

CITY CLERK  
SECRETARIAT

**Bay Cloverhill Community Association --- The Bloor Street East  
Neighbourhood Association &  
Church Wellesley Neighbourhood Association**

2016 OCT 24 AM 9 09

October 24, 2016

Jennifer Forkes, Secretariat for  
The Executive Committee  
City of Toronto  
10<sup>th</sup> Floor, West Tower, City Hall  
100 Queen Street West  
Toronto, On M5H 2N2

Dear Ms Forkes;

**Re: EX18.2 Follow-up Report on the Toronto Ward Boundary Review**

The enclosed Attachment and Appendices form the submission from three Neighbourhood/Community Associations (Bay Cloverhill Community Association, The Bloor Street East Neighbourhood Association and The Church Wellesley Neighbourhood Association). In summary the Attachment outlines our concerns and recommendations regarding the conflict of interest presented to many Councillors including those on the Executive Committee. It also includes our concern regarding the exclusion of Governance in the process and finally our recommendation regarding the number of Wards (26) including detailed reasoning.

Of the three options, the 26 Ward Option, was by far our Number One Choice. Our second choice is the 47 Ward Option. In our opinion the 44 Ward Option contains too many flaws to merit any serious consideration.

Our review embraced a forward looking City that accepts Amalgamation (a **One Toronto**) and a structure that allows for continuity of growth in terms of new taxpayers, built form and the services required to support the increased population.

We challenge you to look to the future as **One Toronto** with a structure that works to unite while at the same time meeting the tests of "effective representation". Our City can be a very welcoming, vibrant and dynamic for all of us and that is how we want it to grow. We urge you as stewards of the process to agree.

We look forward to a timely decision by City Council embracing "effective representation". We do not want an enforced decision by the Ontario Municipal Board which may not work for anyone.


Respectfully,



Rick Whitten-Stovall, President  
Bay Cloverhill Community Association



Linda Brett, President  
Bloor Street East Neighbourhood Association



Andrew Horberry, President  
Church Wellesley Neighbourhood Association

/kah,lab,jrb

## Attachment

### **Ward Boundaries Review, 2016: One Toronto or Toronto Divided?**

- Decision is Raising Conflicts of Interest for Councillors who may be promoting Self Interest rather Than Thought for the Greater good of Residents or the City;
- Decision is Muting a Vision for our City;
- Decision is being made based on a narrow Frame of Reference rather than a fulsome evaluation of future needs.

We commend the City of Toronto for its efforts to reorganize ward boundaries, specifically to balance the population within the city more equitably. The Government of Canada and the Province of Ontario advise that all populations should be divided equitably for proper and fair representation. These statements are supported by the Supreme Court of Canada, Ontario Courts and the Ontario Municipal Board.

We, a group of residents of the City of Toronto, are concerned as follows:

1. We do not believe that a meaningful dialog on the optimal number of Wards can be done without governance as part of the discussion. The current Review of Ward Boundaries (Draw the Lines) has lost focus. The original City Council Motion adopted from the Executive Committee (EX18.12, March 19, 2012) which started this process specifically includes “possible governance implications”. At some point this concept was removed and specifically identified as one of the “Out of Scope” parameters included in Schedule D of the Consultants’ Report (See Appendix II).
2. We are very concerned that some members of Council and their Staff may be working to protect their jobs rather than looking at what is in the best interest of the Amalgamated City of Toronto. They give the appearance of a preference for entrenched boundaries that divide rather than build.

At the moment, these two factors have made the process seem to be more of a ‘numbers game’, an exercise in splitting up the population equitably. We draw your attention to the very long list of issues that the consultants deemed beyond the scope of their consultation (See Appendix II) as compared to the relevant motions at Council (EX18.12, March 19, 2012 and EX32.2, May 13, 2013, See Appendix I).

We ask these questions of ourselves and of you. Where is:

- the thought for the greater good of our city, that is, a greater good that leads to the unity of Toronto?
- the excitement that is generated by a vision for our city in the future?
- the willingness to build bridges between communities and cultures?
- the binding fabric of good governance that provides for a truly amalgamated city?

To the positive, we perceive the current Review of Ward Boundaries to be an opportunity for the city to become more united with the opportunity to have all areas of the city working toward better equality of services and facilities. We see the Review of Ward Boundaries as an opportunity to shake up the status quo and put in place a more workable division of powers within the city. We see new ward boundaries as an opportunity that allows City Council to function at a higher level in its decision making process and inclusion.

## **We support the 26 Wards Option.**

Yet, on this matter of 26 Wards, it cannot work unless staff allotments for Councillors are strictly aligned with the population being served within the ward. A reduction in the number of Wards should not be seen as a way to reduce staff and cut budgets, but rather a way to provide better governance and management. Our City is larger in budget, population, and sheer volume of activity than many of the Provinces. It has been afforded special status by the Province of Ontario and should act accordingly.

What should be considered the desired outcomes of new Ward Boundaries?

We believe that everyone should consider as an absolute that the new Ward Boundaries will provide a better system of municipal government for the City of Toronto. We respectfully suggest the following steps be taken to aid the decision-makers in their duties and responsibilities.

1. We request that Mayor Tory invite the Integrity Commissioner for the City of Toronto to speak to the Executive Committee on October 26 regarding the need for each member of the Executive Committee to be ethical in his/her decisions regarding Ward Boundaries. That should include a responsibility to the population of the city as well as to the good functioning of the city.
2. We request that Mayor Tory invite the Integrity Commissioner for the City of Toronto to speak to the entire City Council at the November 2016 Council Meeting regarding the need for each member of City Council to be ethical in his/her decisions regarding Ward Boundaries. That should include a responsibility to the population of the city as well as to the functioning operations of the City.
3. We request that the entire City Council think about the 26 Ward Option as a legislative vehicle leading to a full conversation within City Council with the purpose of true change in the status quo which forces the city to work toward a re-organization across the board , possibly the first step toward the amalgamation that was legislated by the Province of Ontario in 1999. It has the potential for Councillors to allow an exciting and functional framework to evolve for them to be managers of the Ward for the ease of governance and service to citizens.
4. We suggest that the City of Toronto should/might use the time from this date today to the next election in 2018 to create the necessary governance that will support proper functioning for 26 wards.
5. We would ask that all Councillors be aware that the 47 Ward Option supports the existing fracturing of the Council and the competitive attitudes of different parts of the city. The 47 Ward Option does not encourage a healthy discussion between diverse parts of the city with the goal of revitalization of the city as a whole. In fact, it entrenches the inability to amalgamate.
6. We implore Council to consider the financial impact of the 47 Ward Option at a time when Council has again requested the Civil Service (their employees) to reduce the costs of the delivery of services at a time when the population is growing rapidly.
7. We want you to understand that we have given no consideration to the 44 Ward Option as it thwarts the unity of the city, the unstated aim of the process.

## Appendix I

### City of Toronto Ward Boundary Review History of Council Motions

March 19, 2012 – Executive Committee Referral to Council (EX18.2)

- Request a report on the process of a City of Toronto Ward Boundary review
  - Inclusive of governance implications
- Ensure future Terms of Reference take into account
  - Impact of revitalization plans
  - Future OP and Zoning-By law increased population densities

May 13, 2013 – Executive Committee Referral to Council (EX32.2)

- Authorizes City Manager to retain third party consultants
- Draft terms of reference included
  - Terms of reference silent on Governance
  - Project Parameters include principles of
    - Geography
    - Community history
    - Minority representation
    - Communities of interest
    - Physical and natural boundaries
- Broad process included: OMB proof; principles set out by Supreme Court of Canada; Ontario Courts; OMB appeals
- March 19, 2012 directive referred to but references to governance, revitalization plans, diversity etc not specifically included nor specifically excluded in the motion or terms of reference
- Work plan to allow for implementation in the 2018 election

July 16, 2013 Petition to Redivide Ward Boundaries (CC37.2)

- Council considered a petition under the City of Toronto Act to redraw the Ward Boundaries
  - Council did not adopt the petition
  - If legally challenged authorized City Solicitor to defend the challenge
  - If faced with a challenge authorize City Solicitor to request an adjournment of proceedings until completion of current Ward Boundary Review

June 10, 2014 Draw the Line – Toronto Ward Boundary Review Project Plan (EX42.4)

- Council Approved work plan
- Funds to Consultants \$800,050 based on work plan

May 2016 – Final Report Toronto Ward Boundary Review (EX15.2)

Consultants' Report to the Executive Committee

- Report seems to have been narrowed to meet legal challenges only
- Appendix D – Out of Scope reporting includes
  - Governance
  - Staff Resources
  - Consultant's Process eg Councillor Conflict of Interest
- Additional concepts lost which were included in Charging Motions
  - Communities emerging from revitalization plans and minority interests

## Appendix D – Out of Scope Comments

All of the issues outside the scope of the TWBR raised by survey respondents, submissions, public meeting participants and Members of Council are summarized in this Appendix and organized by theme. Comments received from the various participants have been integrated within the themes. More detailed comments can be found in Appendix C of the TWBR Round One report and Appendix B of the TWBR Round Two report.

### Governance

This topic is the most often discussed ‘outside of scope’ subject. Comments relate to the following:

- Structure and operation of City Council
- Two-tier governance system
- De-amalgamation with local and Metro Councils
- Expanded role for Community Councils
- Community Council Chair with veto
- Balance of ‘parochial’ and ‘city-wide’ approach to issues
- Creation of Midtown Community Council
- Community Council boundaries (TEYCC/EYCC)

- Four Community Councils (Eglinton/Humber River/Victoria Park)
- Smaller Council plus Board of Control
- Board of Control plus Councillors elected-at-large plus local Councillors
- Smaller Council plus New York-style Community Boards
- 25 Councillors plus 5 ‘senior’ Councillors (elected in 5 wards each)
- Proportional representation/ranked ballots
- Multi-member districts
- Councillors elected at-large
- Term limits for Members of Council
- ‘Strong Mayor’ system with veto

### Staff/Resources

Comments on how to handle larger wards/increased workload focus on the following:

- Hire additional staff
- Councillors rely too much on staff
- Councillors’ pay to be competitive with private sector
- Referendum on Council members’ pay/resources at each municipal election
- Difference in levels of service among various Councillors’ offices

## **Naming of Wards**

There is no unanimity on how to name any new wards in Toronto. Comments include the following:

- Use neighbourhood names
- Eliminate pre-amalgamation labels
- Maintain branding of local cycling groups
- Create unique ward names
- Maintain some connection with names of federal/provincial ridings
- Create names independent of federal/provincial ridings

## **School Boards, Trustees, Catchment Areas**

School zone boundaries are important to participants in the TWBR. Comments are far-ranging:

- Concern re how new ward boundaries will influence Trustee wards
- TWBR should consider school zone boundaries
- Trustee ward boundaries should not have to match ward boundaries
- Problems re identifying various school supporters (default registration to TDSB)
- Position of School Board Trustee should be full-time

## **TWBR Process**

Out of scope comments on the TWBR process are limited and include the following:

- Potential conflict of interest, if Councillors vote for a new ward structure
- Stop the TWBR until the Province has completed Municipal Act review
- Don't use pre-amalgamation terms like Scarborough/Etobicoke during TWBR process