make recommendations on whether to maintain existing comparator group or to make amendments to existing group.

Goal #3 – Review external comparator regional and local municipal council methodology and rates and make recommendation for future methodology on base compensation for Regional Councilors.

Goal #4 – Prepare final report with recommendations to CSC and Regional Council for approval.

Two Deliverables:

1. Recommendations to maintain or alter the comparator group
2. Recommendations on the methodology

Data/Tools required for Assessing Remuneration –

1. Union and Non-Union wage increases over the period of 2008 to 2019
2. Councilors wage increases broken down by Core CPI and Conference Board of Canada percentages
3. Current Regional Comparative group
4. Local Municipalities Comparative group
5. Research done by Sabrina Hill on Township of Banff and St. Catharines as well as any other local municipalities' methodologies
6. Landscape brief of feedback collected by Sabrina Hill
7. Possible councilor survey
8. Weighted Averages of data based on Integrity, Reliability & Relevance using a 1 to 5 assignment
9. Dropbox or Google Drive for committee collaboration.

Criteria Checklist –

- Current base pay across jurisdictions
- Council Size across jurisdictions
- Budget size across jurisdictions
- Population size across jurisdictions
- Population Growth across jurisdictions
- Income Growth
- Residents per Councilor

Post Script: *much of this information can be extracted from FACT BOOK, September 30, 2018, Page 79 to 103 of the materials we were sent.*

Approach Outline –

1. Agree on Committee Principles.
2. Explore & determine relevant criteria for assessing remuneration.
3. Review data/information already requested/received to determine if criteria requirement is satisfied.
4. Review draft of Weighted Averages definition and application of weighting.
5. Apply Weighted Values to data/information received in a Matrix as it relates to each Goal & Purpose.
6. Begin analysis of each deliverables (see draft methodology) using weighted values (i.e. *what information is relevant to which Goal or Purpose*).
7. Determine if recommendations are warranted.
8. Develop language around the recommendations using evidence based analysis for support.
9. Signoff on recommendations.

Weighted Values Draft Discussion –

A two-part suggestion from Bob Haig was made that we use the following methodology to arrive at recommendations, here is a draft definition of the terms for our discussion –

Part 1 – **Terminology** – here are suggested titles we could apply to the data/information we use as we evaluate the criteria decided on

1. **Integrity** – *meaning integrity of the information can be defined as the dependability and trustworthiness of information.*
2. **Reliability** – *meaning the information is evidence based that is derived from or formed by objective evidence.*
3. **Relevance** – *meaning the data/information used directly relates to the matters being discussed.*

Part 2 – **Weighted Value** – here are some definitions of weighting that we can discuss for use in determining what weight the data/information contributes to the evidence used to make the recommendations.

1. **Not Important** – this classification contributes very little to the integrity, reliability or relevance of information required to make a recommendation.
2. **Slightly Important** – this classification adds some information but does not support the integrity, reliability or relevance required to make a recommendation.
3. **Important** – this classification adds information and supports less than 2 aspects of integrity, reliability or relevance required to make a recommendation.
4. **Fairly Important** – this classification adds information and supports 2 or more aspects of integrity, reliability or relevance required to make a recommendation.
5. **Very Important** – this classification supports all aspects of integrity, reliability and relevance required to make a recommendation.

Draft Approach Outline – Deliverables**Deliverable #1 – Recommendations to maintain or alter the comparator group****Methodology –**

- Review current application of Core CPI and Conference Board of Canada percentage applications and compare to Union and Non-Union wage increases for the period of 2008 to 2019
- Review what the increases are applied to (i.e. *just the base?*)
- Compare the current application to other regions and municipalities
- Apply the criteria decided upon to the current external comparator group of municipality & determine if the group is reflective of the Niagara Region
- Review the various methodologies compiled from different jurisdictions
- Discuss differences if warranted

Conclusion –

- Determine if the current application is in line with other regions/municipalities
- Determine if there are recommendations for amendments to existing group
- Determine if there are recommendations for future methodology and rates
- Determine the fairness across the various aspects compared
- Determine the ability to defend the conclusion and document it
- Move to the possible recommendation category

Deliverable #2 – Recommendations on the methodology**Methodology –**

- Identify potential methodologies
- Review the potential methodologies based in the criteria
- Apply a weighted value to each recommendation
- Assign a priority to each recommendation
- Ensure recommendations are backed by an evidence-based conclusion, tables, and language
- Apply the macro- and micro reasoning for the recommendation

Conclusion -

- Prepare the final report

Committee Members & Participants –

Name	Email Address	Phone Number
Bob Haig		
Margo Pinder		
Sabrina Hill		
Ann-Marie Norio	Ann-Marie.Norio@niagararegion.ca	905-980-6000; #3220
Kristen Angrilli	Kristen.angrilli@niagararegion.ca	905-980-6000