

Document 3

“What we heard” – Member of Council involvement in donations to the City for community benefit

The following is feedback received by staff through the Engage Ottawa survey in April 2024 regarding Members’ solicitation and/or facilitation of donations. Comments are provided as they were submitted. However, some items may be redacted in keeping with privacy provisions of the *Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*.

Q1: Should Members of Council be permitted to solicit and/or facilitate voluntary donations for community benefits? Why or why not?

Yes. They bring valuable community perspectives that can help improve a project and mitigate some of the effects of development in a particular area.

No, No, No. Those donations may lead to corruption and abuse of power, and gain of political capital for councillors. Developers already control the City's planning process and residents are powerless. Voluntary donations are never charitable donations and the developers will always have a profit-driven purpose in mind.

No, everything needs to be contractual. It is conflict of interest and opens the door for corrupt negotiations

No. It smacks of corruption. It's either favors given to rich friends - they can pay a little money to get their project passed, or it is a penalty to others to overlook parts of a proposal for.

A project should have clear guidelines for its acceptance, and not be judged on the amount of what is in essence a cash payoff.

No. Members of Council should focus on fulfilling their mandate towards their constituents rather than solicit/facilitate voluntary donations for community benefits. To solicit/facilitate voluntary donations for one community benefit would be viewed as favouring one benefit over another.

Yes. Anything which could help the Councillor’s ward is a plus.

Yes - it will lead to better amenities and services in a neighbourhood. Very important in core neighbourhoods where there is little new infrastructure or amenities being built by the city

No, they should not. Such an arrangement would create the sentiment of obligation on the part of the Councillor toward the developer and would create the appearance of a relationship between a developer and a Councillor that could affect subsequent elections.

Yes, as long as they make a public announcement about that fact.

Yes. As density increases - especially in the inner City we need more infrastructure - recreation, parks, community centres. This is not funded by the DC charges. When you double the population - as is happening-the other infrastructure has to increase as well.

I don't think Members of Council should solicit donations. I think their involvement in facilitating them should be only to direct the donor to whichever department vets, accepts and monitor accountability in the appropriate distribution of funds. Members of Council should not be seen to be in any way beholden to donor companies or individuals.

Yes, but they should be required to adhere to the existing City policy.

(1) do you want donations or taxes is sometimes an issue. With more donations there is less need for taxes. (2) sometimes an individual can see a feature that adds to a project in their opinion, but is not getting done, so donations can help (3) what if something gets below the magic red line but someone really wants it. Why can't they donate it or create it themselves, as long as there is agreement that the feature adds to the project and does not detract. IT could just be that the feature got dropped due to lack of funds and here we have someone offering to donate the feature? (4) features that are nice-to-have, but somehow get left out of a the final specification of a project?

No, it's not voluntary when it's solicited by someone in a position of power. This is like asking if dating is appropriate in a military situation with a higher ranking officer.

Yes, provided there is no obvious benefit to the councillor, and the money goes to actual community improvements, and no just improvements that benefit the developer.

Yes. The symbiotic relationship between government and businesses should be openly acknowledged and addressed in a way that benefits the community. Councillors should be encouraged to advocate and facilitate improvement to their wards in partnership with businesses, given the proper oversight.

Absolutely not. The notion that politicians should be soliciting funds - for any reason, separate from the official application process is appalling. It flies in the face of any semblance of government transparency to have Councillors approve an application, while secretly having side conversations seeking hundreds of thousands of dollars that are quote/unquote "totally not related to their vote" is insulting to residents. Who in their right mind would actually believe that a developer cutting a cheque for \$300k is not buying the local Councillor's support? A development application should follow a standard set of criteria, and residents should know that that is all that is being considered.

No, this will only encourage preferable treatment and facilitate misbehavior. This will become the norm and without it development will be further delayed. DC's are in place and no other program should be introduced.

Yes, the city already seems to have a fairly robust process for ensuring these voluntary donations do not have any impact on planning committee decisions and they are very beneficial to communities affected by development. A major goal of development and intensification is to provide more tax income for the city relative to liabilities like roads so that we can afford better services and infrastructure. A mechanism for developers to directly contribute to improvements around their development improves the attractiveness of the development and reduces neighborhood opposition and mitigates negative impacts. It benefits everyone if done in a transparent way.

yes. Provide an offset benefit to communities that may perceive a project as having a potentially negative effect on them. Reduces Nimby response. Potentially provides benefit/value to the community that may not otherwise be available.

Does the city require significant donations/contributions/charges for community benefits by developers of major projects? If not, then yes members of council should be able to solicit and/or facilitate voluntary donations. This is city building.

Yes. Voluntary donations for community benefits are good. Don't overthink this. We shouldn't turn down voluntary donations for community benefits just because the left hates developers for some reason.

There position shouldn't be fundraiser for their ward from the public.

Yes. If a developer wants to help the community then why prevent them from doing so? We need all the help we can get.

Yes. Communities need to see direct improvement from infill development. Increased property tax revenues are simply spread out city-wide, development charges go towards "growth" - largely on the outer edges of the city. If we want communities to support infill in their backyards, they need to see improvements in the community from those developments.

Absolutely not. Some councilors regard such donations as a pre-requisite for their support on Council matters. This creates an environment where the merits of a proposal before Council are disregarded pending payment of additional monies. Councilors have a tendency to tout such payments as an "accomplishment" highlighted for political gain. They derive a benefit from someone else's contribution.

Yes, as long as the quid pro quo is clear, transparent and registered before delivery.

Yes, Councillors are some of the best advocates Ottawa has for their communities. Anything and everything should be done to allow them to solicit and/or facilitate voluntary donations for community benefits. Of course we want Ottawa to have many benefits that help the community. Councillors are some of the people best situated to help improved our city, with the help of all citizens and businesses interested in making Ottawa better.

No. It is just a side-bar way of either shaking down developers (not an entirely bad thing) or the reverse, developers buying the City with things the City probably should be doing anyway.

Yes, done openly and with documentation.

Yes, in their own ward only unless it is a broader scope beyond more than their own ward. If more than a ward then only members of effective wards can be involved in soliciting or facilitating voluntary donations for community benefits.

Yes. They understand what is needed in their community.

Yes. If the solicitation should be open and transparent, then it will lead to community benefits that would otherwise not materialize.

Yes. In 2017 a senior Canadian told me that the City had sucked the life out of the volunteer sector. I was just starting to head of our community association. I was looking forward to working with the city on the needs of our neighbourhood and making a contribution to larger city planning. Instead I have learned it is a constant battle across the city to try have any influence over anything. Porsch could get millions in tax cuts to build a 2 story building on a major corridor. Yet our ward could get \$zero support for a well developed youth strategy - the ask was a mere \$50K for a strategy leader. So the only chance we have is the CBA with the councillor's support. If asking for a benefit for the community is seen as a condition of support for the site plan approval and is transparent, I am satisfied that it meets the ethics test. It is also an indicator of City failure....disinterest in social needs, social infrastructure, and a better environment,

Yes

Not from developers who have or will have development proposals for consideration in Ottawa.

It's an insult for anyone to claim that a developer is going to voluntarily provide benefits. If such a developer exists, then they are most welcome to provide their donations after all decisions & appeals on their developments are final.

YES. I think it may work for certain causes

Yes, as long as there are clear benefits to the community and no adverse effects to geographic areas or households living outside the areas which will benefit from the donations.

I'm not quite sure what this is all about. But simply reading this literally, I would say yes/probably if there is a clear benefit for the community and the whole thing doesn't come across as a 3rd party buying a favour.

Yes because it is a reasonable way to provide benefits to a community that is being adversely impacted by development.

They should be allowed to engage with developers who are willing to make voluntary donations for community benefits. It is their job to obtain benefits for the community they represent.

Yes, why not.

Yes, this benefits for the community

Absolutely - given that unelected officials can it seems to me that the elected officials who are in fact accountable to the community should be allowed to as well. In fact that fact that City staff can do so without any measure of accountability is somewhat startling as I reviewed the issue. Given the decision several years ago of dedicated planning staff to serve developers directly over the interests of individual citizens it does lead one to think that accountability needs to be strengthened within the democracy we should (or supposedly) have.

Sure in the interest of his/ her ward.

Absolutely, if done correctly public and private partnerships can work incredibly and cities around the world have been doing this for years.

Yes, within conditions.

yes provided it's transparent. Communities need additional support

Allowed to facilitate, but not solicit. Clear definitions of each are needed.

Yes, provided there is a policy and it is respected. Community benefits are important and there is never enough public money for them, so enabling such donations from development projects is to everyone's benefit

Members of Council should be able to solicit and/or facilitate voluntary donations for community benefits because the City does not have the funds to meet all the needs in communities. Voluntary donations can meet those needs.

Yes

In my opinion: Members of Council personally and individually should not be permitted to proactively solicit donations. It can later put them uncomfortably in a 'quid pro quo' context for future interactions/decisions, or at least the perception of such. If more than one Councillor - say 2 neighbouring Councillors are involved in a transaction - that could buffer the situation somewhat.

Developers typically do not step-up to give away money unless there is some benefit accruing back to them in the short term or the long term. There is already a fund for development charges - if developers want to give more than is already required they should be allowed to put into this. However these moneys need to be shared a bit more broadly other than just the ward in which their current building transaction is in... otherwise certain wards would always be benefitting more than others.

If the city wants to go ahead with an additional funding approach beyond topping up the development fund account, then a city unit of staffers could be established to do such general soliciting. Not unlike a funding a periodic funding drive - tax receipts as a feasible option??

Agreed. This will benefit our community as long as this is done openly with no strings attached.

Absolutely. The counsellor is ultimately responsible to reflect their wards needs and interests and are directly accountable at and between elections. They should be able to (within normal and appropriate ethical and contracting guidelines) work with private sector organizations to negotiate voluntary donations that can help deliver mutually beneficial community benefits.

Yes. If the councillor's ward lacks sufficient community facilities and the resources to provide them, and the developer's primary project has already received approval, there is every reason to see whether the developer is willing to make an in-kind contribution to the ward where the project will take place.

Probably not. I see a possible risk where a donor making a councilor look good with a donation may affect future decisions for the donor. Candidly I liked the old Section 37.

Yes, they should. The sole reason that the City does not want this is so much development occurs in the core wards, nobody wants the councillors for the core wards to get money to improve their wards and mitigate the effects of development within the areas being developed. This was clearly demonstrated recently.

Yes, but only when there are no planning permissions, or applications requiring decisions/approvals of the city underway.

Yes. They worked with all these groups and know first hand the issues in their ward. All money needs to be disclosed and ensure it is spent as intended

Yes, if handled correctly, can be a net benefit to the community.

Yes. Councillors are in the best position to determine what a local area needs, especially when it comes to remedying the negative effects of large development projects.

No soliciting allowed as it risks being seen as influence peddling. Instead a policy is needed governing all types of community benefits: voluntary agreements, mandatory CB Charges, as well as benefits required for use of city owned land and city procurement.

Yes, they should. In some cases, there will be a change in the community that many constituents do not want and their councillor knows that is the feeling but they have been outweighed in the decision by the rest of the Council. By soliciting the donation, the councillor of those affected by the change can receive some sort of community benefit to alleviate the discomfort of whatever it is that the community must accept against their wishes (a high-rise over the recommended zoning for instance or a garbage dump in the community).

Yes, they should be permitted to do so. They are in an excellent position to work with the community, including community associations, to solicit or facilitate donations from community members and from developers towards improvements that benefit the community such as improvements to parks, donations of land for affordable housing, and free Presto passes in lieu of residential parking spaces.

yes. city does not always have sufficient funds. full transparency essential at all stages, by Council members, to committees and full council, and by all potential parties involved with sufficient advance time for thorough consideration and discussion. should be designated for specific items in specific or relevant areas.

Non

No member of Council should solicit community benefits from any commercial enterprise as it would appear to compromise a councillor's acceptance of an exception to the City's bylaws and official plan. The City should work out a cost to any applicant for what a major change would entail - i.e a clear policy of when and if community benefits apply. Otherwise it would appear that commercial interests may overcome objections in the interest of public good. e.g. a big developer might achieve a major exception to arduously worked out development restrictions simply by bribery.

Q2: If Members of Council are permitted to solicit and/or facilitate voluntary donations for community benefits:

- (a) What rules should apply to solicitation and/or facilitation?
- (b) How should accountability and transparency be addressed?

Ideally this is completed using a community benefits agreement with the community helping to lead the process and the councillors office facilitating.

I answered No to the first question. I encourage you to read the paper published in the Osgoode Hall Law Journal, and follow all advice given.

Have We Legalized Corruption? The Impacts of Expanding Municipal Authority Without Safeguards in Toronto and Ontario, Stanley M. Makuch and Matthew Schuman

Shouldnt be permitted period.

They should not be permitted to do this at all, but if they do, to be fair, they would have to solicit donations to all community benefits, and not pick one over another. This would take time away from representing the needs of all of their constituents. Accountability and Transparency would not be a problem if they did not embark on soliciting voluntary donations; however, if they did, then their actions must be through a third party, and not directly.

Council should be notified and the Councillor should not be providing any assistance in any way in return.

a) let an upset limit; perhaps a % of a project budget as a limit; b) council member and staff should both be involved. Transparency by ensuring that no aspect is a conflict of interest - e.g. Council member is not receiving anything or perception of personal gain

Not applicable

They should also make clear whether the organisation making the contribution has contributed to his/her election campaign.

It should be directed to local needs in consultation with the very local community. It should be a public process for deciding the needs with the Councillor.

- a. The members of Council as a whole should discuss the best use of funds within the City.
- b. Outcomes and timelines for completion should be set and monitored to ensure appropriate use of funds.

Members should initiate discussions only, based on verifiable community desires, and any voluntary add-ons from developers should be handled by City staff

all correspondence between the councilor and the donator should be made public before the donation is accepted. This would replicate an MFIPPA request without waiting for someone to request it.

(a) needs to be done openly. It all depends what you mean by solicitation. Say, it after a public meeting there is chatter about some issue and someone offers to donate to overcome some difficulties that come up. I mean, there needs to be room for people to make donations when they want to. Or, say, someone calls up a councillors office, they get talking, and a donation is proposed ...

(b) everything needs to be transparent.

(c) on the contrary "sinking ship entertainment" at Mooney's Bay park was much too secretive and dumped on the community much too late in the project time line

They should simply not be.

a) not allowed to solicit for anything in their ward

b) all requests would need to be done where audio/text is recorded. The content publicly disclosed for 60 days on the City website.

a) The donations should be brought before council as a matter of notification, not necessarily for approval

b) any donations that council may decide is not above board should be sent to the ethics commissioner for review. Any decisions from the ethics commissioner should be binding on the agreement.

(a) All rules should be governed by the principle of transparency and accountability - if the process and reporting is publicly available, Councilors should be free solicit and facilitate voluntary donations for their community, as they should have the highest expertise when it comes to the needs of their community and how local, regional, or national companies can provide the best support.

(b) Reporting and tracking through donation registers, etc.

a) it should be banned, and anyone seeking such donations should be investigated for also seeking bribes from developers

b) by banning this entire offensive kick-back scheme. how can anyone pretend that secret negotiations, where a politician and a business with financial gain argue back and forth over how much money they will "voluntarily give" that this could ever be transparent.

N/A

Voluntary donations should not influence city council planning decisions. However they should be spent in the area directly affected by the development.

the benefit should not diminish any regulated contribution/fee

Transparency - use a form for information collection.

Involvement of city staff

It should be a requirement for members of council to do this, if, as noted before, there are no other mandatory contributions of this nature by major developers.

I don't consider this to be a problem in need of a solution. Campaign donation limits are very low. I don't think we've seen unethical voluntary donations for community benefits. Let's not overthink this.

All donations above \$50 should be publically listed.

a) The donation should be clearly designated for a specific project and details of this project should be public. It could be something the city wanted to do anyway but didn't have the funds, or a project that a councillor/the developer comes up with that would be of benefit that then gets council approval. b) If a developer suggests a project and it goes over budget, they should pay for all elements of it. All suggested projects and their estimated costs and the breakdown of who pays for what should be public and agreed to by council.

(a) I don't think a Councilor should ever ask for donations from individuals or corporations. We don't let our police or municipal staff ask for donations and elected officials shouldn't either.

(b) The City can post a wish list for each ward along the lines of a bridal registry. Any donations must be anonymous. Only the finance department should be able to identify a contributor to a tax receipt.

Members should be expected to register the donation conversation with an auditable City process at the earliest indication. The process should be developed, monitored, reported and audited by City staff. The objective is to record the parameters of the donation and any understanding of quid pro quo. Acceptable frameworks should be built into the recording process (boxes to be checked/initialed). Any proposal that exceeds minimal levels should require a review and sign off from senior City staff. If flagged as questionable or excessive, it should require Council approval.

All existing provincial and federal laws related to criminality and corruption should apply. The City of Ottawa does not need to recreate the wheel here. If donations for community benefits are negotiated there should be transparency around the discussions that lead to the community benefits being successfully negotiated. Accountability can be addressed at election time, and the City Clerk's office can help guide Councillors to ensure they are following all existing provincial and federal laws related to criminality and corruption.

See above.

Under no conditions should councillors be involved in soliciting or facilitating voluntary contributions from developers or the private sector.

Written and condition to no conflict of interest or personal financial gain.

Transparency. No conflicts of interest. Make everything available for review by the public.

There should also be a registry where those firms/organizations agreeing to make financial donations are listed (and under what circumstances the donations are being made). The registry should also have information of the community benefits (who benefits, where are the benefits, and what development is linked to the benefits). There would need to be oversight of the registry and well as the solicitation process ... Councillors involved in negotiations would need to inform the oversight body and keep it up to date on details. The final agreement would then need to be open for Council review before any agreement became final. Lastly, there would need to be an accounting of monies spent and benefits delivered.

It has to be transparent. If the Community Association is active, then the benefit priorities should be discussed with effected CAs,

How is accountability addressed in measuring the City managements alignment and performance to achieve clear and measurable key performance indicators for the goals set out in the City Strategy. Extend the results framework to Council.

Arms length from Councillor -no relatives or distant relatives, friends or neighbours, business partners. All members of a corporation giving gift should have names published so that any relationship with Councillor can be seen

a) No solicitation from developers, their family, friends, partners, colleagues, ex-spouses, grandchildren etc.

b) Precise records have to be made of all meetings, communications, socialization etc.

- Should be only applicable to those matters that are not a part of the official responsibilities of the municipality that we are paying TAX for that at any level (Federal-Provincial - and Municipal) -If Province or Municipality can not afford to do part of legislations for certain amount of time (Putting those issue on hold) an exemption my be applicable. The found can be recovered through the Province or City when hold is removed. The recovered amount can only be reused for new programs.

- 2a) No personal benefits should accrue to the Member of Council.
 - b) The donation should not take away from or be detrimental to the time spent by the Council Member on official council business.
 - c) The donation should be easily assessed as being net positive to the community.
 - d) The donation should not have any negative implications for any official council community programs.
- 2a) & b) The nature of the donation should be well publicized so that the full council and the public have full knowledge of the nature of the donation.

I really don't know. But is there not an Ethics office somewhere that could apply existing criteria. There should be no need for another office or level of administration.

There should be no direct benefit to the member doing the soliciting, the request and reply should be in writing and viewable

Discussions, whether successful or not, could be required to be listed in a registry.

- a. Open and transparent
- b. Item on Agenda

- A) not to influence or bribe council
 - B) 100% of donation must be given to the community within a reasonable time frame.
- City only holds in escrow for community

Councillors need to openly and transparently present their approach to communities / citizens and seek their support. Community associations are an effective mechanism that the City has used many times to seek representative views at the community level. With the backing of their communities they can then go forward and solicit an/or facilitate donations for community benefits. The involvement of the councillor needs to be declared with a record of the backing they received, the amount solicited and the purpose of the donation. I suggest a public registry of voluntary donations for community benefits on the City website.

- 1) Asking is allowed and the benefit is for the community and ward Member does not receive any benefit personally.
- 2) Media / public can ask member what he did / how he solicited or obtained donations.(he/her/ they)

Check to see what London, UK, Chicago, Melbourne, and other cities with successful PPPs do to ensure transparency. I can't imagine it's that difficult, but best practices and rules probably already exist.

The donations should benefit the residents of the ward without any quid pro quo. The donations should be entirely on the public record, both income and expenditure.

The Councillor should simply be required to publicly acknowledge the donation.

Dollar limit for facilitated donations. Immediate disclosure to Council and/or ethics. Independent verification that donation was proffered not solicited. Rules around benefits donee would receive in exchange.

The solicitation should be open, and part of the up-front negotiation process, and be contingent on approval of the particular project. Community support (i.e., those affected directly by donation and project) should be demonstrable. (b) A record should be kept of the resulting donation and its conditions

1. There needs to be full transparency by means of a record signed by both parties re. the solicitation/facilitation of voluntary donations for community benefits 2. This solicitation/facilitation should not occur in exchange of any favourable business treatment at City Hall 3. Voluntary donations above a yet to be determined amount would qualify for a one time verbal recognition by the councillor in newsletters, community papers or at public events. 4. Donors are permitted to freely advertise their donation 5. The destination of the donation needs to be passed in a motion by the relevant Community Association(s)

Be transparent and accountable

If the city goes ahead to allow Councillors to solicit, then full disclosure and transparency should occur before any decision to accept. Decisions to accept should be made by a neutral panel.

All donations need to be made with a Memorandum of Understanding which specifically states that this is a free will donation and that this is the sole agreement.

a) Existing ethical and conflict of interest rules should apply. The individual councillor, their family, staff, etc. should not be direct or sole beneficiaries of the voluntary donation. Further, and to avoid the appearance of conflict of interest, which is essential to preserve faith in our processes and institutions, the donating company, including its officers, should not have been a donor to the councillor's election campaign.

b) Details of the agreement (including those negotiated by staff) should be available on the city's website, including who the donating company or companies are, what interest they have in the community benefit, which party initiated the negotiation, and the financial and legal terms of the donation. The donation should be free and clear of any other business considerations the donor has before the city. If such business exists, this

should be disclosed. The city's ethics officer should be able to review and make final recommendations pertaining to each agreement. Note: these same accountability and transparency standards should apply to agreements negotiated by city staff.

(a) only applicable for already approved projects, specifically directed to community projects such as parks, community centres, public washrooms. No further advantages, subsidies or tax breaks for the donor.

(b) fully public consultation on the types of facilities the community needs, how much they will cost and how much the developer is prepared to provide, with full transparency on all financial transactions.

Shawn Menard was pretty open and transparent about the Katasa donation, and look at the fuss that started. There was a lot of political nonsense going on there where councillors who don't like Menard (Luloff, Tierney, and the mayor for three) tried to make a pretty transparent deal look bad on Menard. And then they all voted for the money to be divided among them all. Point is, this will probably keep happening over and over no matter what rules and transparency there is.

Rules should be worked out by councillors and city staff. There are already many things being done like this, don't pretend it is not already regulated and transparent. Recent events with Shawn Menard extracting some financial benefits for constituents to mitigate traffic problems and a bunch of suburban councillors greedily saying, "Gimme some of that money, Capital Ward" demonstrate that so clearly.

See above.

Create policy such that a developer would have the option of going to the Integrity Commissioner with complaint re breach of the above, should they be approached/asked for a donation while another process requiring the City's approval is underway.

Agreement to pay a community benefit cannot be used as a tool to sway a councillor's vote to get eg. A zoning change, a higher building, less parking etc.
we do risk kickback payments so builders get their way

There must be rules in place preventing corruption, such as prohibition on prescriptive (e.g. specific provider for services) donations and full conflict of interest disclosure (e.g., who, when, how much, how it was negotiated).

Council needs to develop rules for solicitation and/or facilitation. That's Council's job. Councillors should be required to disclose all requests for voluntary donations for community benefits.

Rules should insure consultation and accountability by making agreements public before they are finalized, and monitoring their implementation.

(a) The donation should be used for the good of as many community members as possible and should contribute to the upkeep of any facilities (for example a park or green space) that are purchased or created. The donation that is solicited should be used for something that truly benefits the community.

(b) Records should be kept and available including emails, letters, transcripts of calls etc. and they should be available to the media, the council and the public once an agreement has been made such as a MOU. There should be no reason to hide any of the negotiations.

There should be no financial advantage accrued to the member of council. The City's Integrity Officer should confirm that the donation is voluntary and does not involve a conflict of interest with any member of council or with city staff (including the appearance of a bribe or other financial or professional advantage), and report on this to City Council prior to Council's accepting the donation.

The donation should be used in its entirety for the purpose stated by the donor.

The documentation concerning the donation - including the donor's statement of intent of the use of the donation - should be published on the City's website so it is visible to the public.

(a) new rules, if needed. see answer to Q1 & Q4.

(b) reporting and adherence to existing "Accountability and transparency".

Many citizens do not know procedures and policies and adherence measures. These are and should be the responsibility of paid staff.

Q3: What, if any, direction should a policy provide regarding the City's acceptance and allocation of voluntary donations solicited and/or facilitated by a Member of Council?

That it be transparently presented to city council and the public.

Voluntary donations must be prohibited because they open the door to corruption and abuse of power.

It seems like you are entertaining the corrupt outside contractual agreements in making decisions on the behalf of taxpayers.

Bad idea - do Members of Council have that much time on their hands that they have to participate in 'fundraising'? Running a City is more important than fundraising.

Any donation would need to be in accordance with City regulations.

should only involve public good - any resident of Ottawa could benefit if used (e.g. amenity, bike lane, park or public space, etc.

The policy should forbid such donations and direct developers to work with City staff.

The policy should affect voluntary donations in the ward of the councillor.

The policy should be tied to increased density. The province does not allow an adequate DC to cover the other needs that this increased density requires. If it did then a voluntary contribution would not be required. Small infill does not change requirements much but large developments do - if density in a small area is doubling (as it is here) then there is a need.

It should be tied to local needs with local community consultation.

See my answer to 1

This needs to be carefully thought through, so community benefits do not become a negotiating tool against planning by-laws, but are truly voluntary (no expected return), what the community desires, and lawful.

The same as the existing policy that applies to City staff.

(1) the donation needs to be something that is accepted by the community. There need to be community meetings to assess the donation before it gets very far along in development.

Direction should be it is simply not ethical, or permitted. Do not seek donations.

I think that if an agreement is reached in good faith between a councillor and developer, and does not breach any ethical standards, it should be allowed to proceed as agreed upon, and Council should have no more input on where that money goes.

Donations should be made with specific stipulations on how the money should be spent, and the outcomes of the donation should be held to measurable standards. Donors and Councilors should acknowledge the purpose of the voluntary donation and that it was made with no expectation of quid pro quo. Value-in-kind donations should also be considered.

IF the City were corrupt enough to introduce a formal shake-down policy, then the funds collected should be negotiated by staff only, all meetings should be recorded, the participants should be banned from communicating outside of those recorded meetings, and the funds generated should go City-wide, not for wealthy developers to simply buy local community support on a bad project.

N/A

That it be done transparently so that the public can see how the donation was negotiated/accepted and the allocation should be limited to the area around the development.

Unless a project has potentially multi-ward impact the City the policy should not attempt to roll the benefit into a city wide or generic benefit

It should be cash to do X, not X specifically. That way if the administrative burden for the city is too high, the cash could be repurposed.

Accept them all! Public goods are public great!

The donation should stay in that ward. And is allowed to be directed toward specific improvements (new pedestrian infrastructure, new bike infrastructure, etc).

It should be allowed.

It should only apply to infill development.

Never ask for a donation, even if you think that it is for the public good.

Come up with some sensible ranges for dollar amounts/ value and for applications. Build these into the reporting/registering process. Anything beyond those limits needs review and sign off from City managers and/ or Council if large enough or unexpected.

Simply direct the Councillors and staff in their offices to understand existing provincial and federal laws related to criminality and corruption. City Clerk's office should ensure guidance is provided, but it need not be complicated.

That it be specific to its stated purpose.

These transactions must be banned.

KISS instead of a heavy bureaucracy!

Donated funds should remain in the community where they were offered/ received.

A policy should give clear direction on conflict of interest. It could also discuss transparency concerns associated with solicitation of funds to ensure financial donations were not obtained via unacceptable behavior or promises related to current or future business considerations. No private backroom deals.

Frankly, I think if we re densifying CBA should be spent to development amenities in the area of where the building is being built. A certain percentage should be set aside for wards with high levels of poverty - to build amenities that support health and support for parks, recreation facilities and social service.

Arms length rules

All voluntary donations from developers and their partners, spouses etc. should be prohibited. A by-election needs to be triggered if a member of council arranges for voluntary donations from developers.

Clearly identify the Type of programs that can be covered.

See my answer to the previous question.

Just make it transparent. Also, should Councillors not have some measure of authority (to go along with all their responsibilities)? Eventually, they come up for re-election. Don't treat them as irresponsible kids.

There should be a clear reason and beneficiary of the donation, the most obvious sort being a good provided to a community that may face some harms due to a new development

First, such donations should be vetted by City legal staff. Their allocation should be in accordance with whatever is agreed with the developer.

To be used for the sole purpose solicited

City hold funds in escrow , once community benefit is determined 100% of funds goes to benefit

The same as the City already does with city staff (who are unaccountable). In fact the City should consider the registry to identify the person facilitating/ soliciting of every voluntary community donation and precisely where the monies flowed. I appreciate that the Mayor will not like this approach - too much transparency.

No comment - just accept and use as requested.

I think community engagement is key, but you also have to outline ethical standards. Funds need to be allocated fairly across communities, and of course, there needs to be ensured that all laws and bylaws are adhered to. Again, I'm sure there are best practices already in place in many cities, so no need to recreate the wheel here!

The City administers the donation, and should ensure that the donation does not offend basic community standards of decency, fairness, etc. The City should not have control of the acceptance, allocation and disbursement beyond basic oversight.

Not being so bloody excessive as they were when Shawn Menard correctly got a donation.

Conditions, including what is noted above in 2(a), need to be spelled out and known to the parties involved in talks, consultation and negotiation of any donations, and it should be clear that no conflict of interest exists. The member of council should be the catalyst for the donation and not benefit from it.

Use stipulations in Q2 as guide for the policy.
The policy should not be cumbersome as this could stifle community donations.
The donation needs to qualify equal to a charitable donation

Not sure

Full disclosure and transparency should occur before any decision to accept. Final decisions to accept should be made by a neutral panel.

It should be spent in accordance with the donator's wishes. It should not be managed by the Mayor or Council.

See answers above. In addition "community benefit" should be defined to ensure these arrangements do benefit the residents of the ward they occur in. Perhaps they should be limited to measures to provide park and recreational space, improve active transportation; eliminate dangerous traffic infrastructure; provide transit infrastructure and right of way, etc. Developers should not be able to use community benefit agreements to get things that solely or principally benefit the developer.

If the project clearly benefits the community of the councillor's ward and is conducted according to the above rules, such donations should be rubber-stamped by Council. No further interference by other councillors or the Mayor should be permitted, since they have the same opportunities to seek donations in their own wards or for the City at large.

I think instead a policy should be struck for community payments for zoning variances that is paid up front. A bit like Section 37, but the policy will have to be set municipally.

Same question as above.

See above.

The ward needs need to be documented and shared and the purpose of the funds declared. The offer should not be allowed if the builder is applying for variance, change to zoning, build heights density etc. that would be a conflict of interest

There must be Ethics rules defined for this process.

Members of Council should be required to disclose all requests for voluntary donations for community benefits.

CBAs typically consist of several crucial elements which are not present in voluntary contributions:

A CB Policy must cover both voluntary and mandatory contributions, both CB Charges covering generic city-wide benefits, as well as requirements for specific large site developments, and other agreements.

1. Legal Mechanisms to organize each transaction, to ensure clarity of ownership and responsibility: Such as agreements, contracts, zoning conditions.
2. Negotiation Forums: Mechanisms to align divergent interests; Facilitate discussions and agreements on community benefits both within the community, and between developers and the community.
3. Monitoring Mechanisms to reduce uncertainty, and build trust and social cohesion: Ensuring the clauses made in the agreement are delivered.

No laws should be broken and no other party should suffer because of an acceptance and use of a donation.

The City should accept the donation as stated by the donor, without adding caveats or conditions.

see other answers.

Q4: Please provide any additional comments.

In the context of Bill 185, affirming the reign of developers in municipalities, it would be very risky for Councillors to accept voluntary donations from developers. The developers now have the high hand over all municipal planning decisions, and councillors and taxpayers are powerless. Authorizing voluntary donations from developers would be the straw that breaks the camel's back. Please preserve whatever shred is left of an open, transparent and accountable local government, and clearly prohibit voluntary donations from developers.

I am in shock that this is even being considered. It reflects on the mayor and any staff councillors that engages in the practice.

To "solicit" a "voluntary donation" is an oxymoron. The old style version of this was a brown envelope of cash with no records. Now the City is proposing to institutionalize this?? Institutionalized corruption. The benefit to the member of Council is that they can go to their constituents and proclaim what a great job they did in facilitating this, so as to look good and get reelected next time at the ballot box.

Members of Council have enough on their plates and should not add a function that could become discriminatory should they chose to support one community benefit over another.

If one ward receives noticeably more than others, this should be offset in some way. Perhaps set a maximum.

it's great there are some guidelines being drawn up. I see openness of projects and planning and donations as essential. On the other hand, donations are wonderful, in general, eh?

Councillor Luloff owes an apology to Councillor Menard for unfounded accusations made in a manner unbecoming of the Council Chambers.

It is my opinion that Councilors will be politically savvy enough to balance solicitation of businesses and their duties. A "beggar Councilor" would lose favor among business owners, and conflicts of interest when it comes to voting on matters should be no issue if there is a robust system of accountability and transparency. There is a greater trend of businesses allocating resources to community benefits as a form of advertising, and residents of Ottawa should encourage these partnerships and initiatives.

This is disgusting and the Councillors involved should be investigated for any other potential shake downs they have committed. This behaviour was more common in Quebec and led to multiple commissions and dozens of elected officials being caught. That Ottawa would try to put an air of "officialness" to this madness speaks to just how corrupt some at City Hall are.

A major goal of intensification is to grow the tax base to provide/free up resources to improve existing neighbourhoods. Voluntary contributions seem like a faster and beneficial way of mitigating community concerns, improving our city, and making new developments more livable. They should be implemented in a way that achieves this goal.

Why does this situation/problem even exist? Just require billionaire and multi-million dollar major corporations to actually contribute to our city and be done with it.

Woooooooooooo

The city is not always responsive in a timely manner to the needs of improving pedestrian and bike infrastructure to provide safety to residents. If donations are how we can correct or account for this, then let's use that money to improve the specific problem, not spread it out to all wards and be useless.

Fundamentally, If items/ projects are truly needed by the public, they ought to be funded by the tax base.

If individuals wish to be philanthropic, let them do so anonymously. This ensures contributions are made without any expectation.

Ottawa is severely lacking many community benefits that could have been achieved as part of major development, redevelopment and renovation projects. Please smarten up and get on with negotiating good community benefits for generations to come. Toronto has a good Community Benefits Network that the City of Ottawa should learn from (see: <https://www.communitybenefits.ca>), so does Ottawa (see: <https://ottawacommunitybenefits.ca>). As is often the case, the City of Ottawa is making this more difficult than it needs to be.

If developers make any contributions related to specific projects, they should be subject to conditions established by council and apply to all developers. Rather than "voluntary" contributions, which look like gifts, council should make financial contributions that are linked to community projects, green space etc, a requirement linked to approval of the project. All of this should be done in the most transparent way possible. Any other arrangement smells of favoritism or worse and individual councillors should in no way be

involved in this process.

I remain extremely disappointed that Councillor Menard still is pursuing this wrong-headed policy,

Given the questionable attack on Councillor Menard and the lack of trust in the city management, I suggest you start by building a results framework for the city that assists managers in making evidence based decisions, creating a learning environment and as a side benefit to report outcomes to the public.

Finally zero tolerance for any benefit from outside sources which benefits individuals, staff, Mayor and Councillors - Free trips, access to private recreational facilities, small renovations, etc..

Regarding Affordable Housing: *I am wondering if the City has any statistic data or analyses to see how many affordable units is needed. How many houses in the City are over crowded and How many homeless do we have? *Affordable housing should not be an excuse for overriding the engineering standards any item of building code, and accessibility. Otherwise, It will be only a try to put the housing creases on hold to be solved by the next generations. It seems that the Canadian houses has a very low Crowded factor. (maximum 2.3 person per 2 Bad room with an average of less than 2). Has the City checked the rate with Statistic Canada? *Population of the City does not seems very stable. Therefore, Building too many affordable housing may be a problem soon. Combination of people from various types of income is only possible for a very short period of time in each building. However it is possible in one neighborhood. We may like this fact or not. The reason is not the expense of building those type. Many problems occur later when the building starts to get older and needs money to be renovated. It is a really a trap for making people homeless. Good luck. **Redacted**

I'm still not quite clear on this. Does it stem from that developer donation tied to the Carling/Bronson development. Quite frankly, it looked like a win/win to me, and I thought the Mayor and Council was pretty small-minded.

In general obtaining additional money from a developer for public benefit (as opposed to private election funds) is to be applauded.

The confidence I have in the administration of City budget and finances is quite low and has been for some time. This would be an opportunity to improve a model of transparency and to recognize the role and accountability that City Councillors have in making such donations happen.

Thanks for reaching out for community input, but don't overthink this, I'm sure there are counterparts in cities around the world (even in the Commonwealth) who would happily share their experiences, advice, and best practices on PPPs.

Don't throw the baby out with the bathwater!

Eliminate councilors' ability to accept donations from developers for election campaigns. That is something that really annoys me.

I think the intent of voluntary donations needs to be an appeal not only to the moral responsibilities of a business or individual but also stimulate the sense of joy of giving to a community. In this era of boundless greed, in the 'haves' as well as the 'have-a-lot-less', we, as a society, need to nurture responsibility and kindness for our communities, for people as well as the physical appearance and maintenance. This is civilised.

Thank you for this opportunity to express my views

One the donation will benefit the community and it's used for that should be ok

When we are short of money, why would we reject money donated in good faith for local projects. We should embrace generous donations to improve our city.

What happened last fall was an embarrassment to the city council. Counsellor Menard negotiated an agreement with a developer to secure a voluntary donation to the city to create a mutual benefit to residents and the developer at no or reduced cost to taxpayers. That some chose to politicize this and accuse the counsellor of unethical conduct is either a misunderstanding, or deliberate subterfuge by those counsellors. They scored some political points, but the ward was denied an improvement at the developer's expense. Absolutely infuriating. Negotiating these kinds of agreements should be part of a counsellor's job and overseen by the city ethics office. Further the same accountability and transparency standards that are applied to these should be applied equally to agreements negotiated by city staff.

If a corporation wishes to pay this kind of voluntary tax they should be encouraged to do so in a clear demonstration of their desire to benefit the community, which will profit them in goodwill and community acceptance.

I probably said it all above.

Ask Shawn Menard what should be done. He has written extensively on this and prepared position papers and briefers and he is a person of honour and integrity and the best councillor on our city council right now, with incredible assistants, in fact the best Capital Ward has ever had. Given his recent experience, just take his advice and make what he says policy.

All donations from developers to the City should be fully transparent and this information should be readily accessible by the public. All discussions between developer and politicians/city staff, related to donations to the city should be tracked, similar to the lobbyist registration (could just piggy-back off this system).

The city/province should be more focused on developer s supporting election campaigns. Look at Mark Sutcliffe who took over \$100,000 from developer buddies. He also accepted meet and greet \$1,500 entry fee at OSEG Jeff Hunt's condo and then he (Surcliffe) pushed through Landsdowne 2.0 for his developer friends. A deal that is bankrupting the city.

I know developers and i know they are cheap and don't want to pay for anything they don't have to. So when they "offer" up \$300K you hsve to look st WIIFM (whats in it for me).

Mandate disclosure of community benefits donations in the same way as campaign donations must be disclosed.

The attack on Councillor Menard over the donation by Katasa to improve the community near the Katasa development, contrary to the manner in which previous donations from developers in other wards had been treated, enforced my opinion that tthe current Council would rather score political points than work towards a better city.

Public input is important, however, as a taxpayer and outsider to the City processes & systems it is difficult to formulate answers to these questions. I'm saying this after following many reports on this issue and reading some of the background information. This issue was instigated by some counsellors who ignored their prior knowledge and agreement and made untrue statements for personal gain and/or popular appeal or unclear reasons. The current mayor and several counsellors continue the tactics of the previous city council in being overly influenced by powerful and influential people /companies and "development industry stakeholders."