

# Elected Officials' Compensation Review

Report Back on December 10, 2015 Motion



#### **Elected Officials Compensation Review**



## Chronology

- Feb. 3, 2015 Council approved a motion calling for appointment of an independent party to review compensation and resources provided to City Council and Park Board
- Mar. 24, 2015 Council accepted a staff recommendation to convene a committee of independent individuals to conduct the review
- Dec. 10, 2015 Council received the Compensation Review Committee's recommendations and directed staff to undertake further work and report back within 3 months

#### Council Direction - December 10, 2015



- As recommended by Compensation Review
  Committee, undertake a review of resources and
  personnel available to support Councillors and report
  back within 3 months, taking into account pending new
  Council duties such as Neighbourhood Liaison which
  have been approved in principle.
- 2. As part of this review, include a comparison of how other cities of comparable size referred to in the Compensation Review Committee Report calculate base compensation for Councillors.



#### Council Support – Current State Review



- At present, 10 Councillors are supported by 4 full-time staff who provide basic administrative support
  - Maintain Councillors' calendars relating to City business, respond to event invitations and arrange meetings
  - Answer calls and take messages
  - Manage expenses and reimbursement
  - Records management
- Review undertaken by the City Clerk
  - Assessed current administrative support
  - Conducted individual interviews with Councillors
  - Obtained comparative information from Toronto, Edmonton, Halifax and Winnipeg

#### Review of Council Support – Current Challenges



#### Themes from Councillor interviews:

- Management of incoming correspondence, phone and social media contacts
- Research and information gathering
- Preparation of correspondence, speaking notes and other materials
- Calendar and contact management
- Neighbourhood liaison function

## Review of Council Support - Other Municipalities



- Staff contacted Edmonton, Winnipeg, Toronto and Halifax
- Generally, Councillors in those municipalities receive support across a broader range of functions
  - Management of constituent issues; correspondence
  - Research
  - Outreach
- The level of staffing/funding allocated to Council support is higher than in Vancouver
  - 0.67–2.0 FTE per Councillor in comparison group v. 0.33-0.5 FTE in Vancouver

## Additional Support – Considerations



- 1. Increase administrative staff complement supporting Councillors
  - Add 1 FTE Assistant to current complement of 4 FTE (0.5 FTE per Councillor)
  - Would create additional capacity for assistance with correspondence and contact management, meeting preparation
  - Estimated annual cost: \$67,000

#### Additional Support – Considerations



- Establish a discretionary fund for Councillors to obtain support beyond the scope of secretarial functions performed by Assistants
  - Funding would be available for Councillors to procure external assistance with functions such as detailed research, writing, social media set-up
  - Would require development of a policy framework for discretionary expenditures, including permissible uses, procurement criteria and reporting requirements
  - Could be implemented as a trial with a specified timeframe for evaluation
  - Annual cost: \$50,000 (assuming annual limit of \$5000 per Councillor)

## Additional Support – Considerations



- Establish an information officer role with mandate to enhance correspondence management
  - Log correspondence, triage, and assign staff lead where appropriate
  - Establish due dates and follow up to ensure file close out
  - Share assignment details and responses with Mayor and Councillors
  - Estimated annual cost: \$73,000



#### Comparison of Base Compensation



- Mercer contacted 11 municipalities included in original comparative analysis
  - 8 of 11 municipalities responded
- Municipalities requested to confirm the approach or formula used to establish base compensation for Councillors
- Results:
  - 2 of 8 referenced existing by-laws as the basis for determining Councillor salaries but did not provide detail regarding the policy reflected in the applicable by-law
  - 2 of 8 indicated that Councillor salaries are set based a comparison with other municipalities
    - Both municipalities aim to pay Councillors at the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile of the relevant comparator group
  - 4 of 8 municipalities rely on recommendations from an independent committee or public advisory group
    - Note: in at least 3 municipalities, the terms of reference for the committee/advisory body reference external comparability as a factor to be considered

## City of Vancouver - Market Comparison\*



Comparator City	Population	Operating budget	No of Councillors	Population/ Councillor	Annual salary
Calgary	1,195,194	3,500	14	85,371	\$ 115,298
Edmonton	877,926	2,364	12	73,161	\$ 99,994
Ottawa	870,250	3,075	23	37,837	\$ 93,999
Mississauga	757,000	695	11	68,818	\$ 84,465
Winnipeg	709,253	994	15	47,284	\$ 89,346
Brampton	523,911	571	10	52,391	\$ 78,713
Surrey	508,000	575	8	63,500	\$ 63,359
Burnaby	223,218	424	8	27,902	\$ 57,070
Richmond	209,338	288	8	26,167	\$ 58,138
Median	709,253	695	11	52,391	\$ 84,465
Vancouver **	648,600	1,223	10	60,350	\$ 71,061
CoV base salary + avg. on-duty stipend					\$ 75,497
CoV Ranking**	6th	4th		5th	7th

<sup>\*</sup> Source: Mercer Council Compensation Review Report, August 6, 2015

<sup>\*\*</sup> CoV councillor salary – as of January 1, 2016

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> CoV ranking in comparator group (n=10)

#### Future Compensation Adjustments - Consideration



 In the event Council adopts a policy for determination of base salaries that departs from the historical reference to average weekly full-time earnings, there would be an associated question regarding the methodology for future annual adjustment

#### Options

- Reference change in Vancouver Consumer Price Index over the prior year
- 2. Maintain reference to change in average weekly earnings
- 3. Forego an established methodology and determine any applicable increase on an annual basis