Appendix A:

Chart B: Chart of Compensation Options for Council

Option #	Description of Option	Advantages	Disadvantages	Cost Impact to Budget
1	No further action required. The compensation rates will remain status quo until the next annual economic adjustment.	No impact to the budget.	Compensation rates lag in the market and do not meet the current practice of the 60 th percentile of the market. Compensation rates do not align with the policy for the non union group at the 55 th percentile.	\$0
2	Increase the compensation rate of all Council positions to the market median as shown in Chart A in the report to Council.	This would raise the compensation rate of Council position to the average market rate.	Compensation rates do not meet the current practice of the 60 th percentile of the market. Compensation rates do not align with the policy for the non union group at the 55 th percentile.	\$18,200 total gross increase not included in the 2024 budget. This may be absorbed in the surplus wage budget but if not, Council would need to direct the Chief Financial Officer to fund the change through Employee Reserve Fund.
3	Increase the compensation rate of all Council positions to the 55 th percentile as shown in Chart A in the report to Council.	This would raise the compensation rate of Council positions to the same percentile as the non union group.	Compensation rates do not meet the current practice of the 60 th percentile of the market.	\$25,600 total gross increase not included in the 2024 budget. This may be absorbed in the surplus wage budget but if not, Council would need to direct the Chief Financial Officer to fund the change through Employee Reserve Fund.
4	Increase the compensation rate of all Council positions to the 60 th percentile as shown in Chart A in the report to Council.	This would raise the compensation rate of Council positions to meet the current practice of the 60 th percentile.	Compensation rates do not align with the policy for the non union group at the 55 th percentile.	\$21,700 total gross increase not included in the 2024 budget. This may be absorbed in the surplus wage budget but if not, Council would need to direct the Chief Financial Officer to fund the change through Employee Reserve Fund.

5	Increase the compensation rate of all Council positions to the 65 th percentile as shown in Chart A in the report to Council.	This would make Lakeshore Council positions very competitive and one of the higher paid Council members in the region.	Compensation rates lag in the market and do not meet the current practice of the 60 th percentile of the market. Compensation rates do not align with the policy for the non union group at the 55 th percentile.	\$34,500 total gross increase not included in the 2024 budget. This may be absorbed in the surplus wage budget but if not, Council would need to direct the Chief Financial Officer to fund the change through Employee Reserve Fund.
6	Increase the compensation rate of all Council positions to an amount specified by Council.		Compensation rates may lag in the market depending on the rate specified and do not meet the current practice of the 60 th percentile of the market. Compensation rates do not align with the policy for the non union group at the 55 th percentile.	Budget impact unavailable until receive specified increase percentage. Any additional costs may be absorbed in the surplus wage budget but if not, Council would need to direct the Chief Financial Officer to fund the change through Employee Reserve Fund.

Chart C: Chart of Benefit and Pension Options for Council

Option #	Description of Option	Advantages	Disadvantages	Cost Impact to Budget
A (Current practice)	Self funded benefits (health care and dental only; no life insurance)	Members have opportunity to enroll in group benefits at a discounted cost if they do not have benefits elsewhere	Members pay for coverage 100%	\$0
В	Municipality funded benefits (health care and dental only; no life insurance)	Members have the opportunity to enroll in group benefits at no cost to them.	Increase costs to the Municipality	\$229.08/ single member coverage \$554.77/family coverage
С	Cost Split between Member of Council and Municipality	Members have opportunity to enrol in group benefits at a discounted rate paying 50% cost	Increase costs to the Municipality	\$114.54/single member coverage \$277.39/family coverage
D	Council Members have no access to benefits through the Municipality		Members would not have the option to participate in the benefits	\$0
E	Council Members have access to Life Insurance coverage paid by the Municipality	Access to life insurance which is not currently available at no additional costs to the Council Member.	Increase cost to the Municipality	The Chief Workforce Advisor would have to research policies and rates.
F	Council Members have access to Life Insurance coverage self funded	Access to life insurance which is not currently available	Members pay for coverage 100%	The Chief Workforce Advisor would have to research policies and rates. \$0
G	Council members have access to Life Insurance coverage split cost between the Council member and the Municipality	Access to life insurance which is not currently available at no additional costs to the Council Member.	Increase costs to the Municipality and to the Member of Council	The Chief Workforce Advisor would have to research policies and rates.
Н	Council Members have no access to Life Insurance coverage	Status quo	No access to coverage	No cost change

(current practice)	Compensation in lieu of OMERS contributions (only for those who are not eligible to participate in OMERS)	Members who are ineligible to participate in OMERS are paid equal benefit to those who are eligible to participate		Status quo
J	No compensation in lieu of OMERS contributions	Reduce costs for Municipality	Perception of inequitable compensation between Members of Council who are eligible and those who are not eligible	Reduce costs