

①

**Hau, Lucy**

---

**Subject:** FW: Submission on Pay Increase

---

**From:** mygins

**Sent:** Saturday, April 02, 2016 2:40 PM

**To:** Mayor & Councillors; Kitteringham, Kimberley

**Cc:**

**Subject:** Submission on Pay Increase

To Members of Markham Council,

RE: Motion on New Council Compensation for Markham Enterprises Corp. (MEC) Board

As I am unable to attend the Council meeting this week I am submitting these written comments prior to the meeting for your consideration.

I believe that this motion, which amounts to a 13.5% pay increase for each member of Markham Council (with certain exceptions), is wrong-headed and inappropriate. It is purportedly to compensate Council members for their work on the board of MEC, a position that has never been compensated before and has been viewed as part of the normal responsibilities of members of Markham Council. Here is how this will look to members of the public:

1. Because some Councillors are losing their extra board member stipends due to the merger of PowerStream, and due to fewer Councillor positions on the board of Markham District Energy, this increase has been devised to provide them with the pay they will no longer receive from those sources.
2. If the payment is meant to compensate members of Council for the extra time spent on the merger of PowerStream last year it should be a one time bonus, not an increase that continues every year. The latter makes no sense especially since the work of the board of MEC has previously been described as "rubber stamping" the decisions of the boards of PowerStream and Markham District Energy.
3. It is inappropriate to increase the salary of our four Regional Councillors and our Mayor. This is not in any way meant to denigrate the work that they do but to recognize that they are already near, or over, the highest pay grade for their position when compared to other municipalities. Markham is not nearly as large, nor does it have as large a budget, as other cities where the Mayor and Councillors make considerably less. There is no justification for increasing the salaries of our Mayor and Regional Councillors at this time. However, if this motion is passed they will, under the guise of payment for work on MEC, get a substantial and permanent salary increase (with the few exceptions noted in the motion.)
4. On the other hand, it is appropriate to increase the salaries of our Ward Councillors. They are not overpaid, when compared to other municipalities, and they are due for an increase. However, this is not the way to do it. A proper, supportable study should be done to determine a fair increase for our Ward Councillors and a new motion brought forward to ratify the increase. (The increase would not automatically be passed on to the Regional Councillors at the same time for the reason stated above.) This method would be proper, transparent, and supportable with the taxpayers who pay all of your salaries.

5. To increase Council members' salaries, using the excuse of work on MEC, is not a transparent way of giving pay raises. It is not difficult to imagine how the voting public will react to a post-election pay increase the size of which most of them will never experience.

6. Here is a quote from an article in the press on Thursday about pay increases for Federal members of Parliament and the Senate. *"The wage hike of 1.8 per cent for MP's and 2.1 per cent for senators is about four times what the federal government has offered public sector unions and executives in the federal public service."*

Council should do the responsible thing and defeat this motion.

Thank you for your consideration of my submission,

Marilyn Ginsburg,

Thornhill

2

**Hau, Lucy**

---

**Subject:** FW: MEC "Board" Compensation Item 7 April 5th Council meeting

---

**From:** Michael Gannon  
**Sent:** Monday, April 04, 2016 1:25 PM  
**To:** Kitteringham, Kimberley  
**Subject:** MEC "Board" Compensation Item 7 April 5th Council meeting

Hi Kimberley, kindly include this message as a written deputation on the subject line above. Many thanks.

With respect to Item 7 on Council's agenda tomorrow April 5th, the proposal to increase certain compensations for councilors attending MEC meetings. This motion is absolutely wrong on so many counts.

1. There is no staff report, or other explanation outlining the reasons for this compensation. You are voting additional monies for yourselves without giving residents any explanation?? How do you think this looks??
2. Ward Councilors are underpaid with respect to their counterparts in other municipalities. Give them an appropriate increase but do it the right way with supporting data.
3. Nine out of 13 councilors receive the exact same amount of "benefits", or \$20,839. Benefits are normally understood to be variable based on each person's unique situation, be it health care, pension, group insurance cover etc etc. Giving 9 the exact same amount has the wrong optics and requires clarification.
4. Powerstream and MDEI already have Boards. Board members are elected and get compensated. Nobody gets elected to MEC, it is "automatic" based on being an elected councilor. The criteria for being a Board member of the energy companies is disclosed, debated and candidates are elected based on meeting the criteria. Which councilors were elected to Council based on their investment management skills, or their board management skills? Councilors should not get compensated as "Board" members of anything without being elected to that Board based on the correct criteria.
5. MEC is not required anyway. Why does Markham need another body like MEC to oversee specific investments in Powerstream & MDEI? Does MEC oversee our bond acquisitions? Does MEC oversee our investments in community centres? Markham has many significant assets that do not require an MEC to oversee them, they are reviewed in Council, in camera if necessary. The business of MEC is normal council business and does not require an additional compensation model.

Regards

Mike Gannon

Hau, Lucy

3

---

**Subject:** FW: Proposed stipend for Markham councillors

From: Bill  
Sent: Monday, April 4, 2016 3:04 PM  
To: [admin@mccrg.ca](mailto:admin@mccrg.ca)  
Cc: Kitteringham, Kimberley; Mayor & Councillors  
Subject: Proposed stipend for Markham councillors

I am opposed to the stipends (the pending vote tomorrow, Tuesday) being applied across the board to include the mayor and regional councillors; the current compensation for both is beyond appropriate. I am not opposed to the ward councillors receiving additional remuneration if it is contingent on significantly increased workload. However, I would like to note that the percentage increase is large, and can be justified only in terms of greater responsibility, time and effort. The unfortunate situation for many working people is that they get increasing responsibilities laid on them without significant or indeed any pay increase. Council would do well to keep this in mind.

Bill Corrigan

(4)

**Hau, Lucy**

---

**Subject:** FW: MEC "Board" Compensation Item 7 April 5th Council meeting

---

**From:** Reid McAlpine  
**Sent:** Monday, April 4, 2016 3:07 PM  
**To:** Kitteringham, Kimberley  
**Cc:** Michael Gannon  
**Subject:** Fwd: Fw: MEC "Board" Compensation Item 7 April 5th Council meeting

Dear Ms Kitteringham,

I would like to add my support to Mike Gannon's comments below.

Reid McAlpine

---

**From:** Michael Gannon  
**Sent:** Monday, April 04, 2016 1:25 PM  
**To:** Kitteringham, Kimberley  
**Subject:** MEC "Board" Compensation Item 7 April 5th Council meeting

Hi Kimberley, kindly include this message as a written deputation on the subject line above. Many thanks.

With respect to Item 7 on Council's agenda tomorrow April 5th, the proposal to increase certain compensations for councilors attending MEC meetings. This motion is absolutely wrong on so many counts.

1. There is no staff report, or other explanation outlining the reasons for this compensation. You are voting additional monies for yourselves without giving residents any explanation?? How do you think this looks??
2. Ward Councilors are underpaid with respect to their counterparts in other municipalities. Give them an appropriate increase but do it the right way with supporting data.
3. Nine out of 13 councilors receive the exact same amount of "benefits", or \$20,839. Benefits are normally understood to be variable based on each person's unique situation, be it health care, pension, group insurance cover etc etc. Giving 9 the exact same amount has the wrong optics and requires clarification.
4. Powerstream and MDEI already have Boards. Board members are elected and get compensated. Nobody gets elected to MEC, it is "automatic" based on being an elected councilor. The criteria for being a Board member of the energy companies is disclosed, debated and candidates are elected based on meeting the criteria. Which councilors were elected to Council based on their investment management skills, or their board management skills? Councilors should not get compensated as "Board" members of anything without being elected to that Board based on the correct criteria.
5. MEC is not required anyway. Why does Markham need another body like MEC to oversee specific investments in Powerstream & MDEI? Does MEC oversee our bond acquisitions? Does MEC oversee our investments in community centres? Markham has many significant assets that do not require an MEC to oversee them, they are reviewed in Council, in camera if necessary. The business of MEC is normal council business and does not require an additional compensation model.

Regards

Mike Gannon

*This e-mail contains information that may be privileged and/or confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, distribution, copying or other use of this e-mail or the information contained herein or attached hereto is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify this sender immediately and delete this e-mail without reading, printing, copying or forwarding it to anyone. Thank you for your co-operation.*

---

5

Hau, Lucy

---

**Subject:** FW: Response re Additional Pay for MEC Attendance

---

**From:** Janis Corrigall  
**Sent:** Monday, April 4, 2016 4:09 PM  
**To:** [admin@mccrg.ca](mailto:admin@mccrg.ca)  
**Cc:** Mayor & Councillors; Kitteringham, Kimberley  
**Subject:** Response re Additional Pay for MEC Attendance

I would not agree to the Mayor and Regional Councillors receiving more payment for MEC than they already earn. It is ridiculous that Markham Regional Councillors and the Mayor earn more than their counterparts in a city the size of Toronto.

As for the Ward Councillors, I think they should receive an increase that is commensurate with the additional time and work required.

Increases in compensation to this group just reminds me of the near disaster Markham taxpayers would have been faced with had the "Markham Arena" gone ahead. Now that the studies on the financial viability of this undertaking have finally been released, we can see just how much was going to be assumed on our behalf without our knowledge. Many thanks and credit go to MCCRG and Karen Rea in helping to halt this.

Janis Corrigall