

ROW #	COUNCIL MEMBERS' FEEDBACK / REQUEST FOR CHANGE	CURRENTLY PROPOSED BYLAW TEXT (ATTACHMENT 1)	ASSESSMENT OF REQUESTED CHANGE
R.1	<p>Currently it is mandatory for the Mayor to preside at Council when he is present, aside from the ability to vacate the chair to participate in debate on a single item.</p> <p>A request was made to allow the Mayor to cede the chair to the Deputy Mayor as desired for one item, several items or for an entire meeting.</p>	<p>Sections 8-9 Presiding at Council:</p> <p>8. The <i>Mayor</i>, when present, presides as <i>Chair</i> over all meetings of <i>Council</i>. [MGA, s. 154(1)(a)]</p> <p>9. (1) <i>Council</i>, at its Organizational meeting, shall adopt a roster of Deputy Mayors for the following year.</p> <p>(2) If the <i>Mayor</i> is absent from a meeting of <i>Council</i>, the <i>Deputy Mayor</i> assigned on the roster shall preside. If the assigned <i>Deputy Mayor</i> is also absent, the next <i>Deputy Mayor</i> in the adopted rotation shall preside, and so on.</p> <p>Municipal Government Act (MGA), Section 154:</p> <p>A chief elected official, in addition to performing the duties of a councillor, must:</p> <p>(a) preside when in attendance at a council meeting unless a bylaw provides that another councillor or other person is to preside</p>	<p>Commentary</p> <p>Report PFC2017-0433 contains a recommendation for Council to consider a Procedure Bylaw amendment which would implement a Councillor-as-Chair-of-Council model for presiding at Council meetings. If Council chooses to file that recommendation, an amendment to the proposed Procedure Bylaw is possible which would allow the Mayor to opt not to preside even though present at a Council meeting.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Proposed Amendment</p> <p>8. The <i>Mayor</i>, when present, presides as <i>Chair</i> over all meetings of <i>Council</i>. [MGA, s. 154(1)(a)]</p> <p>9. (1) <i>Council</i>, at its Organizational meeting, shall adopt a roster of Deputy Mayors for the following year.</p> <p>(2) If the <i>Mayor</i> is absent from a meeting of <i>Council</i>, or elects not to preside for one or more items, the <i>Deputy Mayor</i> assigned on the roster shall preside. If the assigned <i>Deputy Mayor</i> is absent, the next <i>Deputy Mayor</i> in the adopted rotation shall preside, and so on.</p>

ROW #	COUNCIL MEMBERS' FEEDBACK / REQUEST FOR CHANGE	CURRENTLY PROPOSED BYLAW TEXT (ATTACHMENT 1)	ASSESSMENT OF REQUESTED CHANGE
R.2	When moving a motion, the Chair should be required to cede their presiding duties to the Vice-Chair.	<p>Section 25 Rights of the Chair: The <i>Chair</i>:</p> <p>(a) when present at a meeting, must vote only once on all items, unless required or permitted to abstain from voting. [MGA, s. 182, 183(1)]</p> <p>(b) is not required to vacate the chair when wishing to join in the debate or make a motion; and</p> <p>(c) must participate on the same basis as all other Members (i.e.: entering the speaker's queue, complying with set limits on questions and debate).</p>	<p>Commentary This request could be accommodated by amending Section 25 as follows.</p> <p>Proposed Amendment</p> <p>25. The <i>Chair</i>.</p> <p>(a) when present at a meeting, must vote only once on all items, unless required or permitted to abstain from voting. [MGA, s. 182, 183(1)]</p> <p>(b) is not required to vacate the chair when wishing to join in the debate, so long as the <i>Chair</i> participates on the same basis as all other Members. (i.e.: entering the speaker's queue, complying with set limits on questions and debate)</p> <p>(c) must vacate the chair when wishing to make a motion, and must remain out of the chair until the item, including any associated bylaw readings, has been concluded.</p> <p><u>Note: Underlined text is for interpretation purposes and would not be included in the Procedure Bylaw.</u></p>
R.3	Communications from the public. Does this mean all citizen communications to the City Clerk must be disposed of by the City	<p>Section 44 Receipt of communication from public: On receipt of a communication which does not pertain to an advertised public hearing matter,</p>	<p>Commentary Section 44 is not intended to redirect all citizen communications addressed to Council or individual Councillors through the City Clerk.</p>

ROW #	COUNCIL MEMBERS' FEEDBACK / REQUEST FOR CHANGE	CURRENTLY PROPOSED BYLAW TEXT (ATTACHMENT 1)	ASSESSMENT OF REQUESTED CHANGE
	<p>Clerk? Does this provision belong in the Procedure Bylaw? Is there any MGA requirement related to this?</p>	<p>the <i>City Clerk</i> must refer the communication to <i>Council</i>, the appropriate <i>Council Committee</i> or <i>Administration</i> for a report or for a reply.</p>	<p>Proposed Amendment None</p>
<p>R.4</p>	<p>15 minutes' grace is too long for start of meetings.</p>	<p>Section 55 Meeting does not achieve quorum: If a <i>Council</i> or <i>Council Committee</i> meeting does not achieve a <i>quorum</i> 15 minutes after the time set for the start of the meeting, the <i>City Clerk</i> must record the names of the <i>Members</i> present and the meeting shall be adjourned.</p>	<p>Commentary Council meetings do not have a 'grace' period in Bylaw 44M2006, and have been obliged to adjourn with no quorum on rare occasions in the last 7 years. Committee meetings currently have 5 minutes' grace, and there have been several cases in the past of being obliged to adjourn with no quorum, even though Members have been on route to the meeting. Choices for improvements to this rule include: a) Granting the Chair the authority to assess when a meeting should be deemed lost; b) Having no provision at all on calling a meeting lost due to lack of quorum; or c) A longer grace period than exists in Bylaw 44M2006. Option (a) would be problematic if the Chair and Vice-Chair are among those not present at the start time. Option (b) would result in uncertainty to the public and to other Members and Administration on how long they must wait for the meeting to begin. Option (c) in the currently proposed bylaw text is Administration's recommendation, as it recognizes the time which has been committed</p>

ROW #	COUNCIL MEMBERS' FEEDBACK / REQUEST FOR CHANGE	CURRENTLY PROPOSED BYLAW TEXT (ATTACHMENT 1)	ASSESSMENT OF REQUESTED CHANGE
R.5	<p>Questions on Urgent Issues.</p> <p>Can the limits be re-instated as they exist for Question Period in Bylaw 44M2006? Fifteen minutes maximum length and no more than 3 questions.</p>	<p>Section 62 Limits to Questions on Urgent Issues:</p> <p>Questions on Urgent Issues are limited to:</p> <p>(a) a maximum of three questions per meeting; and</p> <p>(b) a maximum of 15 minutes per meeting.</p>	<p>by Members, the public and staff who administer the meeting and the repercussions of rescheduling the lost meeting. Option (c) recognizes the need for enough flexibility to accommodate the rare occasions when unforeseen events have an impact on obtaining quorum.</p> <hr/> <p>Proposed Amendment</p> <p>None</p>
R.6	<p>The proposed mechanism for Administration's responses to Administrative Inquiries (A.I.) would no longer allow a discrete response to an individual</p>	<p>Section 75 Response to administrative inquiries:</p> <p>(1) Administration must respond to an Administrative Inquiry by submitting a written response to the City Clerk for inclusion on a</p>	<p>Commentary</p> <p>"Questions on Urgent Issues" means the time set aside at a Council meeting for Members to ask Administration questions on issues requiring the urgent attention of Council with respect to public health or safety, a financial or legal matter of significance to The City or other urgent issue of wide-spread significance.</p> <p>By their nature, urgent issues are likely to be rare and should not require an imposed limit to the maximum number of questions. In addition, when an urgent issue arises, it is unlikely that Council or Administration would wish to constrain Members' questions with limits on time.</p> <hr/> <p>Proposed Amendment</p> <p>None</p>
R.6	<p>The proposed mechanism for Administration's responses to Administrative Inquiries (A.I.) would no longer allow a discrete response to an individual</p>	<p>Section 75 Response to administrative inquiries:</p> <p>(1) Administration must respond to an Administrative Inquiry by submitting a written response to the City Clerk for inclusion on a</p>	<p>Commentary</p> <p>The factors taken into consideration with the currently proposed bylaw text are:</p> <p>1) In the past two years, Administrative</p>

ROW #	COUNCIL MEMBERS' FEEDBACK / REQUEST FOR CHANGE	CURRENTLY PROPOSED BYLAW TEXT (ATTACHMENT 1)	ASSESSMENT OF REQUESTED CHANGE
	<p>Councillor. Sometimes the A.I. mechanism is used to gather information in preparation for a future motion, and the inquiring Councillor may not wish the response to be widely disseminated. Is there another mechanism that could be used for this need?</p> <p>Other feedback on this issue was with respect to the \$1000 limit which the Procedure Bylaw 44M2006 had always placed on responses from the Administration. Will a dollar limit still be part of the A.I. response process? If so, \$1000 needs to be re-evaluated.</p>	<p>future Council meeting agenda for which the submission deadline has not passed.</p> <p>(2) The response from <i>Administration</i> is not debatable.</p> <p>(3) Despite subsection (1), if <i>Administration</i> determines that responding to an <i>Administrative Inquiry</i> would require a budget allocation or re-allocation, <i>Administration</i> must provide such a statement to the <i>City Clerk</i> for inclusion in a future agenda of <i>Council</i> for which the submission deadline has not passed.</p> <p>(4) Upon receiving a statement from <i>Administration</i> conforming to subsection (3), <i>Council</i> may:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) direct <i>Administration</i> to proceed with the investigation necessary to answer the <i>Administrative Inquiry</i> and provide for the payment of the costs; or (b) instruct <i>Administration</i> to abandon the <i>Administrative Inquiry</i>. 	<p>Inquiries have been submitted 11 times, primarily by 2-3 Members of Council.</p> <p>2) A single return path for responses to A.I.s improves awareness of the request for information, easier tracking of responses and retention in the Corporate Record.</p> <p>3) Bill 20 was passed in March 2015. Section 18 clarifies a duty of the Chief Administrative Officer to provide the same information to all Members of Council on the operation or administration of the municipality. This <i>MGA</i> amendment will be in force when it is proclaimed, but it is not yet clear to <i>Administration</i> the full intent of this <i>MGA</i> amendment, nor how widely it is to be applied.</p> <p>4) The scope of an Administrative Inquiry is intended to include written requests from Members of Council to the Administration, made at a Council meeting and seeking information which is simple to provide.</p> <p>5) One Business Unit may be able to easily expend \$5000 in order to provide the requested information. Another Business Unit may not be able to do so without seeking a funding source. Empowering <i>Administration</i> to advise Council that funding would be required, acknowledges that a single dollar limit does not fit all situations and all Departmental budgets.</p> <hr/> <p>Proposed Amendment</p> <p>A minor clarification to Section 75(3): “75 (3) Despite subsection (1), if <i>Administration</i> determines that responding to an</p>

ROW #	COUNCIL MEMBERS' FEEDBACK / REQUEST FOR CHANGE	CURRENTLY PROPOSED BYLAW TEXT (ATTACHMENT 1)	ASSESSMENT OF REQUESTED CHANGE
R.7	<p>When should an item be moved? Clarify the flow of an agenda item.</p> <p>Why has the period for questions of clarification been limited to 10 minutes? Little efficiency will be gained by limiting this section, as most time loss occurs during questions and responses (from Councilors to Administration) while debating.</p>	<p>Section 77 Flow of agenda items: The flow of each <i>Council</i> and <i>Council Committee</i> agenda item is ordinarily:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) <i>Administration</i> introduction of the item, if required; (b) submissions from the public, if applicable; (c) questions of clarification from <i>Members</i> to <i>Administration</i> (to a combined maximum of ten minutes per agenda item); (d) a motion being put on the floor; (e) debate (once per <i>Member</i>); (f) mover responds to questions raised in debate; and (g) vote. <p>Section 109 Length of debate: A <i>Member</i> must not debate longer than:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) five minutes on a main motion, (b) three minutes on an amendment, and (c) three minutes for the <i>Member</i> who moved the main motion to respond to questions raised during debate. 	<p><i>Administrative Inquiry</i> would require funding, <i>Administration</i> must provide such a statement to the <i>City Clerk</i> for inclusion in a future agenda of <i>Council</i> for which the submission deadline has not passed.</p>
			<p>Commentary Sections 77 (c) to (g) as currently drafted are intended to provide structure around how Council and Committees progress through an item to a decision. Questions which help to influence the decision making of Council Members should be asked of Administration, and then a motion or recommendation should be moved, followed by debate, which may include additional questions from Members to Administration as part of the debate.</p> <p>The intent of Section 109 as currently proposed is that debate should take no longer than 5 minutes per Member. It is intended that the 5 minutes should include debate, questions to Administration and responses from Administration, but the currently proposal bylaw text does not make this abundantly clear.</p> <p>It should be noted that while the proposed bylaw text limits the amount of time for Councilors to ask Administration questions of clarification, there is no limit to the amount of time for Councilors to ask members of the public questions of clarification (Section 31). It would be desirable for the provisions in Sections 31, 79 and 109 to enable Members of Council to</p>

ROW #	COUNCIL MEMBERS' FEEDBACK / REQUEST FOR CHANGE	CURRENTLY PROPOSED BYLAW TEXT (ATTACHMENT 1)	ASSESSMENT OF REQUESTED CHANGE
			<p>seek clarification equally from all participants.</p> <hr/> <p>Proposed Amendment Section 77 “77 The flow of each <i>Council</i> and <i>Council Committee</i> agenda item is ordinarily:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) <i>Administration</i> introduction of the item, if required; (b) submissions from the public, if applicable; (c) questions of clarification from Members to Administration; (d) a motion being put on the floor; (e) debate, including questions to and responses from Administration (once per <i>Member</i>); (f) mover responds to questions raised in debate; and (g) vote.” <hr/> <p>Proposed Amendment Section 109 “109 A <i>Member</i> must not debate, including questions to and responses from Administration longer than:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) five minutes on a main motion, (b) three minutes on an amendment, and (c) three minutes for the <i>Member</i> who moved the main motion to respond to questions raised during debate.”
R.8	<p>The wording of Section 79 on Special meetings appears to say that a Special meeting may not continue past 9:30 p.m. to complete an item under discussion.</p>	<p>Section 79 Fix the time to which to adjourn: If still in session, all meetings of <i>Council</i> and <i>Council Committees</i> must recess at 9:30 p.m. whether or not the order of business is complete. Meetings will reconvene for unfinished business</p>	<p>Commentary Section 79 does suggest that Special Council meetings must adjourn at 9:30 p.m., however, section 79 may be suspended in order to finish a single item or the remaining items.</p>

ROW #	COUNCIL MEMBERS' FEEDBACK / REQUEST FOR CHANGE	CURRENTLY PROPOSED BYLAW TEXT (ATTACHMENT 1)	ASSESSMENT OF REQUESTED CHANGE
		<p>as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) <i>Regular</i> meetings of <i>Council</i> will reconvene at 1:00 p.m. on the next business day to complete business remaining at the time of the recess, without requiring a motion to fix the time to reconvene. (2) <i>Special</i> meetings of <i>Council</i> must fix the date and time to reconvene for unfinished business prior to the 9:30 p.m. recess. (3) All meetings of <i>Council Committees</i> must fix the date and time to reconvene for unfinished business prior to the 9:30 p.m. recess. 	<p>Section 79 also indicates that Regular Council meetings with unfinished business at 9:30 p.m. will resume the next day at 1 p.m., but Special Council and Council Committees do not have a 'regular time' at which to reconvene to finish the meeting, and so they must add a time and date to return in their recess motion.</p> <p>The detail in Subsections (1) – (3) which state what information must be contained in recess motion, is not in character with the rest of the proposed bylaw text. As the procedural advisor to the Chair of Council, the City Clerk can advise on what information is required in a recess motion, and this administrative detail could be removed from the Procedure Bylaw.</p> <p>Proposed Amendment, replace Section 79 with:</p> <p>"79. If still in session, all meetings of <i>Council</i> and <i>Council Committees</i> must recess at 9:30 p.m. whether or not the order of business is complete."</p>
<p>R.9</p>	<p>In the section related to public hearing flow of agenda items, why are the public called upon in the existing order - 'those in favour' and then 'those against'? Is it more efficient to hear from citizens in whatever order they line up?</p>	<p>Section 90 Flow of agenda items, Public Hearings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The flow of each public hearing item must be the same as for <i>Council</i> and <i>Council Committee</i> meetings, except that members of the public will be called upon by the <i>Chair</i> in the following sequence: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the development proponent or applicant, (b) those in favour, (c) those against. 	<p>Commentary</p> <p>There is no legislation which requires Council to call upon members of the public in a particular order. The practice of calling upon those in favour, and then those against the proposal was adopted by a prior Council. Grouping the verbal submissions from all presenters who are like-minded is both efficient and minimizes possible conflict. A citizen in favour of an application who hears another person expressing the same opinion can then streamline their own presentation to focus on concepts not already</p>

ROW #	COUNCIL MEMBERS' FEEDBACK / REQUEST FOR CHANGE	CURRENTLY PROPOSED BYLAW TEXT (ATTACHMENT 1)	ASSESSMENT OF REQUESTED CHANGE
			<p>shared by others. Grouping like-minded submissions also minimizes possible conflict between members of the public.</p> <p>Proposed Amendment</p> <p>None</p>
R.10	<p>Can Council call back other members of the public, or just the proponent in order to ask additional questions of clarification?</p>	<p>Section 90 Flow of agenda items, Public Hearings:</p> <p>(2) The <i>Chair</i> may recall the proponent in order to allow <i>Council</i> to ask additional questions of clarification, if required.</p>	<p>Commentary</p> <p>Subsection 90(2) expressly grants the ability to recall the proponent or applicant for further questions. This would imply that those who spoke in favour and those who spoke against a public hearing item may not be recalled. This rule may be suspended when there is need to ask additional questions of clarification of a member of the public who is not the proponent. It should be noted that the terminology in S. 90(2) is not consistent with Section 90(1)</p> <p>Proposed Amendment for consistency only:</p> <p>"90 (2) The <i>Chair</i> may recall the proponent or applicant in order to allow <i>Council</i> to ask additional questions of clarification, if required."</p>
R.11	<p>Notices of Motion directed through Priorities and Finance Committee (PFC):</p> <p>Councillors appreciate introducing their motions at a Council meeting, as this represents the only forum in which to bring an issue to light. If motions are directed through</p>	<p>Sections 113 – 114 Notice of motion:</p> <p>113. (1) A <i>Member</i>, wishing to introduce a motion for consideration, must provide the <i>notice of motion</i> electronically to the <i>City Clerk</i>.</p> <p>(2) The <i>City Clerk</i> must place the <i>notice of motion</i> on the next Priorities and Finance Committee agenda for which the submission deadline has not</p>	<p>Commentary</p> <p>The current proposal for Notices of Motion is part of a group of proposed rules designed to reduce the frequency of motions being crafted on the floor of Council, without the benefit of consultation with Administration. The value of discussing a Notice of Motion (in this case, at PFC) prior to Council voting on the motion is that motions can be further refined and can</p>

ROW #	COUNCIL MEMBERS' FEEDBACK / REQUEST FOR CHANGE	CURRENTLY PROPOSED BYLAW TEXT (ATTACHMENT 1)	ASSESSMENT OF REQUESTED CHANGE
	<p>PFC, and only appointed Members can vote, then PFC Members could "kill" another Councilor's motion for politically motivated reasons.</p> <p>Additional concern was expressed that PFC should not have the power to refer a notice of motion to Administration.</p> <p>Also, the provision should expressly state that PFC shall refer the notice of motion to the <u>next</u> meeting of Council or Committee, not just to a future meeting.</p>	<p>passed.</p> <p>114. PFC shall consider a <i>notice of motion's</i> financial and policy implications, and shall refer it to <i>Council</i> or to the appropriate <i>Council Committee</i>.</p>	<p>incorporate new elements revealed during the initial discussion prior to a vote of Council.</p> <p>To clarify, the proposal does not authorize PFC to refer the Notice of Motion to Administration.</p> <p>A concern heard on July 4 at PFC with respect to Notices of Motion is that the sponsoring Councilor would not have opportunity to introduce their motion if they do not happen to be appointed to PFC. This is not the intent. All Members of Council are welcome and encouraged to attend all Committee meetings excluding Audit Committee, for the express purpose of a robust discussion of reports and motions.</p> <p>Proposed Amendment</p> <p>In Section 114, delete the words "Council" or to the appropriate <i>Council Committee</i>", and replace with the words "the next meeting of Council or appropriate <i>Council Committee</i>".</p>
R.12	<p>Who will determine if a motion is impossible to reverse or modify for the purposes of determining whether it may be reconsidered?</p>	<p>Section 117 Table – Reconsidering Motions:</p> <p>Note 2: An adopted motion may only be reconsidered if it has not been acted upon in a manner that is impossible to reverse or modify, and does not attempt to interfere with a contractual liability.</p>	<p>Commentary</p> <p>This request can be accommodated by amending Section 117, Note 2 to:</p> <p>Proposed Amendment</p> <p>Note 2: An adopted motion may only be reconsidered if it has not been acted upon in a manner that is impossible to reverse or modify, and does not attempt to interfere with a contractual liability. The Chair, in consultation with Administration, shall make such determination.</p>

ROW #	COUNCIL MEMBERS' FEEDBACK / REQUEST FOR CHANGE	CURRENTLY PROPOSED BYLAW TEXT (ATTACHMENT 1)	ASSESSMENT OF REQUESTED CHANGE
R.13	<p>Reconsideration of third reading of a bylaw would be difficult, given that most proposed bylaws which have received third reading are signed almost immediately.</p>	<p>Section 117 Table – Reconsidering Motions: 'Adopted Motion or Bylaw Reading'</p> <p>Note 3: "A bylaw that has received three readings and has been signed in accordance with Section 213 of the MGA, may not be reconsidered, however a reading of a proposed bylaw which has not been signed may be reconsidered."</p>	<p>Commentary Between first and second readings of a proposed bylaw is when Council can debate the bylaw's substance, and propose amendments to it. The ability to reconsider second reading would allow Council the opportunity re-visit the substance of the proposed bylaw. Most proposed bylaws are signed immediately after third reading passes, and so the ability to reconsider third reading has little value.</p> <hr/> <p>Proposed Amendments, Section 117 Amend column header to: 'Adopted Motion or Second Reading of a Bylaw'. Amend Note 3 to: 'A bylaw that has received three readings and has been signed in accordance with Section 213 of the MGA may not be reconsidered, however second reading of a proposed bylaw may be reconsidered.'</p>
R.14	<p>Is the municipality legislated to take member attendance during meetings, to what extent, and how would the proposed Procedure Bylaw address this?</p>	<p>Section 120 Voting style:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Voting at <i>Council</i> and <i>Council Committee</i> meetings shall be by voice. (2) If three or more <i>Members</i> indicate their opposition to a motion during a voice vote, a <i>roll call vote</i> must be taken. (3) Despite subsection (2), a <i>Member</i> may request a <i>roll call vote</i> at any time prior to commencing the vote. (4) Despite subsection (2), at <i>Council</i> meetings only, a <i>Member</i> may request a <i>recorded vote</i> 	<p>Commentary Under the currently proposed bylaw text, when a voice vote is taken, the Minutes only list the names of Council or Committee Members who voted in opposition. When a roll call vote (verbal) or recorded vote (written) are taken, then the names of all members in favour and all members in opposition are noted in the Minutes. These two vote styles would allow the reader to infer who was absent when the vote commenced.</p>

ROW #	COUNCIL MEMBERS' FEEDBACK / REQUEST FOR CHANGE	CURRENTLY PROPOSED BYLAW TEXT (ATTACHMENT 1)	ASSESSMENT OF REQUESTED CHANGE
		<p>at any time prior to commencing the vote. <i>Recorded votes</i> are not permitted at <i>Council Committees</i>.</p> <p>Section 138: The minutes of every Council and Council Committee meeting must record:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (b) the names of the Members opposed to a motion when a voice vote is taken; (c) the names of those who voted for and against a motion when a recorded vote is taken; <p><i>Municipal Government Act (MGA), Section 174 Disqualification of Councillors:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) A councillor is disqualified from council if <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (d) the councillor is absent from all regular council meetings held during any period of 8 consecutive weeks, starting with the date that the first meeting is missed, unless subsection (2) applies. (2) A councillor is not disqualified by being absent from regular council meetings under subsection (1)(d) if the absence is authorized by a resolution of council passed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) at any time before the end of the last regular meeting of the council in the 8-week period, or (b) if there is no other regular meeting of the council during the 8-week period, at any time before the end of the next regular meeting of the council. 	<p>The <i>Municipal Government Act</i> contains several provisions which would require the City to keep track of absence <u>during an item</u>. Section 170 Pecuniary interest; Section 184 Abstention from voting on matters discussed at public hearing require tracking, but are not required to be noted in the minutes. Section 185 requires that the names of Councillors present and their vote during a Recorded vote are noted in the meeting minutes.</p> <p>With respect to attendance over the course of a whole meeting, Section 208 of the <i>MGA</i> states that the names of the Councillors present at a Council meeting are recorded (<i>Note: the MGA does not contain a definition of 'present'</i>). There is no such requirement for meetings of Council Committees.</p> <p>Should Council wish to perform more robust attendance taking during a meeting, it should be noted that electronic voting would facilitate automatic attendance taking per item, per vote or per meeting, with the option of listing absent members.</p> <p>Report PFC2017-0433 identifies electronic voting as an item Council may wish to consider in a future Procedure Bylaw review.</p> <hr/> <p>Proposed Amendment</p> <p>None</p>

ROW #	COUNCIL MEMBERS' FEEDBACK / REQUEST FOR CHANGE	CURRENTLY PROPOSED BYLAW TEXT (ATTACHMENT 1)	ASSESSMENT OF REQUESTED CHANGE
		<p>(3) For the purposes of this section, a councillor is not considered to be absent from a council meeting if the councillor is absent on council business at the direction of council.</p> <p>Municipal Government Act (MGA), Section 185 Recording of votes</p> <p>(2) When a vote is recorded, the minutes must show the names of the councillors present and whether each councillor voted for or against the proposal or abstained.</p> <p><i>(Note: the MGA does not contain a definition of 'present')</i></p>	
R.15	Clarify that anyone may request to change their vote.	<p>Section 122 Changing a vote:</p> <p>Should a Member request to change their vote, and the requested change does not alter the vote result, the request may be granted by <i>general consent</i> or by a <i>majority vote</i>. If the requested change would alter the vote result, the Member may move to reconsider the original vote.</p>	<p>Commentary</p> <p>Agreed</p> <hr/> <p>Proposed Amendment</p> <p>"122. Should a Member request to change their vote, and the requested change does not alter the vote result, the request may be granted by <i>general consent</i> or by a <i>majority vote</i>, whether the requestor voted for or against the motion. If the requested change would alter the vote result, the Member may move to reconsider the original vote."</p>
R.16	Division of a recommendation should only be allowed if the divided portions can stand on their own as motions.	<p>Section 123 Division of a recommendation:</p> <p>A Member may request or the Chair may direct that a recommendation be divided and called separately in accordance with section D.3 (4).</p> <p>Table of incidental motions, Section D.3 (4):</p>	<p>Commentary</p> <p>The requested provision already exists in Section D.3(4), but could be repeated in Section 123 for ease of reference.</p> <hr/> <p>Proposed Amendment</p>

ROW #	COUNCIL MEMBERS' FEEDBACK / REQUEST FOR CHANGE	CURRENTLY PROPOSED BYLAW TEXT (ATTACHMENT 1)	ASSESSMENT OF REQUESTED CHANGE
		<p>Despite RONR's requirement of a <i>majority vote</i>, requests to divide are granted without a vote, but only if the separated parts can stand on their own.</p>	<p>"123 A Member may request or the Chair may direct that a recommendation be divided and called separately, but only if the divided parts can stand on their own."</p> <p>No amendment proposed to Section D.3 (4)</p>
<p>R.17</p>	<p>The provision which requires that a Member must provide 24 hours' notice to the City Clerk of correction to minutes is unrealistic given the amount of time members of Council have to read the agenda material for an upcoming meeting.</p>	<p>Section 139 Corrections to Minutes</p> <p>(1) A Member may make a motion that the minutes be amended to correct an inaccuracy or omission, however, the City Clerk must be advised of the challenge to the minutes one day prior to the meeting at which they are confirmed, to allow the City Clerk:</p> <p>(a) to review the inaccuracy or omission; and</p> <p>(b) to prepare a revision to be distributed at the meeting if required.</p>	<p>Commentary</p> <p>This request can be accommodated by an amendment to Section 139.</p> <p>Proposed Amendment</p> <p>"139 (1) A Member may make a motion that the minutes be amended to correct an inaccuracy or omission. (2) The Member shall notify the City Clerk of the proposed correction as soon as is possible prior to the start of the meeting at which they are confirmed, to allow the City Clerk:</p> <p>(a) to review the inaccuracy or omission; and</p> <p>(b) to prepare a revision to be distributed at the meeting if required.</p>
<p>R.18</p>	<p>Councillors who are ENMAX directors are restricted from being Committee Members and from attending Gas, Power and Telecommunications (GPT) Committee meetings. Wasn't this restriction going to be examined? Why exclude these Councillors from participating at GPT,</p>	<p>Section A.8 Table of Council Committee membership:</p> <p>GPT – 4 Councillors (No Councillor is eligible to serve on the Gas, Power & Telecommunications Committee if also serving as a director of ENMAX Corporation or its subsidiaries); Chief Financial Officer (CFO) or designate (voting); and Mayor, Ex-Officio</p>	<p>Commentary</p> <p>In consultation with the Law Department, it was recommended that the rule as it exists in Bylaw 44M2006 be retained at this time. The provision in the Procedure Bylaw indicating Members of Council who are ENMAX directors may not sit on GPT arises from the role GPT has played in regulatory interventions in gas and telecommunications regulatory proceedings.</p>

ROW #	COUNCIL MEMBERS' FEEDBACK / REQUEST FOR CHANGE	CURRENTLY PROPOSED BYLAW TEXT (ATTACHMENT 1)	ASSESSMENT OF REQUESTED CHANGE
	<p>especially in light of the fact that such Councilors would be privy to the same reports if those reports are forwarded to a meeting of Council, where the same restriction does not apply?</p>	<p>Section B.6 No Member is eligible to serve on the Gas, Power & Telecommunications Committee if also serving as a director of ENMAX Corporation or its subsidiaries and, despite Section A.13, a meeting of said Committee is not open to a Member who is also a director of ENMAX Corporation or its subsidiaries.</p>	<p>While as a matter of policy The City does not intervene in ENMAX regulatory proceedings, positions taken in proceedings in other industries on issues such as cost of capital, depreciation, risk and other generic financial analyses may, if adopted by the regulator, have an impact on ENMAX in its own proceedings. In addition, confidential industry information may be shared with GPT that should not be shared with ENMAX. This could put ENMAX directors who are Councilors in a conflict of interest situation between duties to The City as a Councilor and to ENMAX as a director.</p> <hr/> <p>Proposed Amendment None</p>
<p>R.19</p>	<p>Regarding non-appointed Councilor status at SPCs. A change was requested so that all Council Members should sit on all the SPCs. Everything comes to Council for final vote anyway. Does not think that Councilors who are not appointed will have their views represented at Committee.</p>	<p>Section A.13 rights of Non-Member Councilors in Attendance:</p> <p>A.13 (1) Meetings of <i>Council Committees</i> are open to all <i>Councilors</i>, and they may join the meeting at any time, including during <i>closed meetings</i>.</p> <p>(2) A <i>non-Member Councilor</i> may take part in discussion or debate of agenda item(s), including items discussed in <i>closed meetings</i>, and has the same obligation as <i>Members</i> to hold confidential discussions in confidence.</p> <p>(3) A <i>non-Member Councilor</i> may not: (a) place nominations for the <i>Chair</i> or <i>Vice-Chair</i>,</p>	<p>Commentary The current proposal meets the need expressed in this request. The input of all Councilors is important to the discussion at the Committee level, and there should not be a barrier to participation. The current proposal for participation allows non-appointed Councilors to contribute to the discussion and to hear firsthand the contributions from members of the public. In addition, fuller participation by interested Councilors at the Committee level would streamline the discussion which occurs when the report is forwarded to Council. Exposure to relevant information allows for informed decision-making. The intention of Council is to organize its workload into portfolios, and to empower designated Committees to make final decisions within those</p>

ROW #	COUNCIL MEMBERS' FEEDBACK / REQUEST FOR CHANGE	CURRENTLY PROPOSED BYLAW TEXT (ATTACHMENT 1)	ASSESSMENT OF REQUESTED CHANGE
		<p>(b) make motions or vote, or (c) count towards meeting <i>quorum</i>.</p>	<p>portfolios. Section A.13 aligns with Council intent.</p> <p>Proposed Amendment</p> <p>None</p>
R.20	<p>Why are affordable housing strategies housed within the Intergovernmental (IGA) Committee mandate?</p>	<p>Section B.7 (c) IGA Mandate and Powers: Intergovernmental Affairs Committee has the following mandate: (c) developing strategies to address the needs for affordable housing in Calgary.</p>	<p>Commentary Issues related to affordable housing often involve monies from other orders of government, making IGA Committee the most logical body to address these issues.</p> <p>Proposed Amendment</p> <p>None</p>
R.21	<p>What is the reason for changing the 'Table' motion to 'Postpone'? Rules are not clear as to when to use 'Table' and when to use 'Postpone'</p>	<p>Table of subsidiary motions Section D.1 (1) Lay on the Table, or "Table": (1) <i>Lay on the Table</i> (RONR Section 17). A motion to set a pending main motion aside temporarily, within the course of the meeting, to accommodate something else of immediate urgency. The motion is not debatable (due to the urgency) and is not amendable. It may not interrupt a speaker. A majority vote is required to adopt. Section D.1 (4): Postpone to a certain time: (4) <i>Postpone to a certain time</i> (RONR Section 14). A motion to postpone consideration of a main motion to a subsequent meeting (may use a meeting date or a description of circumstances which trigger the return). The motion may not interrupt a speaker, and is only debatable or amendable as to the time to</p>	<p>Commentary The purpose for splitting the existing tabling motion into two different uses is to provide clarity to the public by switching to plain language. If the intention is to deal with the item at a later time or at a later meeting, the word 'postpone' will provide better understanding. The motion to postpone should include a time or a date at which the item will next be dealt with. Postponing to a certain time is debatable and amendable as to time. The historic term 'Table' will be retained for a very rare circumstance. A motion to table involves no component of a set time or date to take the item back up, as the intent is only to lay something aside temporarily. When the interrupting event is over, the item is picked back up immediately. As a result, this motion is not debatable or amendable.</p>

ROW #	COUNCIL MEMBERS' FEEDBACK / REQUEST FOR CHANGE	CURRENTLY PROPOSED BYLAW TEXT (ATTACHMENT 1)	ASSESSMENT OF REQUESTED CHANGE
R.22	<p>Concern was expressed that the expanded ability to suspend rules contained in the Procedure Bylaw may be too relaxed. If the new method is adopted, but Council finds that the relaxation is taken advantage of, would the City Clerk's Office be able to curtail it through providing procedural advice? Also, should only Council be authorized to suspend rules?</p>	<p>which the motion is to be postponed. A majority vote is required to adopt.</p> <p>Section 6 Suspension of rules:</p> <p>(1) The rules contained in this Bylaw or RONR may be suspended by <i>Council</i> or a <i>City BCC</i> on a case-by-case basis, by a <i>majority vote</i> or by <i>general consent</i>.</p> <p>Section D.3 (3) Table of Incidental Motions</p> <p>A motion to allow the assembly to waive a rule of order for a specific purpose. Rules that do not originate in legislation can be suspended by a <i>majority vote</i> or by <i>general consent</i> (instead of RONR's requirement of a 2/3 vote). This motion cannot be used to suspend any provisions from the <i>Municipal Government Act</i> or other applicable legislation.</p>	<p>Proposed Amendment Section D.1 (4)</p> <p>"(4) <i>Postpone to a certain time</i> (RONR Section 14). A motion to postpone consideration of a main motion to a specified later meeting or to a specific time during the same meeting."</p> <p>The City Clerk's Office intends to provide education by various means in order to make meeting members comfortable with the motions listed in Appendix D.</p> <p>Commentary</p> <p>There is a risk that adopting a Procedure Bylaw which contains suspendable rules may result in less rather than greater meeting efficiency. This risk is mitigated by the presence of the City Clerk to provide procedural advice to the Chair, and by the delivery of training, education and workshops to meeting members on the use of new provisions and how those provisions align with Council's priorities and commitments.</p> <p>Proposed Amendment</p> <p>A minor clarification to Section 6(1)</p> <p>"(1) The rules contained in this Bylaw or RONR may be suspended by <i>Council</i> or a <i>City BCC</i> on a case-by-case basis, by <i>general consent</i> or by a <i>majority vote</i>."</p>