

**Schedule “A”**

**Review of Comments made February 26, 2024**

**Comments of Mike Sullivan**

February 26, 2024 Meeting:<sup>11</sup>

*“...who is responsible for creating the mess in the first place, the Clerk creates the agenda for each meeting including determining which items should be in-camera.”*

The Clerk does not determine the matters that should be considered at closed session. The Clerk in consultation with senior leadership prepares the meeting agenda. Council by way of a motion confirms that it will be going to an in-camera meeting. The *Municipal Act, 2001* section 239(2) sets out those issues that may be considered at an in-camera session.

*“... the deadline the clerk had set for commenting on the budget”*

The Clerk does not set the deadline for comments. Deadlines for comments are established by the City’s Procedural By-law.

*“the clerk has quietly changed the rules for deputations” and “... she has changed the rulebook”*

This statement is incorrect and alleges that the Clerk has on their own initiative breached, revised or altered the City’s procedural by-law.

*“I thank the Clerk’s Office for allowing me to speak in spite of the rule changes”*

*From the Transcript of the 26 February meeting*

*There is no penalty in law for Council’s misbehaviour. You should call it misbehaviour. But **who is responsible for creating the mess in the first place? The clerk creates the agenda for each meeting, including determining which items should been in camera.** It is then up to Council to decide whether to follow the clerk’s agenda or to move items off the in-camera agenda and discuss items in public. ([See video](#), 30:15)*