

EX18.2 Attachment 5

Appendix 5: Options for Ward Boundary Changes

OPTION	CONSULTANT	MEMBERS OF COUNCIL	PUBLIC	CITY POLL
<p>1</p> <p>Revised Minimal Change (47 Wards)¹</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RECOMMENDED • Avg. ward pop. 61,000 residents • Achieves <i>ER</i> using a +/- 15% population variation • By 2026, the Consultant estimates that 157 residents may be outside of the upper acceptable variance under <i>ER</i>, primarily in current Ward 38 (RW-41 in the proposed model) • Would add 3 new wards to City Council (3 downtown & 1 in North York), and remove 1 existing ward (Ward 18) • Additional 70 comments and suggestions allowed for refinements that addressed some concerns about division of neighbourhoods (including Regent Park and Church-Wellesley Village and the Sentinel community) • Discussed in <i>TWBR Supplementary Report</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 47 ward option allows for better capacity to represent, keeps existing communities together & is the result of an independent process • Adding 3 Councillors is appropriate given city's growth & that no adjustments have been made since 2000 • This option had favourable support among many Members of Council • Concerns were raised about splitting some communities, including many of those also identified by the public 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority of public consulted expressed a preference for this option • Support focused on potential for achieving better local representation, with better local democracy • Concerns focused on increasing the size of City Council, and need to address ward boundaries that split existing communities (e.g. Bridlewood / Corinthian communities, Don Mills Residents Association, Jane-Finch, Malvern, Mount Dennis Community Association)² 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 37% of residents polled identified "being able to reach your Councillor" as their first priority in deciding what ward boundaries are (10% higher than the next leading response) • Making sure every ward in the City has the same number of people ranked a fifth priority (21% of those residents polled) • 71% of those who have voted previously indicated changes to their ward boundary would not influence their decision to vote in the future

¹ This option is now called "Recommended Wards with Refinements (47 Wards)"

² The concerns have been largely addressed in the Consultant's revisions.

ER – Effective Representation

TWBR – Toronto Ward Boundary Review

Appendix 5: Options for Ward Boundary Changes

OPTION	CONSULTANT	MEMBERS OF COUNCIL	PUBLIC	CITY POLL	
2	Minimal Change (47 Wards)³	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Original recommendation of <i>TWBR Final Report</i> • Avg. ward pop. 61,000 residents • Achieves <i>ER</i> using a +/- 15% population variation • Would add 3 new wards to City Council (3 downtown & 1 in North York), and remove 1 existing ward (Ward 18) • Discussed in <i>TWBR Final Report</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had the highest ranked score of all options originally considered for the <i>TWBR Final Report</i> • Ranked "first choice" of all 5 original options by the majority of Councillors voting (13 times) with a low rate of "last choice" (4 times) • Concerns expressed about division of neighbourhoods / communities by creation of new wards and shifting of existing ward boundaries (esp. in downtown core) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had the highest ranked score of all options originally considered for the <i>TWBR Final Report</i> • Was the second "last choice" of all 5 options considered for the <i>TWBR Final Report</i> • Was ranked fourth in "first choice" voting for original 5 options considered for the <i>TWBR Final Report</i>, but often was leading second or third choice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 37% of residents polled identified "being able to reach your Councillor" as their first priority in deciding what ward boundaries are (10% higher than the next leading response) • Making ward boundaries align with historic communities (incl. former boroughs) tied with aligning with geographic boundaries for third place (23%) among residents polled in priorities for setting ward boundaries
3	Small Wards (58 Wards)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avg. ward pop. 50,000 residents • Achieves <i>ER</i> using a +/- 15% population variation • Would add 14 new wards to City Council • Smallest ward population range (45,000 – 55,000 pop.) • Discussed in <i>TWBR Final Report</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixed reaction by Councillors, with almost an equal number ranking this option "first" and "last place". • Most divisive option of those presented in preparation of <i>TWBR Final Report</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ranked the highest "first choice" option, but also among the highest "last place" choice • Ranked second last when all scoring input was incorporated into scoring system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 37% of residents polled identified "being able to reach your Councillor" as their first priority in deciding what ward boundaries are (10% higher than the next leading response) • 30% of residents polled indicated that the city should have an equal number of people in each ward, while 31% indicated that it is okay if wards have different numbers of residents

³ This option is referred to as the Recommended Wards in the Final Report.

ER – Effective Representation

TWBR – Toronto Ward Boundary Review

Appendix 5: Options for Ward Boundary Changes

OPTION	CONSULTANT	MEMBERS OF COUNCIL	PUBLIC	CITY POLL	
4	44 Wards (Revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avg. ward pop 70,000 • Achieves <i>ER</i> using a +/- 10% population variation • By 2026, the Consultant estimates that 350 residents may be outside of the upper acceptable variance under <i>ER</i>, primarily in current Ward 28 (Ward 218 in proposed model) • Would add 3 wards (2 downtown, 1 in North York) by removing 3 existing wards (Wards 10, 18 & 32) • Large amount of change • Option 2 (44 wards) discussed in <i>TWBR Final Report</i> • Refined version discussed in <i>TWBR Supplementary Report</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retains the current size of City Council • Extra workload generated by larger wards is manageable • No cost increase for additional City Councillors • Concerns over the number of existing communities & neighbourhoods split • Concerns over high degree of change • Concerns over disappearance of certain wards and 'capacity to represent' larger wards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for retaining the current size of City Council • Positive feedback for maintaining the integrity of certain existing communities / neighbourhoods (e.g. Regent Park, Church-Wellesley Village, West Toronto Junction) • Concern over large amount of change involved, reduced 'capacity to represent' • Division of certain existing communities & neighbourhoods remains a concern (e.g. Lawrence Heights, Leaside, The Beach) • 'Disappearance' of Wards 10 & 32 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When informed each ward would have approximately 70,000 people if Council decided to standardize ward populations, 30% of residents polled indicated that the city should have an equal number of people in each ward, while 31% indicated that it is okay if wards have different numbers of residents • 14% of residents polled wanted to keep the current number of wards when asked if the City should reduce its wards to 25 and align them with federal riding boundaries

Appendix 5: Options for Ward Boundary Changes

OPTION	CONSULTANT	MEMBERS OF COUNCIL	PUBLIC	CITY POLL	
5	<p>Natural / Physical Boundaries (41 Wards)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avg ward pop 70,000 • Achieves <i>ER</i> using a +/- 10% population variation • Would create additional wards downtown (2 wards) and in North York (1 ward) by removing 6 existing wards and making significant changes to most other city ward boundaries • Discussed in <i>TWBR Final Report</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over significant amount of change, splitting existing communities & neighbourhoods • Received few "first choices" from Councillors, but was the leading choice for "fifth place or 'No'" when polled by the TWBR Consultants • Only surpassed by the 38 Wards option as least popular among Councillors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over significant amount of change, splitting existing communities & neighbourhoods • Some support for reducing the size of City Council and related cost savings • Scored third in ranking overall with slightly more first choice votes than fifth choice votes (but still well behind either first or second ranked Options due to the high number of "last place" votes) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making ward boundaries align with historic communities (incl. former boroughs) tied with aligning with geographic boundaries for third place (23%) among residents polled in priorities for setting ward boundaries • 71% of those who have voted previously indicated changes to their ward boundary would not influence their decision to vote in the future

Appendix 5: Options for Ward Boundary Changes

OPTION	CONSULTANT	MEMBERS OF COUNCIL	PUBLIC	CITY POLL	
6	<p>Large Wards (38 Wards)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avg. ward pop 75,000 • Achieves <i>ER</i> using a +/- 10% population variation • Would remove 6 current wards (Wards 3, 9, 18, 21, 32, 43) while creating significant change in the boundaries of many other wards • Discussed in <i>TWBR Final Report</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had the least amount of support among Councillors • Significant amount of change, concern over splitting existing communities & neighbourhoods • Small number of Councillors supported the reduction in the size of City Council, support for potential cost savings of fewer Councillors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lowest ranked option among 5 options considered by public in preparation of <i>TWBR Final Report</i> • Concern regarding the significant amount of change, splitting existing communities & neighbourhoods • Some support based on reducing the size of City Council and potential cost savings resulting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When informed each ward would have approximately 70,000 people if Council decided to standardize ward populations, 30% of residents polled indicated that the city should have an equal number of people in each ward, while 31% indicated that it is okay if wards have different numbers of residents • 36% of residents polled supported fewer and larger wards when asked if they supported reducing the city's wards to 25 and aligning them with federal and provincial riding boundaries

Appendix 5: Options for Ward Boundary Changes

OPTION	CONSULTANT	MEMBERS OF COUNCIL	PUBLIC	CITY POLL
7	<p>Consistent with Federal Riding Boundaries (26 Wards)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NOT recommended • avg. ward pop. 112,500 • Achieve <i>ER</i> using a +/- 15% population variation • By 2026, the Consultant estimates that 14,330 residents may be outside of the upper acceptable variance under <i>ER</i>, primarily in current Wards 3 / 4 and 5 / 6 (wards merged in this ward boundary model) • Maintaining voter parity, a prime component of <i>ER</i>, in Etobicoke could present a significant challenge by 2026 and require ward boundaries that break from the federal riding boundaries established for the area. • And additional ward was required to be created in Downtown (Toronto Centre North) to achieve <i>ER</i>; this does not conform to federal riding boundaries for the area • Discussed in <i>TWBR Supplementary Report</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only 2 Councillors liked this option, while 29 identified the option as "completely unworkable" • Councillors expressed significant concern that the size of the wards would make them "undemocratic", as they would be too large for Councillors to be able to effectively represent their constituents • Councillors also expressed a general opinion that the reduction of Members of Council from 44 to 26 would not save money due to the additional staff required by Councillors to serve their constituents • Councillors noted that there is a significant difference between the roles of local Councillors and Members of Parliament when it comes to representing local constituents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public opinion was very divided in the input received by the <i>TWBR</i> Consultants – almost an equal number of individuals held views in favour or opposed to this option • Supported the ability of the option to minimize the impact of change to ward boundaries (as they largely would conform to federal riding boundaries) • Liked the ability to more easily help residents know their elected representative (1 per order of government) • Keep many communities together • Reduce the size of government • Concerns over diminishing of local democracy, creation of larger population discrepancies, and difficulties in managing larger wards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 36% of residents polled supported fewer and larger wards when asked if they supported reducing the city's wards to 25 and aligning them with federal and provincial riding boundaries • 28% of residents polled were opposed to 25 wards aligned with federal and provincial riding boundaries • 5% of residents polled believed that there should be fewer than 25 wards when asked if they supported reducing the city's wards to 25 and aligning them with federal and provincial riding boundaries

ER – Effective Representation
TWBR – Toronto Ward Boundary Review